

*Washington State Center for  
Childhood Deafness & Hearing Loss*



*June 30, 2010*

*Department of Health - Kent, Washington*

***CDHL Core Team Meeting  
Department of Health/Kent  
June 30, 2010***

- Agenda
- Department of Education count summary (November 1, 2009)
- ESD/District Demographic Profile Summary
- SurveyMonkey Value-Satisfaction Results
  - Overview
  - Analysis
    - Teachers – Related Services
    - Parents
    - Administrators
    - Early Intervention Providers
- Job Analysis
  - Educational Interpreters
  - Educational Audiologists
- Stakeholder Meeting Participant Profile
- Stakeholder Meeting Exit Survey
  - Parents
  - Teacher/Service Providers



## Center on Childhood Deafness and Hearing Loss

### Statewide Systems Analysis of Services to Students who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind

*Purpose: 1) To examine service availability and gaps and, 2) to identify service delivery options, resources, and policy changes for the implementation and operation of two demonstration sites for regional programs to provide services for children who are deaf or hard of hearing.*

### Core Group Meeting Agenda – June 30, 2010

1PM - 7PM

WA Department of Health, Conference Room 1

20435 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave. S., Kent, WA

1:00 PM	Welcome, Review of Agenda
1:15 PM	Data Summaries & Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DOE Special Education Nov 1 Count - Carol</li><li>• ESD/District Demographic Profile – Rick</li><li>• Survey Monkey Value-Satisfaction Results:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Teachers-Related Service Providers - Jane</li><li>- Parents – Jane</li><li>- Administrators – Rick</li><li>- Early Intervention Providers – Kris</li></ul></li><li>• Job Analysis: Educational Interpreters – Carol</li><li>• Job Analysis: Educational Audiologists – Kris</li><li>• Stakeholder Meeting Exit Surveys (Parents &amp; Providers) - Cheryl</li></ul>
2:30 PM	Break
2:45 PM	Stakeholder Meeting Focus Group Data Analysis: Session 1, THINGS THAT ARE WORKING WELL
3:30 PM	Stakeholder Meeting Focus Group Data Analysis: Session 2, NEEDS
4:50 PM	Break
	Stakeholder Meeting Focus Group Data Analysis: Session 3, OUTCOMES

5:00 PM

Dinner

5:30 PM

Stakeholder Meeting Focus Group Data Analysis: Session 4, ADVICE TO

6:00 PM

STATE

Next Steps

6:45 PM

Adjourn

7:00 PM

# Department of Education Count Summary

Deaf: 7  
Hard of Hearing: 56  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 1  
Deaf-Blind Census: 15  
TOD: 3

Olympic  
ESD 114

ESD  
113

Deaf: 8  
Hard of Hearing: 48  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 1  
Deaf-Blind Census: 11  
TOD: 3

Deaf: 81  
Hard of Hearing: 135  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 10  
Deaf-Blind Census: 52  
TOD: 17

Northwest  
ESD 189

Deaf: 125  
Hard of Hearing: 329  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 5  
Deaf-Blind Census: 61  
TOD: 33

Puget Sound  
ESD

ESD  
112  
Deaf: 95  
Hard of Hearing: 79  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 7  
Deaf-Blind Census: 19  
TOD: 29

North  
Central  
ESD 171

Deaf: 14  
Hard of Hearing: 34  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 1  
Deaf-Blind Census: 14  
TOD: 4

ESD  
101

Deaf: 19  
Hard of Hearing: 89  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 5  
Deaf-Blind Census: 23  
TOD: 6

ESD  
105

Deaf: 31  
Hard of Hearing: 56  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 2  
Deaf-Blind Census: 12  
TOD: 5

ESD  
123

Deaf: 13  
Hard of Hearing: 48  
Combined Hearing Vision Loss: 1  
Deaf-Blind Census: 16  
TOD: 1

ESD 101					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Central Valley	8	6		1	2
Cheney		5		2	
Chewelah				1	
Columbia No. 400	1				
Colville	1		1		
Davenport	1				
Deer Park	1		3		
East Valley No 361	5			2	
Froeman	1				
Inchelium	1				
Leon Lake	1				
Mead	2	8	2	2	1
Medical Lake	3				
Newport	1				
Pullman	2		1	1	
Republic				2	
Riverside	3				
Spokane	7	46	3	8	2
Valley No. 70	1				
West Valley No 363	3				
Wilbur	1				
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	19	89	5	23	6

ESD 105					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
East Valley No 90		1			
Ellensburg		1		1	
Goldendale					
Grandview	3	3		1	
Granger		4			
Mabton		1			
Mount Adams		1			
Royal		3			
Selah		2			
Sunnyside	10	10		1	
Toppenish		1			
Wahluke		1			
Wapato		5	1		
West Valley No208		3			
Yakima	18	18	1	10	3
Zillah		1			
ESD					1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	31	56	2	12	5

ESD 112					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Battle Ground		7		2	
Camas		2			
Evergreen No 114	13	20	1	3	4
Hockinson		1	1	1	
Kalama			1	1	
Kelso	1	8			
Longview		3			
Ocean Beach				1	
Ridgefield		2			
WSSB			3	6	
WSD	79	21	1	1	23
Vancouver	2	11	1	3	1
Washougal		3		1	
White Salmon		1			
ESD 112					1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	95	79	7	19	29

ESD 113					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Adna			1		
Bastford				1	
Centralia		3			
Chehalis		1			
Elma		1			
Griffin		1			
Hoquiam		1			
Montesano	1	2		1	
Napavine		1			
North Beach			1		
North Thurston	6	19		1	2
Vancouver		1		4	
Rochester		1			
Shelton		4			
Tenino		1		1	
Turnwater		3			
Willapa Valley		1			
Winlock		1			
Yalm					
ESD (0-3)	1	5	1	3	1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	8	48	1	11	3

ESD 114					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Bremerton	1	4		2	
Cape Flattery				1	
Central Kit	4	25	1	8	3
Chimacum	1				
North Kitsap		7			
North Mas	1	1			
Port Angeles		4		2	
Port Townsend		2			
Sequim		2			
South Kitsap		11		2	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	7	56	1	15	3

ESD 123					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Auburn	1	6		1	
Bainbridge Island		3			
Bellevue	3	9		2	
Bethel		10	1	3	
Clover Park	3	14		2	
Eatonville		2		1	
Enumclaw	1	4			
Federal Way	6	26		4	4
File		1			
Franklin Pierce		5			
Highline	15	27	1	4	7
Issaquah	5	8			
Kent		11	1	4	
Lake Washington	6	9		5	
Mercer Island		2			
Northshore	6	14		6	
Orling		1		1	
Peninsula	3	5		2	
Puyallup	28	23		3	6
Renton	2	14	1	1	
Riverview		2			
Seattle	12	52		7	6
Shoreline	2	11		3	
Snoqualmie Valley		2		1	
Stellacoom Historical	1	1			
Sumner		7		1	
Tacoma	30	47		5	
Tahoma		4		2	10
Tukwila	1	2			
University Place		2		1	
Vashon				1	
White River		5	1		1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	125	329	5	61	33

ESD 123					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Clarkston	1	1			1
Dayton				1	
Kennewick	5	9	1		
Kiona-Benton City		3			
North Franklin		3		2	
Othello	1	3			
Pasco	5	17		3	
Prescott		1			
Prosser		2			
Richland	1	3		3	
Waitsburg				1	
Walla Walla		5		6	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	13	48	1	16	1

ESD 171					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Brewster				1	
Cashmere		1			
Eastmont		6		4	1
Entiat	1				
Grand Coulee Dam				1	
Lake Chelan		1			
Moses Lake	1	9			
Okanogan	2	2		1	
Omak		2	1	2	1
Oroville	1	1			
Quincy		3		2	
Tonasket		3		2	
Warden		1		2	
Waterville	3	2			
Wenatchee	6	5		1	
ESD 171					1
WSD					1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	14	34	1	14	4

ESD 189					
Serving District	8-Deaf	9-HH	11-DB	DB Census	TOD
Arlington			1	1	
Bellingham	3	8		1	1
Blaine				2	
Burlington Edison	1	5		1	
Concrete	1				
Coupeville		1			
Edmonds	33	41	5	9	8
Everett	2	20		4	1
Ferndale	4	2	1	2	1
La Conner		1		1	
Lake Stevens	3	12	1	2	
Lakewood		4			
Lopez Island		1			
Lyrden		2			
Marysville	1	13		4	
Meridian				1	
Monroe	1	3		2	
Mount Baker		1			
Mount Vernon	9	5		3	
Mukilteo	2	7	1	2	
Nooksack Valley		1			
Oak Harbor	2	3		2	
Sadro-Woodley	2	2			
Snohomish	16	2	11	2	
South Whidbey		1			
Stanwood-Camano	1	2	1	4	
ESD 189					4
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Deaf</b>	<b>HH</b>	<b>DB</b>	<b>DB Census</b>	<b>TOD</b>
	81	135	10	52	17

