

Washington State Center for Childhood Deafness & Hearing Loss (CDHL)



Board of Trustees Packet

March 7, 2014

**WASHINGTON STATE CENTER FOR
CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS & HEARING LOSS**
Board of Trustees Packet
March 7, 2014

- Agenda
- Updated Board of Trustees listing
- 2013/2014 School Calendar

AGENDA ITEMS

- Board Minutes
 - January 10, 2014
- Reports:
 - Director - Rick Hauan
 - Superintendent - Jane Mulholland
 - Business Operations – Jessica Sydnor
 - Outreach - Kris Ching, Carol Carrothers
- Board proposed self-evaluation survey
- SHB 1144 ~ Educational Interpreters
 - Session Law
 - Testimony
 - Why is this a priority?
 - Educational Interpreter Standards Recommendations
- Policy review ~ 2nd reading
 - Isolation and Restraint of Students with IEPs and Section 504 Plans/Policy 3247

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- Enrollment Data
- Proposed procedure 3247P (with minor changes)
 - Use of Reasonable Force

**WASHINGTON STATE CENTER FOR
CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS & HEARING LOSS
Board of Trustees Meeting
March 7, 2014**

- 8:30 a.m. Call meeting to order and determination of a quorum
- 8:35 a.m. Approval of January 10, 2014, minutes
- 8:40 a.m. Reports
- Board Finance Committee
 - Director
 - Superintendent
 - Business Office/Human Resources
 - Outreach
- 9:15 a.m. Board self-evaluation survey
Char Parsley, Nita Kamphuis, Allie Joiner, Rita Reandeau
- 10:00 a.m. Break
- 10:15 a.m. Policy review ~ 2nd reading
*Isolation and Restraint of Students with IEPs and Section 504
Plans/Policy 3247
- 10:45z a.m. House Bill 1144 ~ Educational Interpreters
John Bresko, OSPI
- 12:00 noon Lunch
- 1:00 p.m. Executive Session pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(g) “To evaluate
the qualifications of an applicant for public employment or to review
the performance of a public employee....”
- 2:00 p.m. Adjourn

Next meeting: April 4, 2014
New location: Washington School for the Deaf Campus

5 WASHINGTON STATE CENTER FOR CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS & HEARING LOSS BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Rick Hauan, Director (360) 418-0400 (rick.hauan@cdhl.wa.gov)
 Jane Mulholland, Superintendent (360) 418-0402 (jane.mulholland@wsd.wa.gov)
 Judy Smith, Executive Assistant (360) 418-0401 (judy.smith@cdhl.wa.gov)

Voting Members	Address	Cong Dist.	Contact Information	Date Apptd.	Term Expires	E-Mail/Fax
Maria Christianson	3796 Brown Road Ferndale, WA 98248	1	(360) 402-0162 Text	11/18/13	07/01/18	maria.christianson@cdhl.wa.gov mjochristianson@gmail.com
Allie "AJ" Joiner	15806 18 th Ave. W., B 102 Lynnwood, WA 98087	2	(425) 329-8433 VP	08/30/06	07/01/15	allie.joiner@cdhl.wa.gov
Vacant		3				
Nita Kamphuis, Chair	635 S. Hawaii Place Kennewick, WA 99336	4	(509) 967-6059 (509) 539-0962 cell	09/19/08	07/01/18	nita.kamphuis@cdhl.wa.gov
Char Parsley	3427 W. 7 th Avenue Spokane, WA 99224	5	(509) 315-2128 VP (509) 329-8535 Text	03/16/07	07/01/16	char.parsley@cdhl.wa.gov
Rita Reandeau	1470 Yukon Harbor Rd., SE Port Orchard, WA 98366	6	(360) 871-7367 (360) 443-3626 Cell: (360) 551-3034	08/19/04	07/01/14	rita.reandeau@cdhl.wa.gov
Ariele Belo, Vice Chair	1625 19 th Avenue Seattle, WA 98122	7	(206) 388-1275 TTY (206) 452-7955 (Video & Voice)	01/30/07	07/01/16	ariele.belo@cdhl.wa.gov
Sidney Weldele-Wallace	19501 SE 332 nd Place Auburn, WA 98092	8	(253) 833-6487 (253) 833-9111 ext. 4705 (253) 569-8000 cell	06/27/02	07/01/16	sidney.wallace@cdhl.wa.gov
Nancy Fitta	512 63 rd Ave Ct NE Tacoma, WA 98422	9	(253) 517-1070 (253) 922-0539 (253) 376-0414 cell	05/01/13	07/01/15	nancy.fitta@cdhl.wa.gov
Larry Swift	2306 Glen Kerry Ct., SE Lacey, WA 98513	10	(360) 491-8745	07/31/02	07/01/14	larry.swift@wsd.cdhl.gov

WASHINGTON SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

2013/2014 School Year

July 13

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

December 13

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

May 14

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

August 13

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

January 14

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

June 14

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

September 13

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

February 14

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	

What's Happening!

- Deaf Awareness Week**
September 23 - 27, 2013
- Homecoming**
September 26, 2013
- Open House**
September 26, 2013
- Terrier Invitational (Volleyball tournament)**
October 11-12, 2013
- WSBC/WSBCC 2014**
WSD Campus
January 29 - February 1, 2014
- Flying Hands**
ASL Poetry & Art Competition
March 6, 2014
- All Star Day**
May 22, 2014
- High School Graduation**
June 12, 2014
- 8th Grade Graduation**
June 18, 2014

October 13

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

March 14

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

November 13

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

April 14

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

<p style="text-align: center;">Legend</p>  -First and last day of school  -Non-school days  -Early Release Dates  -Residential Travel days	<p>**EARLY RELEASE DATES**</p> <p>1:00 p.m. ~ Residential students will go to the cottages, day students will ride bus home September 12, October 10, November 14, December 12, January 9, February 13, March 13, April 24, May 8</p>	<p>After School Program</p> <p><i>Fall:</i> September 16 - November 6, 2013 <i>Winter:</i> December 2, 2013 - January 22, 2014 <i>Early Spring:</i> February 10 - April 2, 2014 <i>Spring:</i> April 21 - June 4, 2014</p>
--	---	--

Registration Day/Labor Day*	September 2, 2013	Spring Break	April 7-11, 2014
First Day of School	September 3, 2013	Memorial Day	May 26, 2014
Veterans' Day**	November 11, 2013	High School Graduation	June 12, 2014
Thanksgiving Break	November 25-29, 2013	8th Grade Graduation	June 18, 2014
Winter Break	Dec. 23, 2013-Jan. 3, 2014	Last Day of School	June 18, 2014
Martin Luther King Jr. Day**	January 20, 2014		
WSD's 128th Birthday	February 3, 2014		
President's Day**	February 17, 2014		

*No transportation provided on Registration Day
**Holiday and travel day

Statewide and School Testing Master Schedule	
<p>MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) 2-12th grades Fall testing: September 30 - November 1, 2013 Spring testing: March 31 - May 2, 2014</p> <p>MSP (Measurement of Student Progress) 3-8th grades April 23 - May 30, 2014</p> <p>EOC (End of Course) Algebra & Biology 9-12th grades May 5 - June 20, 2014</p>	<p>HSPE (High School Proficiency Exam) 10-12th grades Reading: March 18 - 19, 2014 Writing: March 20, 2014</p> <p>DAPE (Developmentally Appropriate Proficiency Exam) 11th & 12th grades only Fall: November 1 - 14, 2013 Spring: March 10 - 27, 2014</p>

Quarters end: 1st Quarter: November 1, 2013; 2nd Quarter: January 24, 2014;
 3rd Quarter: April 4, 2014; 4th Quarter: June 18, 2014

AGENDA ITEMS

**WASHINGTON STATE CENTER FOR
CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS & HEARING LOSS
BOARD OF TRUSTESS MEETING
January 10, 2014**

Board Members: Maria Christianson (District #1)
Allie Joiner (District #2)
Nita Kamphuis (District #4)
Char Parsley (District #5)
Rita Reandeau (District #6)
Ariele Belo (District #7)
Larry Swift (District #10)

Absent: Sidney Weldele-Wallace (District #8)
Nancy Fitta (District #9)

Director: Rick Hauan

Superintendent: Jane Mulholland

Legal Counsel: Kim Witherspoon, Bonnie Terada

Recorder: Kelly Moore
Interpreters: Julie Moore, Don Coates

Guests: Jessica Sydnor, Business Services Manager
Lorana Myers, WSFE Representative
Kris Ching, Outreach Director (Birth to pre-school)

The meeting was called to order by Nita Kamphuis, chair, at 10:54 a.m.

The board thanked Kelly Moore for taking minutes and wished Judy Smith a quick recovery from her illness.