# Demographic Information

Demographic Information

District	Total Student Count	OSPI Report			CDHL Survey Results						
		8 (Deaf)	9 (HI)	Total	8 (Deaf)	9 (HI)	Total	No IEP/No 504	504 Only	IEP but not in 8 or 9	Total
Anacortes*	2,733				1	0	1	0	1	2	3
Battle Ground	13,048	7	0	7	1	4	5	1	0	3	4
Bellevue	17,593	5	8	13	9	8	17	35	21	25	81
Blaine*	2,140				0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Bridgeport*	752				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Camas	5,828	0	2	2	1	0	1	4	7	6	17
Cheney	3,863	0	5	5	0	3	3	10	6	8	24
Columbia	907	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Edmonds	20,276	8	34	42	39	40	79	119	9	80	208
Everett	19,049	5	21	26	2	19	21	29	11	21	61
Evergreen No. 114	26,568	13	20	33	12	29	41	50	10	22	82
Highland*	1,183				0	0	0	13	3	3	19
Hockinson	1,994	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Kahlotus*	62				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kelso	5,044	1	8	9	4	7	11	6	7	2	15
Kalama*	1,048				0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lake Chelan	1,405	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	2
Lake Stevens	7,829	3	13	16	3	9	12	9	3	9	21
Lakewood	2,560	0	4	4	0	3	3	0	1	0	1
Lyle*	314				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mead	9,336	2	8	10	3	7	10	0	0	3	3
Medical Lake	2,080	0	3	3	0	4	4	1	1	2	4
Meridian*	2,130				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northshore	19,706	7	14	21	3	10	13	27	1	27	55
Ocean Beach*	935				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ocosta*	696				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Okanogan	1,059	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	1	1
Olympia	9,298	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	10	12
Omak	1,661	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	3	3
Othello	3,667	1	3	4	1	1	2	5	1	2	8
Prescott	241	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Pullman	2,384	2	0	2	1	1	2	6	4	1	11
Reardan-Edwall*	672				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Richland	10,908	1	3	4	1	3	4	20	1	17	38
Ridgefield	2,166	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	3	3
Royal	1,521	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
Sedro-Woolley	4,303	2	0	2	2	1	3	5	0	0	5
Shelton	4,193	0	4	4	0	4	4	72	9	0	81
Shoreline	8,999	8	11	19	9	14	23	42	3	5	50
South Kitsap	10,043	0	15	15	2	21	23	57	3	8	68
Stevenson-Carson	1,444				0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Tumwater	6,789	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	0	8	8
Wapato*	3,334				1	2	3	0	0	3	3
Washougal	2,981	3	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Waterville	287	3	2	5	3	2	5	0	0	0	0
White Salmon	1,199	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1

OSPI report information  
 CDHL Survey Results  
 \*Not listed on the OSPI Special Education report

# SurveyMonkey Results

## Value Satisfaction Survey Results

TOPIC	TODs/ Related Service Providers				Early Intervention				Admin				Parents			
	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat
Identification and Referral	67/64	1	3.87	2.06	34/35	1	3.94	2.52		X				X		
Collaboration	62/60	2	3.77	2.04	33/33	2	3.73	2.67		X				X		
Hearing Screening	63/61	3	3.62	3.02	32/32	3	3.66	2.40		X				X		
Audiological Referral	63/61	4	3.71	2.36	33/33	4	3.85	2.25		X				X		
Vision Screening	60/58	5	3.53	3.26	33/33	5	3.79	2.10		X				X		
Persons Conducting Evaluation	57/57	6	3.79	2.26	32/32	6	3.72	2.79		X			115/111	1	3.88	2.68
Domains to be Evaluated	58/56	7	3.76	2.43	32/32	7	3.78	3.19		X			115/111	1	3.88	2.68
Test Administration	55/56	8	3.85	2.47	32/32	8	3.59	3.00		X			115/111	1	3.88	2.68
Specialized Services, Materials, Equipment	54/54	9	3.78	2.83	31/31	9	3.74	3.36		X				X		
Evaluation Team	51/52	10	3.73	2.28	30/31	10	3.73	3.30		X				X		
Placement Considerations	52/53	11	3.79	2.43	29/29	11	3.79	2.78		X			109/108	2	3.85	2.63
Statement of Purpose	53/53	12	3.60	2.29	29/28	12	3.72	3.22	16/15	1	2.75	3.25	104/102	3	3.63	2.56
Policy on Language and Communication	49/51	13	3.47	2.13	29/27	13	3.45	2.75	13/13	2	3.23	2.70	100/101	4	3.59	2.37
State Oversight	46/49	14	3.52	2.03	26/25	14	3.39	2.95	13/12	3	3.00	2.30	97/96	5	3.62	2.23
Continuum of Options	45/45	15	3.56	2.34	25/25	15	3.64	3.00	13/9	4	3.23	2.64	94/94	6	3.83	2.25
Children/Youth with Multiple Disabilities	49/48	16	3.71	2.41	28/28	16	3.75	3.00	11/11	5	3.64	2.70	91/91	7	3.67	2.51
Program Administrator	48/49	17	3.88	2.55	27/26	17	3.69	3.00	11/12	6	3.64	3.18	91/92	8	3.81	2.31
Staff Qualifications	49/47	18	3.80	3.00	26/27	18	3.89	3.40	11/12	7	3.64	3.40	88/89	9	3.78	2.72
Other Qualified Personnel	49/49	19	3.73	2.88		X			10/12	8	3.60	3.30		X		
Other Personnel-Educational Interpreters	48/47	19a	3.75	2.30		X			11/12	8a	3.64	3.13		X		
Workload Management	47/46	20	3.64	2.75	27/26	19	3.81	2.64	11/12	9	3.45	3.30		X		
Staff Development	47/46	21	3.57	2.37	26/27	20	3.69	2.85	11/12	10	3.64	3.09		X		
Training for General Education Personnel	47/46	22	3.51	2.36		X			11/12	11	3.27	2.36		X		
Facilities	47/46	23	3.51	2.45		X			11/12	12	3.36	2.73	89/91	10	3.66	2.57
Program Accountability	47/47	24	3.53	2.75	25/25	21	3.28	3.22	10/12	13	3.30	3.10	88/90	11	3.64	2.66

## Value Satisfaction Survey Results

TOPIC	TODs/ Related Service Providers				Early Intervention				Admin				Parents			
	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat	# Res	Q #	Val	Sat
Self-Assessment	46/46	25	3.20	2.26	26/26	22	3.04	2.70	11/12	14	2.73	2.20		X		
Cohesive Team	46/46	26	3.65	2.69	25/25	23	3.68	3.04	11/11	15	3.45	3.11		X		
Focus on Communication	47/46	27	3.85	3.10	25/26	24	3.88	3.30	11/12	16	3.64	3.30	87/89	12	3.83	2.78
Focus on Authentic Peer Interactions	47/46	28	3.74	3.00	26/26	25	3.70	2.80	11/12	17	3.36	3.20	88/90	13	3.83	2.73
District Core Curriculum and State Standards	47/45	29	3.30	2.55	26/25	26	3.31	3.28	11/12	18	3.27	2.82		X		
Supplemental Specialized Curricula	46/46	30	3.51	2.83	25/25	27	3.36	3.53	11/11	19	3.45	3.30		X		
Transitions	47/46	31	3.64	3.09	26/25	28	3.73	3.57	11/11	20	3.64	2.89	89/89	14	3.70	2.35
Purpose of Assessments	47/47	32	3.64	2.88	24/25	29	3.58	3.46	11/12	21	3.64	3.20	88/90	15	3.65	2.67
Parent Training and Support	46/43	33	3.67	2.29	25/26	30	3.80	3.12		X			89/87	16	3.73	2.28
Parent Leadership and Participation in Program Development	45/46	34	3.47	2.26	25/25	31	3.80	3.00		X			88/88	17	3.59	2.23
Deaf/Hard of Hearing/Deaf-Blind Adults & Community involvement	44/43	35	3.34	2.03	25/25	32	3.24	2.45		X			88/89	18	3.22	2.08

<p>Q# = Question number          # Res = number of responses          Val = Value          Sat = Satisfaction</p>
---

# Survey Summary—Teachers of the Deaf/Related Service Providers

## Demographics

1. Position:	Percent	Count
➤ Teacher of the DHH	50.5%	52
➤ Teacher of DB	0.0%	0
➤ SLP	16.5%	17
➤ Ed. Audiologist	4.9%	5
➤ Ed. Interpreters *	4.9%	5
➤ Counselor	3.9%	4
➤ School Psychologist	0.0%	0
➤ Other	19.4%	20
2. Caseload—Percent That Are:		
➤ Deaf	49.29%	86
➤ Hard of Hearing	25.95%	86
➤ Deaf-blind	3.76	49
3. Levels Served:		
➤ Preschool	34.1%	31
➤ Elementary	40.7%	37
➤ Middle School	16.5%	15
➤ High School	19.8%	18
➤ All Levels	26.4%	24\
4. School District Size:		
➤ Less than 1,000	14.6%	14
➤ 1,001 – 5,000	6.3%	6
➤ 5,001 – 10,000	9.4%	9
➤ 10,001 – 25,000	15.6%	15
➤ 25,001 – 50,000	10.4%	10
➤ 50,001 +	6.3%	6
➤ NA – Private School	37.5%	36

5. Community Description:	Percent	Count
➤ Rural	10.0%	9
➤ Urban	43.3%	39
➤ Suburban	46.7%	42

6. District's ESD:

➤ 101—Spokane	11.4%	10
➤ 105—Yakima	2.3%	2
➤ 112—Kelso-Longview- Vancouver-Gorge-Goldendale	9.1%	8
➤ 113—Olympia Area	4.5%	4
➤ 114—Bremerton-Peninsula Area	3.4%	3
➤ 121—Seattle Area	47.7%	42
➤ 123—Tri-Cities	4.5%	4
➤ 171—Wenatchee	1.1%	1
➤ 189—Anacortes Area	3.4%	3
➤ Washington School f/t Deaf	12.5%	11

7. Highest Degree:

➤ AA/AS	3.3%	3
➤ BA/BS	14.1%	13
➤ MA/MS	70.7%	65
➤ Specialist	6.5%	6
➤ Ed.D/Ph.D.	5.4%	5

8. Years Experience Teaching/Working with D/HH and/or DB Children and Youth:

➤ 1 – 3 years	14.0%	13
➤ 4 – 6 years	16.1%	15
➤ 7 – 9 years	9.7%	9
➤ 10 – 13 years	16.1%	15
➤ More than 13 years	44.1%	41

9. Attended a Stakeholder Meeting?	Percent	Count
➤ Yes	73.1%	68
➤ No	26.9%	25

## Survey Results: High Value/Low Satisfaction

Qstn #	Topic	Val.	Sat.	Comment Themes
1	Identification & Referral	3.87	2.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough information available in the community about hearing loss, Deaf culture</li> <li>• Physicians not knowledgeable about deafness, speech and language development</li> <li>• Some referring is biased</li> <li>• Parents not aware of the potential in a deaf child</li> </ul>
2	Collaboration	3.77	2.04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more collaboration between private programs and services and public schools</li> <li>• Hospital workers, audiologists and doctors are not training in ASL, deaf education in the importance of early intervention</li> <li>• Need an unbiased 3<sup>rd</sup> party for referrals</li> <li>• Districts have different interpretations of WACs re: establishing eligibility</li> <li>• TODs often not included in eligibility determinations</li> <li>• Isolated pockets of good collaboration exist</li> </ul>
4	Audiological Referral	3.71	2.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referrals seem to be made appropriately for the most part, but follow-up with families that don't keep the appointments or for appropriate</li> </ul>
6	Persons Conducting Evaluation	3.79	2.26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In rural areas, no professionals with expertise in hearing loss; assessments completed and interpreted by people without an understand of the impact of hearing loss on language and academic development</li> <li>• Need a standardized battery of tests for determining eligibility</li> <li>• TOD or specialist in deaf education often not part of the evaluation team</li> <li>• Parent input often not part of the assessment</li> <li>• For deaf-blind, bring in a D/HH and a B/VI specialist, but don't have an understanding of the ramifications of both sensory losses</li> </ul>
7	Domains to be Evaluated	3.76	2.43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation/assessment services lacking or inadequate</li> <li>• Need a standardized battery of required or recommended assessments, and training for personnel who will administer assessments</li> </ul>
8	Test Administration	3.85	2.43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more staff that can administer assessments in ASL</li> <li>• Results are biased depending on who does the testing</li> <li>• Some personnel administering the tests use interpreters—they need to be trained to avoid influencing student performance</li> <li>• Tools are often inadequate, especially for children that have communication but not a language</li> <li>• Issues with the language or communication</li> </ul>

				mode used to administer the tests (i.e. child is primarily ASL but test administered in SEE)
10	Evaluation Team	3.73	2.28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Districts need to understand the expertise required of the evaluation team and know where to find qualified evaluators</li> </ul>
11	Placement Considerations	3.79	2.43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition from preschool to kindergarten is difficult</li> <li>Decision made based on services available rather than child's needs; "This is what we have to offer."</li> <li>Families not given all the options available</li> <li>TODs often not involved in the placement discussion/decision</li> <li>No process for determining who is placed in a DHH program vs. having itinerant or consultation services; based on a standardized score rather than consideration of all the needs of the student</li> </ul>
12	Statement of Purpose	3.60	2.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some programs have a clearly defined mission, others do not; some need to be revisited.</li> <li>Programs may have a clear mission but services may not support the mission</li> </ul>
14	State Oversight	3.52	2.03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't believe there are state-adopted policies for DHH students</li> <li>OSPI and DOH do not have individuals with expertise in DHH to be able to provide oversight</li> </ul>
15	Continuum of Options	3.56	2.34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No support of auditory/oral in the state</li> <li>Training usually not pertinent to DHH; specialists/TODs pay out-of-pocket for relevant workshops</li> <li>One program can't be all things to all children; focus on what they do BEST and allow other programs to be different</li> <li>Need specialists that understand the impact of dual sensory impairments</li> <li>Programs and services students receive are based on where they live, not on communication mode</li> </ul>
16	Children/Youth with Multiple Disabilities	3.71	2.41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students are either in classes for children with multiple disabilities and not getting needed support for deaf or vision issues, or are in DHH of VI classes and not getting the appropriate curriculum for their multiple disabilities</li> <li>Need more training and better curriculum</li> </ul>
19a	Other Personnel: Educational Interpreters	3.75	2.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage interpreters to take EIPA but no state requirement/standards</li> <li>No local, formal, standardized program to train and assess SEE interpreters</li> <li>No training re: tactile interpreting</li> <li>Pay is not high enough to attract qualified interpreters</li> </ul>

21	Staff Development	3.57	2.37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development activities limited due to time and financial constraints</li> <li>• Almost nothing offered specific to deafness is offered</li> <li>• Need to support staff to attend summer trainings</li> </ul>
22	Training for General Education Personnel	3.51	2.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training is inconsistent, often done by interpreters</li> <li>• Not enough time</li> </ul>
23	Facilities	3.57	2.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DHH classrooms are often “left over” spaces</li> <li>• Classrooms and SLP offices don’t meet ANSI acoustical standards</li> <li>• Often barriers for deaf-blind students</li> </ul>
33	Parent Training and Support	3.67	2.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent training is often left up to the individual teacher</li> <li>• Need to use distance learning options for parents that live far from the school</li> <li>• Support communication skills development</li> <li>• Need training on bilingual education</li> </ul>

## Survey Summary—Parents

### Demographics

1. Child's Grade Level:	Percent	Count
➤ Birth-to-3 years	16.1%	20
➤ Preschool	27.4%	34
➤ Elementary	33.9%	42
➤ Middle School	10.5%	13
➤ High School	12.1%	15
2. Child is:	Percent	Count
➤ Deaf	52.0%	64
➤ Hard of Hearing	44.7%	55
➤ Deaf-Blind	3.3%	4
3. Technology & Access Services Used:	Percent	Count
➤ Hearing Aid(s)	55.1%	65
➤ Cochlear Implant(s)	39.8%	47
➤ Baha	0.8%	1
➤ Personal FM System	41.5%	49
➤ Sound Field System (Wide-area Sound Distribution System)	13.6%	16
➤ Interpreter	31.4%	37
➤ Captioning	28.0%	33
➤ Videophone	21.2%	25
➤ Phone Relay	9.3%	11
➤ Other	13.6%	16
4. Child Communicates Through:	Percent	Count
➤ Listening and Speaking Only	40.2%	49
➤ Listening, Speaking and English-based Signs or Tactile Sign	30.3%	37
➤ Listening, Speaking with Cued Speech	0.0%	0
➤ ASL or Tactile Sign	21.3%	26
➤ Other	8.2%	10