Nita Kamphuis introduced Kim Witherspoon who will be sitting in for Bonnie Terada as Legal Counsel for part of the meeting.

Minutes – November 1, 2013

Corrections:

- Page 2:
 - Calendar Planning month from July to June
 - Spokane Community College to Spokane Falls Community College
- Page 3
 - Change loose to lose.

Char Parsley moved to approve the November 1, 2013, meeting minutes with the changes noted above. Allie Joiner seconded the motion. It was voted on and approved.

New Board of Trustees Member

The Board welcomed new member Maria Christianson (District #1.) What a great addition to the team!

Governor's Goal Council Meeting on World Class Education and Implementation of HB1144

The Executive Director distributed a draft working document titled "The Center for Childhood Hearing Loss (CDHL) and implementation of HB1144" regarding testimony before the Education Committees of both the House and Senate. Discussion was held regarding this draft document along with the following three questions from the Governor's Goal Council Meeting.

- Why is this priority?
- How are we doing?
- What are we working on?

CDHL sent a survey to 245 educational interpreters asking if they would like to participate in state sponsored trainings designed to get them ready to meet the requirement of a 3.5 on the Educational Interpret performance Assessment. There was a 4% return on the survey.

Using the survey results information, a training plan for educational interpreters across the state was discussed and presented to the Board.

- CDHL will partner with Spokane Falls Community College to provide instruction to educational interpreters through distance education.
- OSPI has reallocated more funding for educational interpreter training during the summer of 2014, 2015 and 2016, to try and meet the fall 2016 deadline.

Larry Swift requested a report be submitted to the board periodically as to how implementation of HB1144 is progressing.

Due to time constraints the Strategic Plan 2014-2019 Rough Structure agenda item was moved to March.

Board Policies & Protocols Report

Char Parsley, Nita Kamphuis, Allie Joiner and Rita Reandeau submitted the following documents for discussion.

- CDHL Board of Trustees' Committee Chair Rotation Policy
- CDHL Board Rotation Schedule
- CDHL Board of Trustees Committee Policy
- CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

Char Parsley will email Judy Smith CDHL Board Member self-evaluations. Board members will complete the evaluation and send it to Judy Smith who will compile results for the March Retreat.

Policy Review

Isolation and Restraint of Students with IEPs and Section 504 Plans/Policy 3247
The policy will be up for a 2nd reading at the February meeting

Accreditation Survey

Board of Trustee members took the CDHL Accreditation Survey. Results will be emailed to the Board and discussed at the March retreat.

Student involvement in future Board Meetings

Jane Mulholland suggested a time change for future meetings to make it more accommodating for student attendance.

Jane Mulholland invited Board members to the Flying Hands ASL Poetry Completion on March 6, 2014, here at Washington School for the Deaf.

RCW 72.40.015 Center for Childhood Deafness and Hearing Loss – Functions.

Rick submitted the above document to Board members and asked them to review it for future discussions.

Adjournment

Seeing no objections the meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

Nita Kamphuis, Chair
CDHL Board of Trustees

Rick Huan, Executive Director
CDHL

Date

Date

CDHL Board of Trustees Meeting – March 7, 2014
Reports from Executive Director, Superintendent, Outreach Directors,
Business Manager, Human Resources Manager

Rick Hauan, Director

On-going

- Governor's Goal Council meeting on World Class Education
- Deaf Interpreter Work Group
- Core Meetings with the Spokane Public Schools
- Meetings with Tacoma Public Schools
- Outreach with Highline School District

January 2014

- Meetings
 - Gallaudet liaison from Ohlone College (three year professional development planning)
 - Respect and DHH Collaboration video conferences
 - ESD 123/Pasco Special Ed. Director's meeting
 - Combined Summer Institute Planning
 - Phone conference with Training Counselor with Gallaudet University
 - Hands & Voices retreat/Denver
 - Building State Capacity Summit presentation/Denver
 - WSDS (Washington Sensory Disabilities Services)

February 2014

- Tour of various facilities with SRG architectural firm to gain ideas for the new academic building
- Staff appreciation ~ each year the Leadership Team members contributed money for a variety of dessert to thank staff for the outstanding job they are doing.
- Statewide Outreach Team meeting in Fife
- Meeting with Spokane Falls Community College staff, along with Carol Carrothers, Kris Ching, and Pam Snedigar (Gallaudet liaison) to discuss professional development for interpreters.
- ESD 123/Pasco Special Ed. Director's meeting
- Meeting with members of the OPTION schools board. Focusing on resolution of issues of mutual concern and which affect services at the state and local level. This meeting was held in Washington D.C.

Jane Mulholland, Superintendent

- Battle of the Books: WSD's Battle of the Books team, composed of students Jadzia Ingram, Mai Truong, Cristian Martinez-White and Caleb Plock, participated in this Gallaudet-sponsored competition for middle school students. The competition involves students independently reading 3 books and then

competing with other schools to answer questions about the books, characters, themes, etc. In the first round WSD played against CSD-Fremont, CSDS—Riverside, and the Illinois School for the Deaf. WSD scored higher than all 3 schools and advanced to the top 8 out of 30 schools in our division. The second round consisted of each school competing against a team from Gallaudet. We were informed Monday, 2/3, our WSD team made it to the finals! Our students along with Tyler DeShaw will fly to Gallaudet in May to compete for the national title—all expenses paid! We are SO proud of our students and this great academic achievement! The three other schools against whom we will be competing are the Kentucky School for the Deaf, Illinois School for the Deaf, and Indiana School for the Deaf.

- Green Team: A group of middle school students has formed a WSD “Green Team” as part of the Washington Green Schools program. Washington Green Schools is a nonprofit program supported by government agencies, individuals, businesses and foundations. Their vision is for every school in Washington to teach, model and practice environmental sustainability, and to serve as centers for change throughout the region. Jennifer Ellis, Secondary Department teacher, is the sponsor for WSD’s Green Team, which is made up of 7th & 8th graders. They have already been bringing in kudos and acclamations from the program coordinators for the work they have done establishing a baseline for recycling and garbage handling at WSD. The outstanding video they made, entitled “Where does your garbage go?” can be found on WSD’s Facebook page. A second video, “What can WSD do to be more Green” is in the making. We are really proud of WSD’s Green Team!
- WSBC/WSCC: The 38th annual Western States Basketball Classic and Cheerleading Classic took place January 29 – February 1 at WSD. Tournament directors Sharon Caton and Ron Spratlen did an outstanding job with the planning and coordination of the event. The tournament was a great success on all fronts. Our Terriers took 4th place in basketball after a hard fought overtime game; our Lady Terriers took 3rd place in basketball winning all 3 of their games, and our Terrier cheerleaders took 1st place in the cheerleading competition! There was a wonderful spirit of sportsmanship and support among all 6 schools throughout the long weekend. Thanks to the many volunteers and supporters that made the tournament a great success. Our guests had a chance to see what an amazing school and community WSD has.

WSD won the following team and individual awards:

- Free Throw Contest—WSD boys and girls teams—1st place

- Lay Up Contest—WSD boys—1st place
 - Cheerleading—WSD cheerleaders—1st place
 - ✓ Special Recognition—Yajaira Bedolla and Maria Lopez
 - ✓ All Star—Miguel Peregrino
 - Boys Basketball—WSD boys—4th place
 - ✓ Honorable Mention—Trevor Dockter
 - ✓ Second Team All Star—Randall Smith
 - ✓ First Team All Star—Norinston Joe
 - Girls Basketball—WSD girls—2nd place
 - ✓ Honorable Mention—Kayla Girard
 - ✓ Second Team All Star—Maria Lopez
 - ✓ First Team All Star—Yajaira Bedolla
- Basketball Season: Our 2013-14 season concluded February 6 with home games for both girls and boys teams. WSD seniors were honored during the games. Special thanks to our coaches, Ron Spratlen, Tracey Boyes, Jason Cox and Rob McArthur.
 - Iron 5 Tournament: Coach Nathan Boyes will take a group of 5 middle school students to the Iron 5 basketball tournament in Tucson, AZ, February 13. This is WSD's first time participating in the tournament. Students include: Taylor Payne, Jacob Tufton, John Smart, Cristian Martinez-White, and Ramon Varaja. They will represent WSD with pride! WSD appreciates coaches Nathan Boyes and Carmine Faella for their work with this group of young men.
 - DAB: Four students and two advisors leave February 13th for Riverside, CA, to participate in the Deaf Academic Bowl. Students on WSD's team are: Trevor Dockter, LaSinda Rivas, Randall Smith, Samantha Rowland and Miguel Peregrino (Alternate). Thank you to DAB advisors are Ryder Patton and Tyler DeShaw for their support of these students. Good luck to our academic all star team!