5. Child Attends Special School or Program for the Deaf?		
➤ Yes	46.3%	56
➤ No	53.7%	6
6. If “yes,” indicate:		
➤ Washington School f/t Deaf	31.0%	18
➤ Other	69.0%	40
7. Primary Language Used at Home:		
➤ English	88.5%	108
➤ ASL	6.6%	8
➤ Spanish	2.5%	3
➤ Native American	0.0%	0
➤ Other	2.5%	3
8. Description of Resident Community:		
➤ Rural	18.0%	22
➤ Urban	36.1%	44
➤ Suburban	45.9%	56
9. Resident ESD		
➤ 101—Spokane	8.3%	10
➤ 112—Kelso-Longview- Vancouver-Gorge-Goldendale	10.0%	12
➤ 114—Bremerton-Peninsula Area	4.2%	5
➤ 123—Tri-Cities/Walla Walla	4.2%	5
➤ 105—Yakima	0.8%	1
➤ 113—Olympia Area	4.2%	5
➤ 121—Seattle Area	61.7%	74
➤ 171—Wenatchee	0.0%	0
➤ 189—Anacortes Area	6.7%	8
10. Highest Level of Education:		
➤ Did Not Complete High School	1.7%	2
➤ High School Diploma	12.5%	15
➤ AA/AS Degree	20.0%	24
➤ BA/BS Degree	30.8%	37
➤ Graduate Degree	35.0%	42

11. Attended a Stakeholder Meeting:

➤ Yes	46.2%	55
➤ No	53.8%	64

Survey Results: High Value/Low Satisfaction

Qstn #	Topic	Val.	Sat.	Comment Themes
4	Policy on Language and Communication	3.59	2.37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is too vague or doesn't exist</li> <li>• Districts don't fully understand modern approaches to language acquisition</li> <li>• Little-to-nothing in place for auditory/verbal or auditory/oral students</li> <li>• Districts are uneducated regarding for a deaf child learns language and what is appropriate instruction given modality of child</li> <li>• Nothing written re: parent training</li> </ul>
5	State Oversight	3.62	2.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Districts' adherence to state-wide policies varies dramatically from district to district implying that the oversight role is not strong enough</li> <li>• Appears to be a distinct difference between the OSPI and WA Dept. of Health policies and the actual deaf classroom and parents. Neither the state nor Health Department has ever asked me what my child needs.</li> <li>• School districts think they can handle all problems for all children. They can't! These children need special education that the average school district is not capable of providing, but won't admit it. The problem is that there is no oversight / uniformity and the children suffer for it.</li> <li>• Not even close to meeting this for deaf kids who are oral; no consistency or agreed upon best practices for meeting their needs.</li> </ul>
6	Continuum of Options	3.83	2.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program unavailable in home district—had to pay for private services</li> <li>• Not a full range of options</li> <li>• No options other than general education classrooms in my district</li> <li>• Not many options—either a self-contained class or mainstreamed without supports for hearing impairment</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No program available for a child with hearing aids or cochlear implants focused on listening and spoken language</li> <li>• School district doesn't collaborate with early intervention program</li> </ul>
8	Program Administrator	3.81	2.31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat satisfied as a number of district personnel appear well qualified but constrained by district policy, ideology, and general dysfunction</li> <li>• District doesn't have the trained administrators in deaf education</li> <li>• Administrators were very negative in attitude about teaching a hard of hearing child sign language. Been hard in the district to get our child help even on an IEP, so she just goes without and the family has more of a burden of learning and then trying to teaching her.</li> <li>• District could not and had no desire to provide appropriate services to our child. They had no one on staff with any training / experience / knowledge to deal with our son and his disability.</li> <li>• No interaction with anyone in our school district who has any background in deaf education</li> </ul>
14	Transitions	3.70	2..35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition from early intervention to elementary not only unsatisfactory but actively rife with misinformation and hostility</li> <li>• Yes, you have to plan for this all and that is important. But I fear that we are spending so much time on paper work and assessments that we're not leaving enough time for actually working with the child. If I had to choose between paper work and instruction, I would choose instruction</li> <li>• Lack of communication between providers, lack of available assessments to teachers/therapist prior to meetings-no prior planning being done. Therapists/teachers not being available during summer months to meet with the team to do transitions for summer birthday children. Parents not being given information ahead of time about what will be discussed during the transition meetings. Not being apart of the conversation of which goals should be set for their IEP.</li> <li>• From birth to three transition none of</li> </ul>

				<p>the federally mandated or state mandated timelines were met for my child - and no one cared except me and my husband</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We had to organize my son's transition from elementary deaf program to mainstream program. It would be nice to have a policy that insures both schools meet together to help transition and that staff is informed of how the student will use the interpreters and communicate.</li> </ul>
16	Parent Training and Support	3.73	2.28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other than early intervention service (state provided), district provides no training to parents other than very basic technology- based training (i.e. how to use a FM system). No sign training available for parents or even children (except in contained classrooms). IEP meetings have neither all relevant district personnel nor do advance planning, nor are parents treated as equals, nor are there timely responses (in fact timeliness blamed on parents when district staff have delayed and ignored parent communications).</li> <li>Parents here are left to find out this information on their own.</li> <li>There is no program yet for kids who are oral. We are making it up as we go... no workshops, no peer groups, no parent education classes specific to our needs.</li> <li>We have not found many resources or support for Signing Exact English. It's been very difficult to access classes- there are only two being taught and difficult to find available and certified interpreters.</li> <li>You're kidding right? I was not allowed to bring a friend to meetings; not a single one of my requests was addressed; timelines have never been met; no training for parents was given; parent counseling or training was not even mentioned in the IEP</li> </ul>
17	Parent Leadership and Participation in Program Development	3.59	2.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On specific deaf/HH issues I have seen no solicitation of parent involvement. In special ed in general</li> <li>Our school does not want parent involvement. We are just supposed to come to an IEP and sign. There is no parent support, board or input requested.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They don't want me to even come in the classroom more less have a say regarding anything</li> <li>• Our parent community in using SEE sign is very small and disjointed. Parents need more access to online social networking groups, list serves and activities to promote community and support networks. The parent groups are strapped for volunteers and finances to create opportunities for parents to be more involved in learning and supporting their schools and children. We need a lot more support in this area!!</li> <li>• Did not feel as a parent that I was part of a "team" for "my" son's education. I did however feel "strong-armed" and "bullied" into accepting what they were TELLING me they were going to do.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

# Survey Summary—Administrators

## Demographics

1. Position:	Percent	Count
➤ Special Education Director	66.2%	90
➤ Special Education Assistant, Director, Coordinator or other	6.6%	9
➤ General Ed. Administrator	11%	15
➤ Building Administrator	10.3%	14
➤ Program Administrator for D/HH and or DB program	.7%	1
➤ Other	5.1%	7
2. School district size:		
➤ Less than 1,000 students	39%	53
➤ 1,001-5,000 students	33.8%	46
➤ 5,001-10,000 students	11.8%	16
➤ 10,001-25,000 students	11.8%	16
➤ 25,001-50,000 students	2.2%	3
➤ More than 50,000 students	.7%	1
➤ Not applicable	.7%	1
3. Describe the community where you work:		
➤ Rural	70.6%	96
➤ Urban	11.8%	16
➤ Suburban	17.6%	24
4. Which ESD are you located:		
➤ 101 - Spokane	18.8%	25
➤ 105 – Yakima	5.3%	7
➤ 112 – SW WA	11.3%	15
➤ 113 – Olympia area	10.5%	14
➤ 114 – Bremerton/Peninsula	6%	8
➤ 121 – Seattle area	15.8%	21
➤ 123 – Tri Cities	12%	16
➤ 171 – Wenatchee	9%	12
➤ 189 – Anacortes	10.5%	14
➤ WSD	.8%	1
5. What is your highest degree:	Percent	Count
➤ AA/AS	.8%	1
➤ BA/BS	4.7%	6
➤ MA/MS	69.8%	90
➤ Specialist	10.1%	13
➤ Ed.D./Ph.D.	14.7%	19
6. How many years of experience do you have in education:		
➤ 1 – 3 years	.0	0
➤ 4 – 6 years	4.6%	6
➤ 7 – 9 years	4.6%	6
➤ 10 – 13 years	9.2%	12
➤ More than 13 years	81.7%	107