- WSD's 128 birthday: WSD celebrated its 128th birthday February 3. Large screen TVs displayed power point presentations about WSD's history and about historic buildings on campus throughout the day. Thanks to WSDAA for the great power points.
- Flying Hands Poetry Competition: If you are available, I encourage you to come for part or all of the ASL poetry event March 6. Students from WSD, OSD and around the state of Washington will perform original ASL poetry. This will take place in the WSD Lloyd Auditorium.

Outreach, Kris Ching (0-5), Carol Carrothers (6-21),

From Kris Ching.....

Italicized= Early Childhood related

January

- *Skagit & Whatcom counties phone conference with Katie Humes (WSDS) – discussing plans for B-3 services for D/HH children and families 1/9*
- *Spokane County Interagency Coordinating Council meeting 1/15*
- *Spokane HOPE School meeting with Amy Hardie – plans for B-3 services now that Early Intervention Teacher of the Deaf has resigned from the county 1/-15*
- *Tri-Cities B-5 meeting at ESD 123 – group of 13 administrators and related services providers to discuss regional resources 1/16*
- *D/HH Early Childhood Workgroup meeting in Olympia 1/24*
 - *Input from CDHL, WSDS and ODHH for ESIT's WAC process*
 - *Including CDHL contact to WA's Family Health Hotline*
 - *Plans for CDHL Registry*
 - *Interagency partnerships becoming more concrete*
 - *Rolling out CDHL plan for statewide B-3 support at Local Lead Agency meetings in*
- WSDS/CDHL Blackboard meeting 1/8
- Carol and David Brenna's SHB 1144 Testimony to House Representatives 1/13
- Tim Shockley, volunteer librarian is staying on campus to focus on Destiny library system for Mildred Johnson Outreach Library 1/13
- Respect meeting 1/15
- DHH Collaboration meeting 1/15
- ESD 123 Special Ed. Director meeting 1/16
- Family Academy Night (FAN) at WSD 1/16
- Combined Summer Institute (CSI) planning meeting with State Special Needs Projects at Seattle University 1/17
 - July 24-25, 2014 (CSI at Seattle University)
 - August 12, 13, 14, 2014 (Educational Interpreters at CWU)

- Spokane Public Schools Core D/HH Core Meeting 1/22
- 4th Annual CDHL Silent Auction fundraiser for Family Events in WA 1/22-31, 2014 Closing event live at WSBC 2/1
 - Proceeds support Deaf Family Camp, FAN, Deaf Fiesta, playgroups, partnered events like Guide By Your Side gatherings, and more.

From Carol Carrothers.....

- 1/8 WSDS Meeting
- 1/11 Deaf Plus Workshop (32 attended at sites: Edmonds School District, Birney Elementary, North Thurston School District)
- 1/13 Testified to House Education Committee in Olympia on tentative plans for implementation of training for SHB1144
- 1/15 Respect and DHH Collaboration meetings
- 1/16 Combined Summer Institute (CSI) Planning meeting. For 2014 CSI for educational interpreters is August 12, 13, 14 in Ellensburg. CSI for teachers and staff July 24, 25 at Seattle University
- 1/28-29 Denver Colorado for Pepnet Transition Conference

Jessica Sydnor, Business Services Manager
--

Operating:

- Supplemental Requests:
 - Our supplemental requests are still being reviewed at the legislative level. We have had inquiries from both the House and Senate side and so far, the response has been positive. One of the supplemental requests will address our critical need to update the IP phone system. We are working in conjunction with Department of Enterprise and various IT regulatory agencies to ensure a strong understanding of our agency’s needs and the operational impact should the request be denied. These departments have been very supportive. Our capital and charter bus supplemental processes have required less justification from the agency level but we are assured that there is a strong grasp of the importance of these two requests. The Business Office will continue to monitor all supplemental request progress.

Capitol:

- Current Budget Submittal
 - We are very excited to announce that the first planning meeting for the Academic Building submission has taken place in mid January and the enthusiasm from the team is simply contagious. Our team, which includes members from the SRG Partnership (architecture firm), Dwayne Harkness, Project Manager, John Dickinson (architect from Dickinson & Partners) and several CDHL team members. We are especially fortunate to have Mr. Dickinson join our team. He is a member of the Deaf community with extensive knowledge of designing facilities to maximize environments for the deaf and hard of hearing. He also brings a great

deal of knowledge and resources to the table in reference to effective emergency notification systems for our population. The team will be convening on February 11th to tour 3 facilities that have all been designed by SRG with their innovation and cutting edge “green” technologies and designs. A full report of these visits will be made available to stakeholder groups within few weeks of the tour.

- Business Office
 - The Business Office has almost completed the year end closing processes. W2s have been issued to employees and all quarterly tax filing have been and will be submitted on time. We do not anticipate any need for W2 or 941 filing corrections.
- Facilities, Grounds and Custodial
 - Our Facilities Manager, Warren Pratt, Custodial Supervisor, Paula Olson and Administrative Assistant, Shannon Jordan have worked diligently to coordinate and meet the needs for the upcoming WSBC games. By working closely Sharon Caton and Ron Spratlen to fine tune all the details to ensure for a safe and healthy environment for our students and guests. The WSBC planning committee has done a wonderful job of working together and we are especially grateful to Sharon Caton for her dedication to the details and her proactive approach to planning.

April Lynch, Human Resources Manager

Recruiting and Hiring Update

- Sarah Decker promoted into the Fiscal Analyst position in the business office.
- Breanna “Val” Gocha promoted into the Special Education Secretary position.
- Bethany Moreland moved into the Northrop Building Secretary position.
- Veronica Carmona is a new on-call nurse helping us fill shifts while we recruit for a swing shift RN.

Recruitments for the upcoming school year include:

- Secondary Principal
- Residential Director
- Curriculum and Assessment Coordinator
- ASL Specialist
- Speech Language Pathologist

The human resources department will work with hiring managers to implement a comprehensive recruitment plan as these key positions are critical to the effective ongoing operation of the academic and residential programs at the school.

Statewide Employee Survey Results

Trend of Averages						Change from previous survey	Trend Line
Deaf, School for the	Apr 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2009	Nov 2011	Nov 2013		
Number of Responses:	41	62	32	56	71		
1) I have the opportunity to give input on decisions affecting my work.	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7	-0.2	
2) I receive the information I need to do my job effectively.	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7	-0.2	
3) I know how my work contributes to the goals of my agency.	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	-0.1	
4) I know what is expected of me at work.	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	0.0	
5) I have opportunities at work to learn and grow.	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	0.1	
6) I have the tools and resources I need to do my job effectively.	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	
7) My supervisor treats me with dignity and respect.	4.2	4.2	4.6	4.7	4.6	-0.1	
8) My supervisor gives me ongoing feedback that helps me improve my performance.	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.0	0.1	
9) I receive recognition for a job well done.	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	0.0	
10) We are making improvements to make things better for our customers.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.1	n/a	
11) A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my workgroup.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.0	n/a	
12) I know how my agency measures its success.	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	0.2	
13) My agency consistently demonstrates support for a diverse workforce.	n/a	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.2	0.1	
14) I receive clear information about changes being made within the agency.	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.9	3.7	-0.2	
15) I am encouraged to come up with better ways of doing things.	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.1	3.8	-0.3	

16) We use customer feedback to improve our work processes.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.4	n/a	◆
17) In general, I'm satisfied with my job.	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.1	4.1	0.0	◆
Averages of ratings where 1=Never or Almost Never 2=Seldom 3=Occasionally 4=Usually 5=Almost Always or Always							

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***1. Do you have the required information and opportunity to understand your obligations and responsibilities as a Board member?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***2. Are you familiar with the stated missions, plans, and current policies of CDHL?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***3. Do you stay abreast of education trends, legislation, and other public policy by reading Education Update, OSPI Special Education Updates, or other material?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***4. Have you taken advantage of opportunities to meet with Board members, educators and outreach team members from CDHL?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***5. Through scheduled Board programs and activities, or through your own initiative, have you had opportunity to get to know your fellow Board members?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***6. Do you find any conflict between your responsibility for the welfare and advancement of CDHL and your responsibility to the citizens of your region, state, or nation?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***7. Please indicate your three strongest areas of expertise based on your background and experience.**

	Yes	No
Budget/Finance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Legal affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Plant management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Real estate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fundraising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marketing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Government relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***8. Please indicate your three areas of interest outside of your background and expertise.**

	Yes	No
Budget/Finance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Legal affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Plant management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Real estate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fundraising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marketing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Goernment relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***9. Are you well informed about the type and quality of CDHL's education programs?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***10. Have you visited one or more programs within CDHL in the last year?**

- Yes
- No

***11. Can you accurately assess the leadership effectiveness of:**

	Yes	No	Somewhat
The Executive Director	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The key administrators in CDHL	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The leaders of the individual programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***12. Are you acquainted with the major aspects of the physical plant needs at the institution including: buildings and maintenance needs, deferred maintenance, planned new construction or enhancements, etc.?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***13. Are you comfortable with your attendance record at Board and committee meetings?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***14. Do you read the minutes of meetings to determine whether they faithfully represent the proceeding decisions as you recall them?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***15. Do you consistently and thoroughly familiarize yourself with the information prepared for you in advance of Board and committee meetings?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***16. Have you found it necessary to remind your fellow Board members to avoid involvement in non-policy matters better left to the executives and administrators?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***17. Have you recently taken advantage of an opportunity to say a good word about CDHL to a policy maker or organization at the state level?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***18. Do you take advantage of opportunities to formally present information about CDHL and/or deaf education in general to key groups or individuals?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***19. Have you ever suggested to the Governor or other appointing authority someone who would make an outstanding new Board member?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***20. Do you understand the concept of "fund-accounting"?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***21. Do you find CDHL's financial statement intelligible?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***22. Are you able to maintain impartiality regarding the concerns of students and faculty and the needs of CDHL?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***23. Do you make yourself available for counsel with your Executive Director in support of his relationships with outreach personnel, as well as with state policy leaders?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***24. Is it important to keep your Executive Director informed of any personal communication you may establish with administrative leaderships with other schools?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***25. If you have such lines of communication, can you avoid prejudiced judgments that could result from the communication?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***26. Do you avoid asking special favors of the administration?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***27. Are you satisfied that you have no real or perceived conflicts of interest in your service as a Board member?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

***28. If you have not already done so, would you be willing to serve as a committee chair or Board officer?**

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

***29. Have you found your Board membership to be stimulating and rewarding thus far?**

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Please explain your response

***30. How would you rate yourself as a Board member at this time?**

- Above average
- Average
- Below average

***31. What issues have most occupied the Board's time and attention during the past year?**

***32. What were the one or two successes during the past year for which the Board takes some satisfaction?**

***33. What particular shortcomings do you see in the Board's organization or performance that may need attention?**

34. Other comments or suggestions?

CDHL Board Member Self-Evaluation

35. Please add any additional comments here



CERTIFICATION OF ENROLLMENT

SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1144

Chapter 151, Laws of 2013

63rd Legislature
2013 Regular Session

EDUCATIONAL INTERPRETERS

EFFECTIVE DATE: 07/28/13

Passed by the House April 22, 2013
Yeas 88 Nays 7

FRANK CHOPP

Speaker of the House of Representatives

Passed by the Senate April 16, 2013
Yeas 45 Nays 0

BRAD OWEN

President of the Senate

Approved May 7, 2013, 2:12 p.m.

JAY INSLEE

Governor of the State of Washington

CERTIFICATE

I, Barbara Baker, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the attached is **SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1144** as passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate on the dates hereon set forth.

BARBARA BAKER

Chief Clerk

FILED

May 7, 2013

**Secretary of State
State of Washington**

SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1144

AS AMENDED BY THE SENATE

Passed Legislature - 2013 Regular Session

State of Washington

63rd Legislature

2013 Regular Session

By House Education (originally sponsored by Representatives Dahlquist, Lytton, Fagan, Haigh, Moscoso, Magendanz, Lias, Ryu, and Santos)

READ FIRST TIME 02/13/13.

1 AN ACT Relating to qualifications for educational interpreters;
2 adding a new section to chapter 28A.410 RCW; and creating a new
3 section.

4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

5 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 1.** The legislature finds that although the
6 professional educator standards board has begun work on standards and
7 assessments for educational interpreters as directed by the 2012
8 supplemental operating budget, there is a need formally to codify this
9 as an ongoing responsibility. The legislature also intends to specify
10 how the standards and assessments will be used to improve learning
11 opportunities for students who are deaf, deaf-blind, or hearing
12 impaired.

13 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 2.** A new section is added to chapter 28A.410
14 RCW to read as follows:

15 (1) The definitions in this subsection apply throughout this
16 section.

17 (a) "Educational interpreters" means school district employees,

1 whether certificated or classified, providing sign language translation
2 and further explanation of concepts introduced by the teacher for
3 students who are deaf, deaf-blind, or hearing impaired.

4 (b) "Educational interpreter assessment" means an assessment that
5 includes both written assessment and performance assessment that is
6 offered by a national organization of professional sign language
7 interpreters and transliterators, and is designed to assess performance
8 in more than one sign system or sign language.

9 (2) The professional educator standards board shall adopt standards
10 for educational interpreters and identify and publicize educational
11 interpreter assessments that are available and meet the definition in
12 this section. The board shall establish a performance standard for
13 each educational interpreter assessment for the purposes of this
14 section, defining what constitutes a minimum assessment result.

15 (3) By the beginning of the 2016-17 school year, educational
16 interpreters who are employed by school districts must have
17 successfully achieved the performance standard established by the
18 professional educator standards board on one of the educational
19 interpreter assessments identified by the board.

20 (4) By December 31, 2013, the professional educator standards board
21 shall recommend to the education committees of the house of
22 representatives and the senate, how to appropriately use the national
23 interpreter certification and the educational interpreter performance
24 assessment for educational interpreters in Washington public schools.

25 (5) The provisions of this section do not apply to educational
26 interpreters employed to interpret a sign system or sign language for
27 which no educational interpreter assessment has been identified by the
28 professional educator standards board.

Passed by the House April 22, 2013.

Passed by the Senate April 16, 2013.

Approved by the Governor May 7, 2013.

Filed in Office of Secretary of State May 7, 2013.



The Center for Childhood Hearing Loss (CDHL) and Implementation of HB1144

Washington has approximately 245 educational interpreters. CDHL has sent a survey to each one asking if they would like to participate in state sponsored trainings designed to get them ready to meet the requirement of a 3.5 on the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment. There was a 44% return on the survey.

Survey results:

- 66 people have never taken the EIPA (either written or performance)
- 42 have taken the EIPA
- 1 no response

Level of Training

- 2 no Training
- 16 3 or less American Sign Language Classes (ASL)
- 6 3-6 ASL classes
- 17 began an Interpreter Training Program but didn't complete it
- 52 completed an Interpreter Training Program
- 2 unknown
- 8 SEE Training

EIPA Scores

Of the 42 who have taken the EIPA (performance), 40 reported the following scores:

- 1 scored a 2.9 or below
- 12 scored a 3.0 – 3.4
- 17 scored a 3.5 – 3.9
- 10 scored a 4.0 or above

We believe the scores above reflect higher scores that would be the overall average for the state. We believe the people who have volunteered to take the test, without waiting for a requirement, will be more motivated and score higher

Experience:

- 23 people had less than 4 years experience in the classroom interpreting
- 23 people had 5-9 years experience
- 15 had 10 – 14 years experience

- 20 had 15 – 19 years experience
- 21 had 20 or more years experience

Interest in Training

85 people said they **would** be interested in participating in trainings provided by the state. 24 said they **would not** be interested in participating.

Training Plan

Using the survey information we plan to divide educational interpreters across the state into groups according to level of training/skill. We have talked to Spokane Falls Community College and asked if they would partner with us to provide instruction to educational interpreters through distance education. They are on board, working to create courses for educational interpreters in regional areas.

OSPI has sponsored a 4-day training called The Combined Summer Institute in the summer for the past 13 years. This 4-day training is designed for “low incidence” populations. We have numerous workshop offerings for teachers with students who are deaf, blind, autistic, and multiple disabilities. For the summer of 2014, we will change this conference to a 1 or 2-day conference in Seattle for teachers and a 3-day intensive training for educational interpreters in Ellensburg. We will have three or four courses for educational interpreters during the summer of 2014, 2015 and 2016 to try to meet the fall 2016 deadline.

On September 1, 2016, will all 245 interpreters have met the standard? Most likely not all will. Some interpreters have expressed that they will resign or retire from their position before the deadline.

Supply will lag behind the demand for qualified interpreters. Washington does not have enough training programs. Spokane Falls currently offers the only Interpreter Training Program in Washington.

What we have yet to do is to determine the number of courses each interpreter will need to meet the requirement. Some may only need mentorship. Some may need as much as a full interpreter training program. Spokane Falls Community College will need financial help to hire the additional faculty needed to provide Adult Education courses.

1. Why is this a priority?

Every child deserves access to basic education. For a deaf child that often comes through his/her interpreter. House Bill 1144 directed the Washington Professional Educators Standards Board (PESB) to recommend to the education committees of the house and senate how to appropriately use the national interpreter certification and the educational interpreter performance assessment for educational interpreters in Washington public schools.