7. Attended a Stakeholder Meeting?					
➤ Yes	18.2%	24			
➤ No	81.8%	108			
8. Program specifically designed to serve D/DB/HH?					
➤ Yes	17.2%	23			
➤ No	82.8%	111			
9. D/DB/HH students that you send to another district or agency to receive educational services?					
➤ Yes	28%	30			
➤ No	72%	77			
10. Do you serve any single students who are D/DB/HH?					
➤ Yes	46.2%	49			
➤ No	53.8%	57			
11. If yes, the student is?					
➤ Deaf	28.6%	14			
➤ Deaf/blind	16.3%	8			
➤ Hard of Hearing	55.1%	27			
12. If yes, please indicate the student's level.					
➤ Preschool	14%	7			
➤ Elementary	54%	27			
➤ Middle School	16%	8			
➤ High School	16%	8			
13. If yes, please indicate the services you provide?					
➤ Audiology	27%	14			
➤ FM or other hearing assist.	64.7%	33			
➤ Sign language interpreter	35.3%	18			
➤ ASL	15.7%	8			
➤ SEE or Signed English	13.7%	7			
➤ Tactile	13.7%	7			
➤ Speech Therapy	72.5%	37			
➤ Notetaker	5.9%	3			
➤ Real time captioning	2%	1			
➤ Special Ed. classroom	70.6%	36			
14. How satisfied are you with your level of access to information and resources to evaluate and serve D/DB/HH students who resident in your district?					
	<b>Unsatisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>I don't know</b>
	5.2% (5)	19.8% (19)	40.6% (39)	12.5% (12)	21.9% (21)

15. Please indicate any resources you have used within the last 5 years and your level of satisfaction?

	<b>Unsatisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>I don't know</b>
OSPI	2.6% (2)	19.5% (15)	42.9% (33)	5.2% (4)	29.9% (23)
My ESD	4.5% (4)	10.2% (9)	37.5% (33)	26.1% (23)	21.6% (19)
WSDS	1.3% (1)	9.3% (7)	17.3% (13)	25.3% (19)	46.7% (35)
WSD	1.4% (1)	8.3% (6)	23.6% (17)	15.3% (11)	51.4% (37)
Private Program	2.9% (2)	4.3% (3)	7.2% (5)	7.2% (5)	78.3% (54)
Local/nearby cooperative	1.5% (1)	1.5% (1)	7.7% (5)	9.2% (6)	80% (52)
Neighboring district	1.4% (1)	1.4% (1)	27.4% (20)	17.8% (13)	52.1% (38)
Local Deaf services center	1.5% (1)	1.5% (1)	6% (4)	6% (4)	85.1% (57)
Local medical provider	3.1% (2)	4.6% (3)	16.9% (11)	1.5% (1)	73.8% (48)

16. What additional supports/resources do you need to help you determine how best to meet the needs of D/DB/HH/ students in your district?

Comments include anecdotal statements of concern and lack of understanding of needs in system development and support.

17. Please indicate the categories of students your district serves directly through this program.

➤ Deaf	91.3%	21
➤ Deaf-Blind	52.2%	12
➤ Hard of Hearing	91.3%	21

18. Please indicate the levels in which you serve D/DB/HH children/youth.

➤ Preschool	30.4%	7
➤ Elementary	47.8%	11
➤ Middle School	39.1%	9
➤ High School	34.8%	8
➤ All levels	56.5%	13

Survey Results: High Value / Low Satisfaction

Qstn #	Topic	Val	Sat.	Comment Themes
1.	Statement of Purpose	3.56	2.75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No statement</li> <li>Don't know</li> </ul>
2.	Policy on Language and communication	3.23	2.70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy not in place at local level</li> <li>Early intervention service insufficient</li> </ul>
3.	State oversight	3.00	2.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification/qualification criteria unclear</li> <li>Not enough deaf role models</li> <li>No clear guidance on service expectations</li> </ul>
4.	Continuum of options	3.23	2.64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding does not support full spectrum of choice</li> <li>(see question *27)</li> </ul>
5.	Children with Multiple Disabilities	3.64	2.70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantially insufficient supports for students with additional disabilities</li> </ul>
6.	Program administrator has skills and	3.64	3.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site and program dependent</li> </ul>

	understanding of field to ensure appropriate instruction and services			
7.	Staff Qualifications	3.64	3.40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statewide extreme variability of qualified staff</li> <li>High caseload for qualified staff</li> </ul>
8.	Other qualified personnel – related service providers	3.60	3.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site dependent</li> </ul>
9.	Other qualified personnel – educational interpreters	3.64	3.13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“I would hate to see this mandated because there are no qualified educational interpreters available in this area.”</li> </ul>
10.	Workload management – class size	3.45	3.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extreme variability</li> </ul>
11.	Staff Development	3.64	3.09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need recognition (clock hours offered) for out of state training opportunities</li> </ul>
12.	Training for General Education Personnel	3.27	2.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrequent and no funding to complete activities</li> </ul>
13.	Facilities designed to meet unique needs	3.36	2.73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited resources to adjust acoustics or technology needs</li> </ul>
14.	Program accountability	3.30	3.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
15.	Self-assessment – established standards	2.73	2.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a formalized method</li> </ul>
16.	Cohesive team – Early Childhood – K-12	3.45	3.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordination between agencies challenging</li> <li>Tremendous variability</li> </ul>
17.	Communication curriculum	3.30	3.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vague language on what language services are allowed through the IEP process</li> </ul>
18.	Authentic Peer Interactions	3.36	3.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Younger children are easiest to achieve this</li> </ul>
19.	District Core Curriculum	3.27	2.82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult to determine whether the core curriculum addresses communication needs of D/HH students</li> </ul>
20.	Supplemental Specialized Curricula	3.45	3.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsatisfied with many consultants highlighting statewide gaps in unified approach</li> </ul>
21.	Transitions early childhood and School-to-Work	3.64	2.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weakness on multi-agency communication related to transitions.</li> </ul>
22.	Assessment	3.64	3.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfied with current system – agency dependent</li> </ul>

\* 27. Check the following options that your PROGRAM can effectively support. 127 (out of 136) respondents skipped this question. Data skewed due to low response rate.

## Early Intervention Survey Monkey Summary

### Demographics (51 respondents)

1. Training backgrounds	Percent	Count
• Teacher of the Deaf	33.3%	17
• Speech Language Pathologist	27.5%	14
• Family Resource Coordinator	17.6%	9
• Early Childhood Special Education	15.7%	8
• Educational Audiologist	5.9%	3
2. Degree	Percent	Count
• MA/MS	78.6%	33
• BA/BS	14.3%	6
• Ed.D./Ph.D.	4.8%	2
• Specialist	2.4%	1
3. Years of experience working with infants/toddlers with disabilities and their families:	Percent	Count
• 13 or more years	47.6%	20
• 10-13 years	7.1%	3
• 7-9 years	11.9%	5
• 4-6 years	14.3%	6
• 1-3 years	19%	8
4. Years of experience working with D/HH infants/toddlers and their families:	Percent	Count
• 13 or more years	31.7%	13
• 10-13 years	14.6%	6
• 7-9 years	12.2%	5
• 4-6 years	14.6%	6
• 1-3 years	26.8%	11
5. Community Description:	Percent	Count
• Suburban	36.7%	18
• Rural	34.7%	17
• Urban	28.6%	14

6. Percentage of caseload that is:	Percent	Count
• Deaf	23.7%	36
• Hard of Hearing	28.9%	42
• Deaf-Blind	7.9%	26
• Other disabilities (not above)	54.2%	29

7. Counties where EI services are provided:	Percent	Count
• Snohomish	31.8%	14
• King	25%	11
• Spokane	9.1%	4
• Pierce	9.1%	4
• Clark	6.8%	3
• Clallam	4.5%	2
• Cowlitz	4.5%	2
• Grays Harbor	4.5%	2
• Kittitas	4.5%	2
• Klickitat	4.5%	2
• Skamania	4.5%	2
• Thurston	4.5%	2
• Whatcom	4.5%	2
• Yakima	4.5%	2
• Adams	2.3%	1
• Benton	2.3%	1
• Chelan	2.3%	1
• Columbia	2.3%	1
• Douglas	2.3%	1
• Kitsap	2.3%	1
• Mason	2.3%	1
• Okanogan	2.3%	1
• Skagit	2.3%	1
• Stevens	2.3%	1
• Whitman	2.3%	1
• Asotin	0	0
• Ferry	0	0
• Garfield	0	0
• Grant	0	0
• Island	0	0