2. How are we doing?

- The PESB has recommended that by the September 1, 2016, educational interpreters must pass the written portion of the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment as well as meet one of these two performance standards:
 1. Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) with a minimum score of 3.5; OR
 2. National Interpreting Certificate (NIC) with Registry of the Deaf (RID) certification.
- Appoint the Center for Childhood Deafness and Hearing Loss (CDHL) to implement, coordinate, and manage the educational interpreter standards.
- Develop capacity to provide the EIPA to 200 or more educational interpreters that may require testing prior to the 2016 deadline.

3. What are we working on? (use 3 bullets with 1-2 short sentences per bullet to describe the top 3 things you are doing to improve or maintain)

- Perform a district by district review to determine the number of interpreters who meet the standard and those who do not to serve as a baseline for assessment and professional development needs.
- Develop professional development opportunities to assist interpreters in passing or retaking the EIPA including a summer institute solely purposes on preparing educational interpreters for EIPA test.
- Secure additional funding for supporting professional development and management of this assessment program for educational interpreters.

How can you help?

Link to the SHB 1144:

<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=1144&year=2013>

Link to the PESB final recommendations:

<https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BzB1kJv-8a4iVW9SznZMaDRvS0k/edit>

Link to the EIPA website:

<http://www.classroominterpreting.org/eipa/index.asp>

Educational Interpreter Standards Recommendations

The Washington Professional Educators Standards Board (PESB) was directed to develop and publish standards for educational interpreters as a result of HB 2127, Sec 501(1)(d)(iii). The specific requirements of this proviso are:

Develop educator interpreter standards and identifying interpreter assessments that are available to school districts that meet the following criteria:

- A. Include both written and performance assessment;
- B. Be offered by a national organization of professional sign language interpreters and transliterators; and
- C. Be designed to assess performance in more than one sign system or sign language.

The board shall establish a performance standard, defining what constitutes a minimum assessment result, for each educational interpreter assessment identified. The board shall publicize the standards and assessments for school district use.

Summary of Recommendations

The workgroup’s recommendation for the assessments and performance standard are:

- 1. Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) with a minimum score of 3.5 AND Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) - Written Test – passing score; OR**
- 2. Interpreting Certificate (NIC) with RID certification AND Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) - Written Test – passing score**

The Process

To address the proviso, the following steps were taken that culminated with this report:

February, 2013	Facilitator hired to guide the development of these recommendations through the competitive RFQQ No.2012-13 process in December 2012.
March 25-26, 2013	Meeting of invited representatives of relevant stakeholder groups representing the interests and education of children who are deaf and hard of hearing in Tacoma, WA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation included the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), the Center for Childhood Deafness and Hearing Loss (CDHL), local school districts, special schools and programs for deaf and hard of hearing children, and relevant agencies (see Attachment A for a list of participants).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several representatives are current consumers of interpreting services. • Work group made recommendations for the standard according to the process outlined in this report.
April-May 15, 2013	Report developed
May 15-June 15, 2013	Written comments were solicited through a distribution of the report and specific instructions for returning input.
June 2013	Written comments analyzed for consideration within report
July 30-31, 2013	Final recommendations presentation to PESB, Olympia, WA

History of Educational Interpreting in Washington and National Perspective

The activities summarized below represent the efforts of professionals and parents to establish standards for educational interpreters in Washington and demonstrate the long-standing need that has existed for this legislation and the work of this group under the Professional Educators Standards Board.

- 2004: State Educational Interpreter Council (SEIC) worked with Senator Fraser of Olympia to develop Senate Bill 5105 that included establishing competencies for educational interpreters, and to identify training programs, funding sources, and distance learning options.
- 2006: Senate and House Education Committees requested that OSPI develop recommendations related to standards for educational interpreters resulting in House Bill 6606. The SEIC developed educational interpreter qualifications and requirements for Level I and Level II tiers and forwarded them to OSPI to send to the legislative committee.
- 2007: The Washington State Institute for Public Policy report, *Educational Services for Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Children in Washington State: Stakeholder Views* identified one of the problems in Washington’s deaf education system as having “widespread use of unqualified educational interpreters” (p 14).
- 2010: The Center for Childhood Deafness and Hearing Loss (CDHL) Board of Trustees Report to the Legislature includes Recommendation 4.2: OSPI in consultation with CDHL, should establish state minimum standards and certification requirements for educational interpreters and support access to the assessment of sign language interpreting skills.

On the national level, educational interpreting evolved from the passage of PL 94-142 in 1975, now the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Interpreting was specifically added as a related service in the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA with the following definition:

Educational Interpreting Services includes oral transliteration services, cued language transliteration services, sign language transliteration and interpreting services, and transcription services such as CART, C-Print, and TypeWell; and special interpreting services for children who are deaf-blind) (34 CFR 300.34 (c) (4).

At the present time 8 states required educational interpreters to have a general interpreting license, 9 states issue an Educational Interpreter license, and 24 states require educational interpreters to meet their state’s standards for a qualified educational interpreter. Ten states have no requirements (WA is in this list until these standards are implemented). The latter two methods are generally managed within the Department of Education. Most states have adopted the following general provisions as part of the “qualifications” for educational interpreters:

- Degree level: High school diploma or equivalent or Associates degree.
- Test: The most common test/standard used to consider an educational interpreter “qualified” is the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) 3.5 or higher.
- National Certificate: If an interpreter holds the National Interpreter Certification (NIC) from the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, most states will consider this person qualified to work as an Educational Interpreter.
- Registry: Some states that outline qualifications also provide a registry to assist school systems locating qualified Educational Interpreter’s.
- Remaining “Qualified”: States require interpreters to complete continuing education units to remain qualified.

Interpreter assessments evaluate voice-to-sign and sign-to voice skills using videotape stimulus materials and an evaluation procedure based on a rating system .The following tests are used for assessing Educational Interpreter skills (see Attachment B for state by state analysis of current educational interpreter minimum requirements):

EIPA: 37 states

Cut Scores: 6 states- 3.0, 22 states – 3.5, 10 states – 4.0

EIPA–Written Test: 12 states

NIC: 23 states

Educational Signed Skills Evaluation (E.S.S.E.): 2 states (CA, OK)

Quality Assessment Test or Quality Assurance Screening Test (QAST): 6 states

The EIPA and the E.S.S.E. use a 5 point scale that aligns with interpreter skill. The EIPA website (www.classroominterpreting.com) describes the skills for these levels as follows:

Level 1 (Score 1.0-1.9): Beginning Interpreter not ready to interpret

Demonstrates very limited sign vocabulary with frequent errors in production. At times, production may be incomprehensible. Grammatical structure tends to be nonexistent. Individual is only able to communicate very simple ideas and demonstrates great difficulty comprehending signed communication. Sign production lacks prosody and use of space for the vast majority of the interpreted message. An individual at this level is not recommended for classroom interpreting.

Level 2 (Score 2.0-2.9): Advanced Beginner

Demonstrates only basic sign vocabulary and these limitations interfere with communication. Lack of fluency and sign production errors are typical and often interfere with communication. The interpreter often hesitates in signing, as if searching for vocabulary. Frequent errors in grammar are

apparent, although basic signed sentences appear intact. More complex grammatical structures are typically difficult. Individual is able to read signs at the word level and simple sentence level but complete or complex sentences often require repetitions and repairs. Some use of prosody and space, but use is inconsistent and often incorrect. An individual at this level is not recommended for classroom interpreting.

Level 3 (Score 3.0-3.9): Intermediate

Demonstrates knowledge of basic vocabulary, but will lack vocabulary for more technical, complex, or academic topics. Individual is able to sign in a fairly fluent manner using some consistent prosody, but pacing is still slow with infrequent pauses for vocabulary or complex structures. Sign production may show some errors but generally will not interfere with communication. Grammatical production may still be incorrect, especially for complex structures, but is in general intact for routine and simple language. Comprehends signed messages but may need repetition and assistance. Voiced translation often lacks depth and subtleties of the original message. An individual at this level would be able to communicate very basic classroom content, but may incorrectly interpret complex information resulting in a message that is not always clear. An interpreter at this level needs continued supervision and should be required to participate in continuing education in interpreting.

Level 4 (Score 4.0-4.9): Advanced intermediate

Demonstrates broad use of vocabulary with sign production that is generally correct. Demonstrates good strategies for conveying information when a specific sign is not in her/his vocabulary. Grammatical constructions are generally clear and consistent, but complex information may still pose occasional problems. Prosody is good, with appropriate facial expression most of the time. May still have difficulty with the use of facial expression in complex sentences and adverbial non-manual markers. Fluency may deteriorate when rate or complexity of communication increases. Uses space consistently most of the time, but complex constructions or extended use of discourse cohesion may still pose problems. Comprehension of most signed messages at a normal rate is good but translation may lack some complexity of the original message. An individual at this level would be able to convey much of the classroom content but may have difficulty with complex topics or rapid turn taking.

Level 5 (Score 5.0): Advanced

Demonstrates broad and fluent use of vocabulary, with a broad range of strategies for communicating new words and concepts. Sign production errors are minimal and never interfere with comprehension. Prosody is correct for grammatical, non-manual markers, and affective purposes. Complex grammatical constructions are typically not a problem. Comprehension of sign messages is very good, communicating all details of the original message. An individual at this level is capable of clearly and accurately conveying the majority of interactions within the classroom.

Development of Recommendations

The following steps comprised the process for determining performance and written test recommendations and their minimum score.

1. Consideration of existing data regarding current assessments of interpreting skills and knowledge.
2. Identification of relevant criteria on which to evaluate each performance assessment.

3. Evaluation and selection of performance assessments.
4. Evaluation and selection of written assessments.
5. Determination of minimum standard for recommended assessments.
6. Evaluation of process for developing the recommendations.

Consideration of Existing Data Regarding Current Assessments

Three educational interpreter performance assessments and two written assessments were reviewed and considered by the committee. A full description and data regarding each assessment follows as well as a summary of pertinent aspects of the assessments in Table 1.

Performance Assessments

- EIPA
- E.S.S.E.-Interpreting, E.S.S.E.-Receptive
- NIC

Written Assessments

- EIPA Written Test
- NIC Written Test

Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA)

The EIPA is the most widely used assessment for educational interpreting skills and is specifically designed for K-12 school interpreters. The EIPA is a national certification managed through Boys Town National Research Hospital in Omaha, NE (www.classroominterpreting.org). To assess the skills of the candidate, the EIPA utilizes two video samples of actual classroom settings called stimulus tapes. The first tape is used to assess the candidate's receptive skills (voice to sign) and the second to assess his/her expressive skills (sign to voice). The tapes are chosen based on the grade level (elementary or secondary) and the sign language or system selected by the candidate. The candidate is videotaped interpreting the classroom tape. Videotapes are analyzed in the areas of grammatical skills, sign to voicing skills, vocabulary, and overall abilities by a 3 member panel of trained experts that match the sign system used by the candidate. Scores from all three evaluators are averaged for each skill area and each domain as well as the overall test score. Scores may range from 0 (no skills demonstrated) to 5.0 (advanced native-like skills). An individual's EIPA score is reported as "EIPA Elementary PSE 4.1" which represents the grade level, the language modality, and the total summary EIPA score. In addition to the score, detailed written feedback on the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for improvement are provided in the reports which are returned within 90 days. The language modality options for the EIPA are:

- American Sign Language (ASL)
- Pidgin Signed English (PSE)
- Manually Coded English (MCE) (Note: MCE includes Signing Exact English or SEE, a type of MCE)
- EIPA-Cued Speech (available 2013)

EIPA also offers a pre-hire screen that can be used to get a quick "thumbs up/thumbs down" recommendation regarding an individual's sign skills. Additionally, the EIPA has an internet-based

knowledge assessment. The classroom interpreting website contains guidelines for professional conduct, EIPA practice materials, and other classroom interpreting resources.

Educational Signed Skills Evaluation (E.S.S.E.)

The E.S.S.E. is similar to the EIPA. It focuses on classroom interpreting skills, includes receptive (sign to voice) and expressive (voice to sign) tests with 3 different age levels options (elementary, middle school, high school) and uses classroom stimulus tapes. The receptive component (E.S.S.E.-R) consists of 10 signed sentences and the interpreting (E.S.S.E.-I) segment uses samples of classroom teachers. The assessment results are viewed and scored by a 5 member panel of experts and a report is provided to candidates with their averaged score and an analysis of strengths and weaknesses. Performance is scored on a scale of from 1.0 (beginner, not ready to interpret) to 5.0 (advanced interpreting skills). The sign modes offered are:

- American Sign Language (ASL)
- Pidgin Signed English (PSE)
- Signing Exact English (SEE)

Other services from the SEE Center (www.seecenter.org) include a test for teacher sign skills and a screening test. The following numbers illustrate use of the E.S.S.E. in the U.S. Of the candidates who have taken the E.S.S.E., 86% resided in California, where the SEE Center is based.

Breakdown by mode for E.S.S.E.-I (expressive) since 2002 (total=1953):

- American Sign Language – 18
- Pidgin Signed English – 1362
- Signing Exact English/Signed English – 308
- Mode data missing – 265

Numbers of interpreters taking the E.S.S.E. in the past 3 years nation-wide (total=534):

- 2010 – 252
- 2011 – 160
- 2012 – 122

By comparison, the EIPA was administered to 1786 individuals in 2010, 1674 in 2011, and 1773 in 2012 for a total of 5233.

The California Department of Education data compared the scores of 513 interpreters who took both the EIPA-MCE and E.S.S.E.-SEE. Interpreters who performed at the 3.5 level had comparable passing rates for both tests. Of the interpreters who performed at the 4.0 level, 12% passed the EIPA and 28% passed the E.S.S.E. suggesting the E.S.S.E.-SEE was easier to pass at the 4.0 level.

National Interpreter Certification (NIC)

NIC is a national certification designed for general interpreting offered through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). The examination tests interpreting knowledge and sign skills in three domains:

- General knowledge of the field of interpreting through the NIC knowledge exam (must pass before proceeding to other tests);
- Ethical decision making through the interview portion of the NIC Interview and Performance Exam; and
- Interpreting skills through the NIC Interview and Performance Exam

The NIC Interview and Performance Examination is a vignette-based assessment using video to deliver and record the assessment. Each vignette contains a real world problem or interpreting activity. Seven video-based vignettes represent the stimulus materials (two for the ethics interview, 5 for the performance assessment). A team of up to three trained raters score each vignette using an established scoring rubric. NIC rating determines a pass/fail status of each candidate. A numeric score is provided to give the candidates feedback as to how far below or above the pass/fail point they performed. Some feedback is provided to candidates who do not pass. The NIC requires a minimum of a BA degree for all candidates although an Alternative Pathway Application may offer an alternative to this requirement. Continuing education is required to maintain the NIC.

Candidates earn NIC certification if they demonstrate professional knowledge and skills that meet or exceed the minimum professional standards necessary to perform in a broad range of interpretation and transliteration assignments in all three domains. RID also recognizes educational interpreters with EIPA scores of 4.0 and above who also pass the Educational Interpreter Written Test.

Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment – Written Test (EIPA-WT)

The EIPA-WT is a comprehensive multiple choice test that evaluates the interpreter’s understanding of information that is critical to performing with students in an education setting such as roles and responsibilities of the interpreter, tutoring, child development and relationships with students. The proctored computer-based test contains 177 questions taking about 1.5 to 3 hours to complete and is administered over the internet offering immediate feedback. A passing score on the EIPA-WT is not needed in order to take the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment.

Table 1. Comparison of pertinent elements of the EIPA, E.S.S.E., and NIC.

	EIPA	E.S.S.E.	NIC
Sign Systems	American Sign Language (ASL) Pidgin Signed English (PSE) Manually Coded English (MCE) EIPA-Cued Speech	American Sign Language (ASL) Pidgin Signed English (PSE) Signing Exact English (SEE)	American Sign Language (ASL) English-based sign systems
Levels	Elementary, Secondary (MS & HS)	Elementary, Middle School, High School	Adult
Length of Tests	1 hour	2.5 hours	1 hour
Diversity of Test	Receptive: 1 situation	Receptive: 1 situation	7 vignettes

Stimulus Materials	Expressive: 5 situations for elementary, 2 situations for secondary	Expressive: 3 situations	
Analysis	Score and Written Report detailing strengths and weaknesses	Score and Written Report detailing strengths and weaknesses	Pass/fail and score with report identifying problem areas for those who fail
Knowledge	Computer-based via Internet 177 MC questions Passing score not required to take the EIPA	None	Computer-based via internet 150 MC questions Scaled score of 500 required to pass
Number of Endorsing States	37	2	23
Proctoring of Test	Local test administrator	Local test administrator	Local test administrator
Cost	EIPA \$310 Cued Speech \$350 Pre-Hire assessment \$100 EIPA Written Test \$200	\$300/test	NIC Knowledge \$285 NIC Interview and performance \$370 (Note: these are member rates for new applicant assessment)

Educational Interpreter Assessment in Washington State

The EIPA Diagnostic Center and the SEE Center provided data on assessment of interpreter candidates in Washington State for this report. Data was not requested from the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf on the NIC since that test is not specific to educational interpreting. Table 2 reports the numbers of interpreters taking all modes of the EIPA and each mode of the E.S.S.E. in Washington State to date by performance level. Of the interpreters who have already been assessed 86 meet the recommended performance standard. This fact illustrates motivation on the part of interpreters to have their skill levels assessed and should ease the transition to a standard.