• Jefferson	0	0
• Lewis	0	0
• Lincoln	0	0
• Pacific	0	0
• Pend Oreille	0	0
• San Juan	0	0
• Wahkiakum	0	0
• Walla Walla	0	0

8. Communication option your county can support effectively: (25 responded, 27 skipped question)

	Percent	Count
• Simultaneous (oral/sign)	96%	24
• Bilingual (ASL/English)	84%	21
• Oral/Auditory	80%	20

9. Attended a CDHL stakeholder meeting:

	Percent	Count
• Yes	40.5%	17
• No	59.5%	25

Survey Results: High Value/Low Satisfaction

Question #	Topic	Val.	Sat.	Comment Themes
1	Identification & Referral	3.94	2.52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss to follow-up after a child fails a new-born hearing screening (reoccurring theme)</li> <li>• Limited number of local audiologists (not a pediatric audiologist)</li> <li>• Hearing screening is not always covered under health insurance plans - some families choose not to receive the screening</li> <li>• wait time from initial diagnosis to BAER and referral to services is frustrating</li> </ul>
13	Hearing Screening	3.66	2.40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hearing screenings provided via Childfind is often of limited value</li> <li>• Greater attention is paid to hearing status by the medical community (ie: physicians requesting hearing screening/evals)</li> </ul>

				<p>following ear infections, standard referral for medical conditions such as Down Syndrome or high risk babies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WA needs mandate for hearing screenings</li> <li>• Late identification continues to happen, resulting in delayed language and behavior (due to lack of follow up)</li> <li>• Physicians may not refer families to audiologist for formal hearing evaluation</li> <li>• Audiologist may not know where to send family for early intervention services</li> <li>• Lack of follow through by families for further testing/evaluation</li> <li>• Some clinics have long waiting lists for appointments (follow up testing)</li> <li>• Lack of services provided to Native American Reservations – families don't understand importance of follow up appointments</li> <li>• Not all clinics comply with best practices procedures/protocols</li> </ul>
15	Audiological Referral	3.85	2.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss to follow up after family is referred further evaluation</li> <li>• Parents need reminders to attend follow up appointment, parents may be in denial and not notice their child has hearing loss (can't see it)</li> <li>• Need for tracking system of families who are referred – for follow up appointments</li> <li>• Families need to make it through to the diagnosis</li> </ul>
17	Vision Screening	3.79	2.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges with vision screening technology</li> <li>• More information and documentation needs to be given to families about vision screening</li> <li>• No system in place for vision screenings, rely on pediatric vision screenings</li> <li>• No vision screenings are conducted, not mandated</li> <li>• Children with hearing loss should also have vision screening</li> </ul>

# Job Analysis

## Educational Interpreter Survey Monkey Summary

The educational interpreter survey was completed by a total of 71 interpreters, 99% of those responding work for a school district and just 1% for an Educational Service District. Approximately 13% work in P-K setting, 30% in elementary schools, 44% in middle schools, 47% in high schools and 9% in vocational programs. Most have worked in a variety of settings from preschool to high school.

About 45% of the respondents stated they have over 20 deaf students in their school district, 17% have between 2 – 5, 22% have 6-10 and 15% have 11-20. Most (43%) have from 2 – 5 deaf students in their building, another 20% have 11 – 20 deaf students in their building and another 20% have just one student in their building. Most (59%) work with different students throughout the day as opposed to 41% who work with the same student all day.

Almost all of the interpreters work full time but reported a variety of job titles. Some job titles were Interpreter for the Deaf, Interpreter/Paraeducator, Interpreter/Aide, Educational Interpreter, and Interpreter/Signer. A little less than half of the respondents work 6 hours per day, half work 7 hours per day, approximately 9% work 8 or more hours per day. 27% have worked as an educational interpreter 2-5 years, 22% have worked 6-10 years, 27% have worked 11-16 years, 13 % have worked 17 – 20 years and 9% have worked more than 20 years as an educational interpreter.

44 of the 71 total respondents responded that they had graduated from an Interpreter Training Program (ITP). Those who had **not** graduated from an ITP, were then asked how many sign classes they had taken. Responses were: 1 ASL class (1 response), 2 classes (1 response), 3 classes (3 responses), 5 classes (2 responses) 6 classes (3 responses) 7 classes (1 response), 10 + SEE classes (1 response) CODA (3 responses), no college classes, just workshops (1 response), numerous sign classes and workshops or weeklong workshops (2 responses), equivalent of ITP from a private tutor (1 response), started ITP but didn't graduate (1 response).

Respondents reported their rate of pay, in a range from \$9.40 per hour to \$30.06 per hour. Actual rates were: less than \$10.00 per hour (1 response) \$13.00 - \$15.00 (3 responses) \$16.00 - \$18.00 (10 responses) \$19.00 - \$21.00 (17 responses) \$22.00 - \$24.00 (13 responses) \$25.00 - \$28.00 (2 responses) \$29.00 - \$31.00 (2 responses). One person who is salaried stated they earn \$2,477.00 per month. 82% said they are affiliated with a union, 17% are not.

78% of the interpreters responded that they are paid their regular hourly rate for interpreting extra curricular activities. 20% said they received more than their regular rate of pay, and 0% said they were not compensated at all for interpreting extracurricular activities.

Interpreters were asked if their school district would increase their rate of pay if they had a bachelor's or master's degree. 64% responded that would not be compensated, 6% said for a bachelor's degree only, 7% said they would for either degree and 23% said they didn't know. When asked if they would receive additional pay if they had RID, NAD or EIPA certification, 85% indicated they would not receive additional pay, 15% said they would. When asked if the EIPA is encouraged or required in their district, 60% said it was neither encouraged nor required. 38% said it was encouraged but not required. 85% said their district would not pay for the EIPA if they should want to take the test. 15% said their district would pay for it.

Most educational interpreters (57%) stated they are assigned duties in addition to interpreting, 43% were not. Those assignments included tutoring (25 responses) assist in the classroom (8 responses) teach sign language (1 response) bus duty (5 responses) playground/recess duty (5 responses) cafeteria supervision (2 responses) and sound field/FM system equipment (1 response).

Half of the interpreters said they were invited to attend the IEP meeting as a participant, half said they were not invited.

Almost half of the interpreters (46%) stated they are supervised by the special education director in their district and the other half supervised by either their principal (35%) or teacher of the deaf (29%). When asked who evaluates their interpreting skills, 35% said the program coordinator, 13% the principal, 6% said a lead interpreter, and 7% said the district hires an outside person to evaluate interpreting skills. 48% said the person assigned to evaluate their interpreting skills is **not** knowledgeable in sign language or interpreting, 32% are evaluated by a skilled interpreter and 20% by a skilled signer but not an interpreter. 39.7% said their interpreting skills are not evaluated at all.

When asked if they are given time each day to prepare for classes they interpret, 45% said they were and 55% said they were not given prep time. Of those who were given prep time, when asked if they receive additional pay when they were asked to interpret during their prep time, 96% said they were not.

71% said if they were absent from school, the school would call a substitute interpreter, 29% said a substitute would not be hired.

72% said they are not scheduled to interpret with another interpreter (team interpret). 28% said they were given a team interpreter when students are in two groups or a heavy lecture class, an 80 minutes lecture classes, interpreting for a deaf-blind student (tactile interpreting), or if a class has more than 2 or 3 students with different needs.

Where training is concerned, 87% said they do not write a professional development plan each year, only 13% do. 36% said they are provided some

training opportunities during the year 21% state their district does not provide workshops for interpreters specifically but only for teachers and 53% said they do not have workshops opportunities provided by the district so they attend workshops provided for interpreters by other agencies.