Table 2. Test performance profile of individuals who have taken the EIPA and the E.S.S.E. in Washington State. Asterisk indicates the current performance standard is met.

Performance Level	EIPA (all modes)	E.S.S.E.-I SEE (Expressive)	E.S.S.E.-SEE (Receptive)	E.S.S.E.-PSE (Receptive only)	E.S.S.E.-ASL (Receptive only)
4.0 or higher	18*	9*	11	6	2
3.5-3.9	58*	1*	1	6	5
3.0-3.4	39				
2.5-3.0	10	9	7	10	13
2.5 or lower	3				
Total	128	19	19	22	20
Total per					

Identification of Relevant Criteria on which to Evaluate each Performance Assessment

After discussion and deliberation, the work group agreed to the following criteria to evaluate each of the assessments. The issue of test validity and reliability was deferred because the work group did not have sufficient information to evaluate this parameter of the assessments.

- Offered by National organization/ Nationally-recognized assessment (required by proviso)
- Assesses more than one system or language (required by proviso)
- Portability/reciprocity across states and school districts
- Professional development available to increase pass rate
- Feedback in reporting results
- Relevance to classroom interpreting
- Proctoring
- Discourse – based assessment

Evaluation and Selection of Performance Assessments

A rubric was designed to evaluate how well each test addressed each parameter. For this task the committee worked in four groups. First, each of the parameters was discussed to determine a weighting to reflect its importance based on the following scale:

- 1=somewhat important
- 2=important
- 3=critical

Consensus on the weightings was achieved through whole group discussion. The second step of the rubric analysis required each group to rate each assessment according to how well it met each of the parameters. Ratings were made used the following scale:

- 1=poorly meets parameter
- 2=somewhat meets parameter
- 3=meets parameter well

Finally, each group multiplied the parameter weighting by the assessment rating to obtain a score for each parameter. Group scores were averaged to arrive at the average parameter scores. A total score was derived for each assessment by summing the scores. The higher the score the better the assessment met the parameters that were identified for consideration. Table 3 illustrates the group consensus weighting for the importance of each parameter, the group average rating of how well each test met the parameter, and the group average parameter score. The total scores of the average parameter score are located at the bottom of the shaded columns. Based on this scoring rubric, the EIPA best met the established parameters for an educational interpreter assessment, followed by the NIC, then the E.S.S.E.

Table 3. Scoring rubric.

Parameter/Weighting	EIPA		E.S.S.E.		NIC	
	Ave rating “meeting parameter”	Ave Parameter Score	Ave rating “meeting parameter”	Ave Parameter Score	Ave rating “meeting parameter”	Ave Parameter Score
National Test (weighting=3)	3	9	.2	3.75	3	9
Assesses more than 1 mode (3)	3	9	2.38	3.5	2	5.75
Portability (2.5)	2.88	7.57	1.25	3.25	3	7.5
Professional Development (2.5)	2.63	6.56	2.66	6.66	2.75	6.88
Proctoring (3)	3	9	3	9	3	9
Feedback Report (2.38)	3	7.13	3	7.15	1.25	2.89
Relevance to Classroom Interpreting (3)	3	9	2.5	7.5	1.75	5.25
Discourse-based (2.87)	3	8.6	1.25	3.65	2.5	7
TOTAL		65.86		44.46		53.27

A primary discussion point was whether the EIPA-MCE adequately assesses Signing Exact English (SEE) skills. Based upon data and information collected from states using the EIPA and the EIPA Diagnostic Center and the fact that SEE is a derivation of Manually Coded English, the majority of committee members felt that SEE skills was appropriately assessed by the EIPA (see Attachment C. Minority Report for further discussion on this issue).

Psychometric Analysis: Published studies describe the reliability and validity for the EIPA¹ and NIC² while the E.S.S.E. has completed only an internal report of this information. Therefore it was difficult to compare the E.S.S.E. data to that of the other assessments.

Recommendation: Based on the analysis of the assessments and discussion by work group members, the EIPA and the NIC were the recommended assessment options for Educational interpreters in Washington State by the majority of members. The EIPA was recommended by all work group members. Work group member recommendations were: 75% (12/16) EIPA or NIC; 19% (3/16) EIPA or E.S.S.E.; 6% (1/16) EIPA only.

¹ Schick, Williams, & Kupermiintz (2005). Look Who’s Being Left Behind: Educational Interpreters and Access to Education for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students. *Journal of Deaf Education and Deaf Studies* 11 (1), 3-20.

² The Caviart Group, LLC (2012, June). Building Value in Certification – A Status Report of the Enhanced NIC Interview and Performance Examination.

Evaluation and Selection of Written Assessment

The EIPA- Written Test and the NIC Written Test were the two options considered by the committee. The EIPA Written Test was unanimously selected because of its relevance to classroom interpreting.

Determination of Minimum Standard for Recommended Assessments

Performance Assessment:

- EIPA: Advantages and disadvantages were discussed by the work group for the 3.5 and 4.0 levels of the EIPA. The minimum score of 3.5 was selected as the standard because it was felt to be most achievable for increasing the number of qualified interpreters. The score applies to any one of the mode options and at either the elementary or secondary level. The 4.0 level could be recognized by individual school districts if they wanted to establish a salary schedule or other acknowledgement system for interpreters with higher scores and/or those who achieve proficiency in multiple sign modalities or at multiple grade levels.
- NIC: Interpreters who are RID certified are recommended.

Written Assessment: All interpreters must obtain a “pass” score on the EIPA written test.

Evaluation of Process for Developing the Recommendations

Participants were asked to evaluate the process used to determine the recommendations for this report. The following questions were asked via Survey Monkey.

1. To what extent do you feel the meeting achieved the goal of developing recommendations for written and performance tests and their standards for educational interpreters?
2. How effective was the format and overall process used for developing the recommendations for written and performance tests and their standards?
3. How well did we do on making sure everyone was equally involved?

Seventy-five percent of the participants responded. Favorable response rates (good – excellent) were 83.3% for questions 1 and 2, and 91.6% for Question 3. Additional feedback was obtained through open-ended questions that addressed meeting elements that worked best and least for each participant.

Final Recommendations

The following recommendations reflect the majority of work group members. A minority report is included in Attachment C representing the perspectives of the members who recommended the E.S.S.E. in addition to the EIPA for the performance component of the assessment. There was unanimous agreement for the written test recommendation.

Assessments and Performance Standard:

Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) with a minimum score of 3.5, AND
Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment - Written Test – passing score; OR

National Interpreting Certificate (NIC) with RID certification AND Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment - Written Test – passing score.

Attachment A

Educational Interpreter Standards Work Group Participants

Paul Bert	Education Interpreter
Carol Carrothers	WSDS/CDHL
John Bresko	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Linda Darling	Tacoma School District
Eloisa Williams	Washington State Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf
Char Parsely	Hearing Loss Center
Eric Raff	Office of the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing
Marie Rendon	Spokane Falls Community College
Rick Hauan	Washington State Center for Childhood Deafness & Hearing Loss
Kris Ching	Washington State Center for Childhood Deafness & Hearing Loss
Karen Mool	Puyallup School District
Peggy Mayer	NW School for Hearing-Impaired Children
Colleen McKearney	Education Interpreter
Brent Stark	NCESD
Ann Curry	FWPS
Paul Glaser	Washington State Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf
Tracy Wilson	PSD
Mary Jaeger	Snohomish School District
Theresa B. Smith	Ph.D., CSC, SC:L - Education Interpreter

Attachment B

State Minimum Standards for Educational Interpreters

State	Skill Test/Criteria			Written Test		
	EIPA	RID	Other	EIPA	RID	Other
Alabama	4	X	QAST			RID approved or Jacksonville SU
Alaska	4			pass		
Arizona	3.5	x	NAD 3 or higher			
Arkansas			QAST			80% on AR Ed Interp Handbook
California	4	x	ESSE 4.0, NAD, ACCI			
Colorado	3.5			pass		
Connecticut		x	NAD 3		pass	
Delaware	4	x				
D.C.						
Florida						
Georgia	3.5	x	QAST, NAD			
Hawaii	3.5		Other - EI I - AA degree in interpreting; EI 11- BA + 2 yrs experience			
Idaho	3.5					
Illinois	3.5	x	ACCI (American Consortium of Cert Interpreters)	pass	pass	
Indiana	3.5	NIC, CT	NAD 4,		pass	
Iowa	3.5	x	EIPA-CS, CLTNCE, NAD 3 or higher			
Kansas	4		QAST			
Kentucky	3					
Louisiana	3			pass		
Maine	3.5	x	NAD 4			
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan	3.5		MI BEI			
Minnesota	4	X	NAD 3 or higher	pass		
Mississippi	3	x	NAD			
Missouri	3.5					pass state test
Montana	3.5			pass		
Nebraska	3.5	NIC	ACCI 4.0, QAST 4.0, NAD			
Nevada	4					

New Hampshire	3.5	x	NAD	pass
New Jersey	3	x	NAD	
New Mexico	4	x		
New York				
North Carolina	3	x	NAD 4, 5; NC Interpreter Classification A,B, Nat Cued Speech AS	
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma	3.5	x	NAD 4, NCI, Signed Exact english 3.5, QA	
Oregon	3.5	x		pass
Pennsylvania	3.5	x	qualified under Sign Language Interpreter and Transliteration Registration Act, NAD 4-5	
Rhode Island	4			pass
South Carolina	3.5			pass
South Dakota	3.5	x	NAD 3	
Tennessee				
Texas	4			
Utah	3.5	x		
Vermont				
Virginia	3.5		QAST	pass
Washington				
West Virginia	3.5	x	NAD 4 or higher	pass
Wisconsin	3			
Wyoming				

Attachment C

Deaf Education Interpreter Project: Work Group Minority Report

The Deaf Education Interpreter Work Group had a contingent of professionals advocating for one manually signed approach to educational interpretation, Signing Exact English (S.E.E.). Unlike American Sign Language (ASL), which is a separate and autonomous visual-manual language unrelated to English, S.E.E. is a manual code for English and allows for more exact transliteration of the spoken message.

While the majority opinion of the workgroup recommended standards for the Education Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) and the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) National Interpreter Certification (NIC) along with the written portion of the EIPA, the assessment called the Educational Sign Skills Evaluation (ESSE) was discussed by the workgroup. This report reflects the position of the minority of workgroup members who wanted the PESB to set a standard for the ESSE.

Sign Exact English is a communication option for parents and is used in educational settings in Washington State by approximately 90 K-12 students, state-wide. Interpreters who communicate with deaf and hard of hearing children in SEE contend it is an important system for educational interpretation because of its emphasis on grammatical features of English. SEE interpreters also contend that while the EIPA does have an option for assessment of Manually Coded English, the ESSE better represents SEE. The ESSE also has assessment options for PSE (Pigeon Signed English) and ASL as does the EIPA. In a single testing session, rather than choosing which system the interpreter intends to focus on as in the EIPA, the SEE evaluation team determines the sign system used by the candidate and evaluates accordingly.

While the ESSE is only used in two states, supporters of the SEE system believe that money and politics played a significant role in the preference by states for selecting the RID/NIC or the EIPA. Supporters point to the need to assure a standard for SEE interpreters in Washington State that helps advance options to parents who choose to send their children to schools with SEE interpreters, regardless of the limited adoption of the ESSE in other states.

All workgroup members express strong commitment to supporting deaf children in their education and all members supported the EIPA and RID/NIC plus the written test of the EIPA. Three of the sixteen members asked that the ESSE be included, but that was not supported by the majority. The minority report includes a request that the PESB be prepared to expand the approved assessments in the future as advancements and continuing developments determine.

WASHINGTON STATE CENTER FOR CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS & HEARING LOSS

POLICY: **3247**

Adopted:

SUBJECT: **Isolation and Restraint of Students with IEPs and Section 504 Plans**

Approved by:

Nita Kamphuis, Chair, Board of Trustees

It is the policy of the Washington State Center on Childhood Deafness and Hearing Loss (CDHL) Board of Trustees that the Washington School for the Deaf (WSD) maintains a safe learning environment while treating all students with dignity and respect. All students in the school, including those with an Individualized Education Program (IEP), an Aversive Intervention Plan (AIP) or a plan developed under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504 plan) will remain free from the unreasonable use of force.

Isolation and restraint of these students will generally be avoided and will not be used as a form of discipline or punishment. The school recognizes, however, that isolation and restraint are necessary at times to preserve the safety of students and school staff. The school therefore authorizes these actions under limited circumstances. This policy and its accompanying procedure set forth the statutory definitions and authorized use of isolation, restraint and restraint devices as well as incident review procedures and requirements for reporting and parent/guardian notification.

The school will provide parents or guardians of students with an IEP or Section 504 plan a copy of the school's Isolation and Restraint policy when the IEP or Section 504 plan is created and will include parent/guardian notification procedures in the student's IEP.

Cross References: Policy 2161
Related

Policy 2162

Special Education and
Services for Eligible Students
Education of Students With
Disabilities Under Section 504
of the Rehabilitation Act of
1973

Legal References: RCW 9A.16.020

Use of Force — When lawful

RCW 9A.16.100	Use of Force on Children — Policy — Actions presumed unreasonable
RCW 28A.155.210	Special Education notification procedures
RCW 28A.600.485	Restraint of students with individualized education programs or plans developed under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973- Procedures-Definitions.
RCW 28A.150.300	Corporal Punishment Prohibited
Chapter 392-172A WAC	Rules for the Provision of Special Education
WAC 392-400-235	Discipline — Conditions and limitations

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

CDHL Data As of February 28, 2014

WSD Campus

- Elementary School: 29
- Middle School: 17
- High School: 51
- Post High School: 8
 - Total students: 106

Statewide Outreach

- Birth to 5 program
 - Southwest Washington: 11
 - Central Washington: 11

Districts Served Through Statewide Outreach

ESD 101	ESD 105	ESD 112	ESD 113	ESD 114	ESD 121	ESD 123	ESD 171	ESD 189
Davenport	Ellensburg		Chehalis/Centralia	Central Kitsap	Bellevue	Finley	Bridgeport	Ferndale
Mead	Grandview		Elma		Bethel	Pasco		Lake Stevens
Lake Stevens	Granger		Montesano		Federal Way	Richland		Lakewood
Lakewood	Highland		North Thurston		Highline			Meridian
Mount Baker	Royal		Olympia		Issaquah			Mt. Baker
South Whidbey	Sunnyside		Pe Ell		Kent			Mt. Vernon
Spokane					Puyallup			South Whidbey
					Renton			
					Snoqualmie Valley			
					Steilacoom			
					Tacoma			
					Tahoma			

Number of student visits contracted to date: 368

Number of students contracted to date: 95

WASHINGTON STATE CENTER FOR CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS & HEARING LOSS

PROCEDURE: **3247P**

Adopted:

SUBJECT: **Use of Reasonable Force**

Approved by:

Richard Hauan, Executive Director

A. Definitions

- **Isolation:** Excluding a student from his or her regular instructional area and restricting the student alone within a room or any other form of enclosure, from which the student may not leave. "Isolation" does not apply to an in-school suspension wherein a student is assigned to a room/enclosure where he/she is periodically monitored but left alone in the room/enclosure for periods of time to do schoolwork.
- **Restraint:** Physical intervention or force used to control a student, including the use of a restraint device.

B. Authorized Use of Isolation or Restraint

School staff are authorized to use isolation or restraint:

- when responding to unpredicted, spontaneous behavior which poses a clear and present danger of serious harm to the student, another person, or property; or a clear and present danger of seriously disrupting the educational process; or
- as specified in a student's Individualized Education Program (IEP), aversive intervention plan (AIP) and in a manner consistent with Chapter 392-172A WAC, or in the student's 504 plan.

Under no circumstances will isolation or restraint be used for purposes of discipline or punishment.

C. Review of Incident

Following release of a student from isolation or restraint, the school will:

- review the incident with the student and their parent/guardian (though not necessarily at the same time) to address the behavior that precipitated the incident; and
- review the incident with the staff member who administered the isolation or restraint to discuss whether proper procedures were followed.

D. Reporting Requirement

If any school staff member or school administrator isolates or restrains a student on an IEP or a 504 plan during school-sponsored instruction or activities, he or she will:

- inform the principal or designee as soon as possible and;
- submit a written report of the incident to the superintendent's office within two (2) business days that contains, at a minimum:
 - the date and time of the incident;
 - the name and job title of the staff member who administered the restraint or isolation;
 - a description of the activity that led to the restraint or isolation;
 - the type of restraint or isolation used on the student, and the duration;
 - whether the student or staff was physically injured during the restraint or isolation; and
 - any medical care provided to the student or staff.

E. Parent/Guardian Notification

The principal or designee will:

- make a reasonable effort to verbally inform the student's parent/guardian of the incident within twenty-four (24) hours of the incident; and
- send written notification no later than five (5) business days after the incident occurred in the language that the school customarily provides school-related information to the parent.

IEPs will include the above procedures for notification of parents/guardians regarding the use of isolation and restraint on their student.

F. Providing Parents/Guardians with Restraint and Isolation Policy

The school will provide parents/guardians of students on IEPs or 504 plans with a copy of the school's policy on Isolation and Restraint when the IEP or 504 program is created.