## Educational Audiologist Survey Monkey Results

### Demographics (19 respondents)

1. Employer	Percent	Count
• School District	94.7%	18
• Educational Service District	5.3%	1
2. Audiology FTE (full time equivalent)	Percent	Count
• 1 FTE	42%	8
• .6-.9 FTE	42%	8
• .3-.5 FTE	16%	3
3. Supervisor of Audiologist	Percent	Count
• Special Ed Director	64.3%	9
• Program Coordinator	35.7%	5
• Principal	0%	0
4. Performance Evaluation	Percent	Count
• Special Ed Director	61.5%	8
• Program Coordinator	38.5%	5
• Principal	0%	0
5. Supervisor knowledgeable in area of audiology	Percent	Count
• Knowledgeable	15.8%	3
• Not knowledgeable	84.2%	16
6. Student population per school district or combined districts	Percent	Count
• 8,000-13,000 students	19%	3
• 17,000-20,000 students	31%	5
• 21,000-30,000 students	31%	5
• 45,000-48,000 students	19%	3
7. Audiology FTE per population of students (*Percent & count not calculated by Survey Monkey)		
• .5-.8 FTE.....8,000-13,000 students		
• .9-1.0 FTE.....17,000-20,000 students		
• 1.5-2.0 FTE.....21,000-30,000 students		
• 4.8 FTE.....45,000-48,000 students		

8. Age Group of Children Served	Percent	Count
• Birth to Three	31.6%	6
• Three to Five	89.5%	17
• Elementary	89.5%	17
• Middle School	89.5%	17
• High School	89.5%	17
9. Number of students (in district) with hearing loss (including unilateral and/or fluctuating loss)	Percent	Count
• Over 100	82.4%	14
• 51-100	11.8%	2
• 11-50	5.9%	1
• Less than 10	0%	0
10. Number of D/HH students with direct IEP services (ex: auditory habilitation, assistive technology training, self advocacy skills)	Percent	Count
• More than 40	27.8%	5
• 31-40	5.6%	1
• 21-30	16.7%	3
• 11-20	16.7%	3
• Less than 10	33.3%	6
11. Number of D/HH students with indirect IEP services (ex: consultation, monitoring)	Percent	Count
• More than 40	44.4%	8
• 31-40	5.6%	1
• 21-30	5.6%	1
• 11-20	27.8%	5
• Less than 10	16.7%	3
12. Assigned duties and responsibilities:	Percent	Count
• Provide consultation & in-service to training to staff	95%	19
• On-site management of FM equipment	95%	19
• Attend IEP/504 meetings	95%	19
• Help with FM selection and verification	90%	18
• Assistive Technology orientation & training	90%	18
• Monitor & troubleshoot hearing aid & CI function	85%	17
• Hearing screening follow up for students	80%	16

• Make recommendations for classroom acoustics	80%	16
• Student counseling re: hearing loss, access, tech.	80%	16
• Parent counseling and training	80%	16
• Select & manage sound-field & individual systems	80%	16
• Monitor chronic middle ear problems	70%	14
• Audiological evals for educational recommendations	70%	14
• Functional listening evaluations in classrooms	70%	14
• Develop self-advocacy skills with students	70%	14
• Manage and calibrate audiologic equipment	70%	14
• IEP/504 development and case management	70%	14
• Conduct hearing screening	55%	11
• Auditory skills with students	50%	10
• Hearing loss prevention education	50%	10
• Classroom acoustic measurements	40%	8
• Supervise audiology assistants or support staff	40%	8
• Supervise district hearing screening program	35%	7
• Supervise/manage district audiology program	25%	5
• CAPD (central auditory processing d/o) assessment	20%	4
• Develop articulation/language skills	10%	2
• Early intervention services (birth-3)	10%	2
13. District offers professional development training annually	Percent	Count
• Yes	47.4%	9
• No (attend training by other agencies/orgs)	57.9%	11
• No, s district provides teacher training only	10.5%	2
14. District pays more with Audiology Doctorate	Percent	Count
• Yes	62.5%	10
• No	37.5%	6

Narrative:

The educational audiologist survey was completed by 19 audiologists, 95% are employed by school districts and 5% by ESDs. Approximately 42% work 1 FTE (full time equivalent) or 40 hours per week, 42% work .6-.9 FTE (24-36 hours/week) and 16% work .3-.5 FTE (12-20 hours/week). Special Education directors and Program Coordinators supervise and evaluate this position. School principals do not supervise or evaluate performance of educational audiologists

(of these respondents). 16% of the supervisors are knowledgeable in the area of audiology whereas, 84% of the supervisors are not.

16 out of 19 educational audiologists responded on the student population they serve per school district or combined districts. 19% serve 8,000-13,000 students, 37% serve 17,000-21,000 students, 25% serve 21,001-30,000 students, and 19% serve 45,000-48,000 students. The audiology FTE that serve each population count is approximate due to the fact that the number of respondents varied within the question (16 responded to the population and 18 responded to the FTE). .5-.8 FTE works with 8,000-13,000 students, .9-1.0 FTE works with 17,000-21,000, 1.5-2.0 FTE works with 21,001-30,000, and 4.8 FTE works with 45,000-48,000 students.

Almost all of the audiologists who responded to the survey (89.5%) reported they work with school aged children (elementary, middle school and high school), the same percentage also works with three-five year olds. 32% report they work with the birth to three population. 14 respondents work with over 100 students with hearing loss (including unilateral and/or fluctuating loss), 2 audiologists work with 51-100 students and 1 works with 11-50 students.

When asked how many deaf and/or hard of hearing students are served with direct IEP services (Ex: auditory habilitation, assistive technology, self advocacy skills), 33% (6 people) replied less than 10 students, 33% serve 11-30 students, and 28% (5 people) work with 31-40 students. One respondent works with 31-40 students.

Deaf and hard of hearing students also receive indirect IEP services, such as consultation and monitoring. 8 out of 18 audiologists serve more than 40 students with indirect services, 5 of 18 serve 11-20 students, 3 of 18 serve less than 10 students, and 2 audiologists serve 21-40 students.

Educational Audiologists have many assigned duties and responsibilities. 90% or more provide consultation and in-service training for teachers and other school staff, provide assistive technology orientation and training for students, staff and parents (if used at home), manage on-site FM systems, help with FM selection and verification (hearing aids and cochlear implants, CI), as well as attend IEP/504 meetings. 80-85% of audiologists conduct follow-up for students who do not pass hearing screening, provide counseling and training to parents, provide counseling to students regarding hearing loss, communication access, and use of technology – they also monitor and troubleshoot hearing aid and CI function, make recommendations for classroom acoustics, and select and manage individual and classroom soundfield distribution systems. 70% of the respondents conduct monitoring for students with chronic middle ear problems, provide comprehensive audiological evaluations resulting in educational recommendations, provide functional listening evaluations in the classroom, work with students to develop self-advocacy skills, manage audiologic equipment and calibration, and case manage/develop IEP/504. 50-55% of audiologists conduct hearing screening, work with students and auditory skills, and provide hearing loss prevention education. 35-40% supervise district hearing screening program, supervise audiology assistants or support staff and conduct

classroom acoustic measurements. 10% of the audiologists who responded work with students to develop articulation/language skills and provide services to children and their families in early intervention programs.

47% of the educational audiologists who responded report that their district provides some training during the school year, however the topics are generally focused on administrative matters such as Medicaid billing, IEP writing, or geared towards Speech Language Pathologists (SLPs); the training is not related to audiology. 58% said they attend workshops provided by other agencies or professional organizations for their field. 10% said their district only provides trainings for teachers. 10 out of 16 respondents reported their district pays more if they hold an Audiology Doctorate (AuD).

# Stakeholder Meeting Participant Profile

Stakeholder Meeting Participant Profile

SITE	Total # Part.	Number of Comments by Group							Total # Comments
		Admin	TODs/ tchrs/ Related Service	Ed Interps	EI/ Fam Rsrc Coord	Parent/ Family Members	MS/HS Stdnts	Comm/ Prof	
Edmonds	101	16	139	38	15	109	91	95	503
Mt Vernon	68	28	56	8	16	44	50	89	291
Renton	51	32	40	22	32	86	26	147	385
Fife	69	48	80	25	26	38	54	146	417
Longview	1	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	27
WSD	74	65	229	79	26	97	58	49	603
Olympia	21	37	44	20	6	53	4	42	206
Bremerton	13	37	38	54	27	57	15	0	228
Spokane	46	57	52	0	7	87	0	29	232
Pasco	15	30	27	17	0	0	0	37	111
Yakima	19	27	56	17	31	0	0	31	162
Wenatchee	8	0	31	49	35	0	0	0	115
Family Retreat	7					59			59
Seattle	21	50	51	0	0	48	0	49	198
Totals	514	427	843	329	206	705	298	714	3537

SITE	Total # Part.	Number of Participants by Group							
		Admin	TODs/ tchrs/ Related Service	Ed Interps	EI/ Fam Rsrc Coord	Parent/ Family Members	MS/HS Stdnts	Comm/ Prof	Other
Edmonds	101	3	10	2	7	20	19	40	0
Mt Vernon	68	3	4	8	1	10	4	38	0
Renton	51	2	3	5	3	23	1	14	0
Fife	69	7	9	8	3	7	16	19	0
Longview	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
WSD	66	5	16	1	0	9	22	5	8
Olympia	21	3	6	2	0	3	1	6	0
Bremerton	13	3	3	1	1	3	2	0	0
Spokane	46	6	16	1	4	17	0	2	0
Pasco	15	5	6	2	0	0	0	2	0
Yakima	19	1	4	1	5	0	0	8	0
Wenatchee	8	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0
Family Retreat	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
Seattle	21	2	2	0	0	6	0	11	0
Totals	506	40	81	35	26	106	65	145	8

# Stakeholder Meeting Exit Survey

## CDHL Parent Survey

We are interested in the options and services that are currently used at school by your son or daughter who is deaf, deaf-blind, or hard of hearing. If you have more than one child receiving services it may be necessary to complete more than one form. Thank you for completing this survey.

School District Composite Summary – 67 Respondents

Date \_\_\_\_\_

What is your child's primary communication mode? **41.1%- ASL** **42.9%- Auditory-Oral** **12.5%- Simultaneous/Total Communication** **3.6% - Other**

Where does your child receive his/her educational program? **13.1%- WA School for the Deaf** **26.2%- Public School DHH Self-Contained Classroom** **1.6%- Public School Special Education Self-Contained Classroom** **14.6%- Public School DHH Resource Room/Mainstream Combination** **6.6%- Public School General Education Classroom Full-time (with itinerant/consult support)**  
 Other: **3.3%- Home School** **16.4%- Parent Infant Program** **18% - Private School**

Please review the following list of services. **For the services your child needs**, indicate which services are *available* (Yes), *not available* (No), or, if you don't know, indicate *don't know* (DK). **If your child does not need the service, leave it blank.**

**YES=Yes, available NO=Not Available DK=Don't Know**

Services	YES	NO	DK
Teacher of the D/HH	75.9%		
Consultation (if yes, by whom/purpose):	37.8%		
Teacher of the Visually Impaired	11.4%		
Special education teacher <u>without</u> services or consultation from deaf educator	32.5%		
Interpreting (sign, oral, cued speech, tactile, speech to text transcription)	73.5%		
Speech-language pathology	81.5%		
Educational audiology	47.3%		
Counseling	48.1%		
Family counseling and training	32.6%		
Sign language instruction for family members	47.1%		
Deaf/Hard of Hearing peers	60%		
Deaf/Hard of Hearing role models	50%		
Recreational/Social opportunities	66%		
Transition Services:	33.3%		
Vocational Rehabilitation services			
Linkages to higher education, job training	21.4%		
Self-advocacy & personal responsibility training	31.8%		
Financial resources	29.3%		
Other:			

Communication Accommodations	YES	NO	DK
Teacher accommodations for understanding:			
Obtains attention prior to speaking	69.4%		
Uses lighting, physical location in classroom & rate of speech to enhance speechreading	61.4%		
Reduces auditory distractions (background noise)	51%		
Reduces visual distractions	53.1%		
Presents information in simple, structured, sequential manner	62.5%		
Clearly enunciates speech	71.7%		
Allows extra time for processing information	66%		
Frequently checks for understanding	69.4%		
Special seating arrangement	72.1%		
Other:			

Assistive Technology	YES	NO	DK
Videophone or Text Phone	51.1%		
Alerting devices (smoke alarm, fire alarm)	62.2%		
Other:	50%		

**NO=Not Available DK=Don't Know**

Amplification Accommodations	YES	NO	DK
Personal FM (hearing aid + FM)	67.3%		
FM only (without personal hearing instrument)	32.4%		
Portable FM system which sits on desk	28.8%		
Classroom sound distribution system (classroom amplification/speaker system)	33.3%		
Other:			

Instructional Accommodations & Modifications	YES	NO	DK
Visual supplements (overheads, charts, vocabulary lecture outlines)	73.7%		
Large print/Braille	16.6%		
Interactive whiteboard (e.g., Smart Board, Mimio)	35.7%		
Classroom captioning (CART, CPrint, TypeWell)	29.3%		
Captioning and/or scripts for television, videos, movies	52.5%		
Buddy system for notes, extra explanations/directions	36.6%		
Down time/break from listening/watching	50%		
Extended time to complete assignments/tests	47.5%		
Speech to text software (speech recognition)	19.4%		
Tutoring	47.2%		
Notetaker	28.1%		

Other:	YES	NO	DK
Special Classes-please indicate the classes taken from a <b>special teacher or therapist outside the general education classroom.</b>			
Check YES, if taken; NO, if not taken, DK, if you do not know. <b>In order of used:</b>			
Speech	1		
Auditory / listening skill development	2		
Language	3		
Sign language	4		
Reading	5*		
Math	5*		
Social Studies	6		
Science	7*		
Transition planning	7*		
Art	8		
Self-advocacy	9*		
Deaf studies	9*		
	*=tie		

## CDHL Teacher/Service Provider Survey

We are interested in the options and services that are currently available at your school or school district for deaf, deaf-blind, and hard of hearing students. Please indicate the current status of the listed services by checking whether each one is *available* (Yes) or *not available* (NO). Thank you for completing this survey.

School District Composite Summary – 81 respondents

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**YES=Available NO=Not Available**

Placement Options	YES	NO
DHH Self-contained classroom: ASL	53.3%	
DHH Self-contained classroom: Auditory-Oral	23.2%	
DHH Self-contained classroom: Simultaneous/TC	60%	
Self-contained classroom: Special Education	48.3%	
DHH Resource Room/Mainstream combination: ASL	50%	
DHH Resource Room/Mainstream combination: Auditory-Oral	33%	
DHH Resource Room/Mainstream combination: Simultaneous/TC	53.4%	
General Education Classroom fulltime (with itinerant/consult support)	50.7%	
Other:		

Services	YES	NO
Teacher of the D/HH	88.5%	
Consultation (if yes, by whom/purpose):	75%	
Teacher of the Visually Impaired	47.4%	
Interpreting (sign, oral, cued speech, tactile, speech to text transcription)	83.8%	
Speech-language pathology	94.8%	
Educational audiology	64.8%	
Counseling	56.5%	
Family counseling and training	42.6%	
Sign language instruction for family members	52.1%	
Deaf/Hard of Hearing peers	83.8%	
Deaf/Hard of Hearing role models	72.2%	
Recreational/Social opportunities	72.1%	
Transition Services:	63.9%	
Vocational Rehabilitation services		
Linkages to higher education, job training	65.5%	
Self-advocacy & personal responsibility training	57.1%	
Financial resources	40.7%	
Other:		

Communication Accommodations	YES	NO
Teacher accommodations for understanding:		
Obtains attention prior to speaking	89.8%	
Uses lighting, physical location in classroom & rate of speech to enhance speechreading	84.3%	
Reduces auditory distractions (background noise)	80.6%	
Reduces visual distractions	79.4%	
Presents information in simple, structured, sequential manner	88.6%	
Clearly enunciates speech	85.5%	
Allows extra time for processing information	31.5%	
Frequently checks for understanding	87.7%	
Special seating arrangement	91.8%	
Other:		

**YES=Available NO=Not Available**

Amplification Accommodations	YES	NO
Personal FM (hearing aid + FM)	85.5%	
FM only (without personal hearing instrument)	55.2%	
Desktop FM system	39%	
Classroom sound distribution system (classroom amplification system)	60%	
Other:		

Assistive Technology	YES	NO
Videophone or Text Phone	50.7%	
Alerting devices (smoke alarm, fire alarm)	75%	
Other:		

Instructional Accommodations & Modifications	YES	NO
Visual supplements (overheads, charts, vocabulary lists, lecture outlines)	88.2%	
Large print/Braille	54.7%	
Interactive whiteboard (e.g., Smart Board, Mimio)	66.6%	
Classroom captioning (CART, CPrint, TypeWell)	24.6%	
Captioning and/or scripts for television, videos, movies	76.1%	
Buddy system for notes, extra explanations/directions	70.4%	
Down time/break from listening/watching	72.5%	
Extended time to complete assignments/tests	83.3%	
Speech to text software (speech recognition)	30.6%	
Tutoring	68.6%	
Notetaker	66.6%	
Other:		
Special Classes-please check (√) which classes are available from a <b>special teacher or therapist outside the general education classroom:</b>		
<b>In order of availability:</b>		
Speech	1	
Reading	2	
Language	3	
Math	4	
Auditory /listening skill development	5	
Sign language	6	
Transition planning	7	
Social Studies	8	
Art	9*	
Self-advocacy	9*	
Science	10	
Deaf studies	11	
Other:	*=tie	