Task Force Members January 25 & 26 Meeting
National Technical Institute for the Deaf - Rochester, NY

Minutes Friday, March 11, 2011

Session was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

1. Subcommittees Reports
   Educational Curricula and Training Program Subcommittee
   • Seeing problems from different points of view was important for our discussion.
   • We classified the short term goals and “laundry list” or menu of items we had. We didn’t prioritize them. Most of our recommendations are major. Maybe a paragraph at the start of the section can help the reader understand the importance of the “laundry list.”
   • The advantage of the laundry list is that the institutions can pick which recommendations they would like to pursue. We are not giving them a “one size fits all.”
   • We didn’t have much time to work on the Long Term Recommendations. We re-organized some items we had and were working from.

Questions/Answers/Comments

Q: When the June Interim Report Subcommittee looked at that list, we noticed two categories. One was the category of making sure deaf and hard of hearing are integrated into already existing pre-college and college activities that the four institutions have. We have a good list of activities from NTID and RIT and a good list from Gallaudet, but not an in depth list from U of R and RGH. We will contact the institutions to determine what precollege activities for high school and middle schools they have and how can they be more integrated.

A: I would like to visualize a big picture and we have models established here locally and at other institutions that can be enhanced with deaf sensitivity training.

A: The Policy group identified that as a short term goal.

A: In addition to integrating deaf and hard of hearing students into existing precollege programs, we can also integrate health care career emphasis in existing precollege programs such as “Explore Your Future.” There are two kinds of integration.

A: There are other programs that deal with health care careers on campuses; it is marrying two things that already exist so there are easy fixes in some cases.
A: The policy group discussed the possibility of the four institutions asking private foundations for small amounts of funding in the short-term to support such efforts.

Q: So as a follow up. You identified new initiatives which can lead to long term recommendations. Do you see any funding in that area? Or can we just work with existing programs?
A: We didn’t emphasize that at all. Good question.

A: Some of the precollege and post college recommendations can be done without any money at all. For example, a passionate leader can initiate sponsoring a club. Other recommendations such as a post- baccalaureate program require serious money or institutional support. Perhaps parents can pay just like college. That could be one option also.

A: The U of R has a post baccalaureate program for medical school. It would be asking how we can piggy back on to that.

A: There is probably room in the U of R and the rest of the campus. I don’t see a lot of interaction around deaf issues. The main campus has the research that happens there and other centers do their thing. I don’t see a lot of interaction between the two sides of the street. I am sure that is something that we could try to enhance.

Q: Could you help us by making a recommendation to do that?
A: Are we going to figure that out now or later? I thought the education committee wanted each institution to figure out their own priorities. Are we going to go through one by one for all four?

C: Right now we are trying to come to a second draft and add more of Bob’s comments and more direct institutional recommendations so there is a guide for the institutions to develop.
A: As a Task Force we can write recommendations to the four institutions and identify what we think is important and make recommendations for them. Ultimately those four institutions need to look at our recommendations and see which ones they can handle quickest. They need to decide their own institutional priorities. We can identify what we think is important but then they need to let us know.

**Accessibility/Technology Subcommittee**

- Our group came up with several items: We need a place for information dissemination and a place to gather information like a one stop shop. This can be a clearing house.
The subcommittee thinks there is a need for a public website, separate from the TF website that can be such a clearinghouse. There are several reasons for such a site:

- One is to share successful communication strategies used by health care professionals who are D/HH.
- The second reason is to determine what is out there and what is available for use. Many people use email, but we need a more open communication environment.

- **A second priority is for counseling and advising on access/technology solutions.** We want to set up physical space for sharing information on interpreting services and giving advice on that service and equipment that can be loaned. We need to be able to borrow equipment for individuals to test and we need to also establish a tracking system.

- **We are also thinking about collaboration with cardiologists and others in the field to set up teams for individuals with hearing loss.**

- **As a long-term goal we would like to see a set up that includes all the players such as manufacturers so that individuals can have a central place to get the latest information on technology and access solutions.**

- **Third priority is to focus on interpreting services by expanding the tools and increasing the number of qualified interpreters across the United States.**

**Questions/Answers/Comments**

**Q:** Some of the recommendations relate to policy and funding because if interpreting has to expand, then we have to look at funding for that activity as well as funding a hub of technology. Is that what your group has begun to consider?

**A:** That is what we discussed, yes.

**C:** So you have three priorities. That helps us reduce the listing and categorize ideas, keeping the details but the primary focus is the ideas and concepts and the details are subcategories.

**C:** One challenge we are trying to figure out relates to online courses for interpreters and the software needs for such a course. Right now, signing online is not clear nor easy to do. We would like to figure out how to improve delivering sign online.

**C:** This is an important issue since many online courses now have professors in real time live and the necessary sign language interpreting for such courses is not available. For example, there is a medical terminology course starting in the fall which will be live.

**C:** Also important is the need for captioning - that can be a short term goal to improve accessibility. Perhaps we want to establish a partnership with captioning services.
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**Governmental Policies/Research Subcommittee**

- First priority is to involve the government relations specialist from each of the four institutions at the federal level to explore issues important to the TF goals.
- Second, we talked about interpreting and issues for providers. In DC there are providers in Spanish and other languages so maybe we can take advantage of that for ASL also.
- Third priority is support for education using existing programs in precollege and summer institutes to match what the education subcommittee has already mentioned.

2. Preparing for next meeting/Task Force Evaluations/Remarks

- Writing Subcommittee will integrate the information you gave us and will try to reduce the number of listings and categories but still maintain the flavor of the recommendations. We will send it to you by the middle of April for more comments and feedback. Then you will get a final draft for our June meeting.
- Discussion of major issues the TF needs to consider as subcommittees begin working on Long Term Solutions.
  - Should we be recommending a central federal fund to deal with access issues or continue to leave it to the individual institutions?
    - It was agreed to recommend central federal funding.
  - Should we be recommending that all institutions in the country become more deaf friendly or do we think we need several centers of excellence for health care careers who could provide assistance to other educational programs that may get students who are deaf?
    - Short-term recommendation - encourage the four institutions to cooperate together in a consortium.
    - A long term recommendation could be centers of excellence that model pipeline programs that serve deaf and hard of hearing from precollege to graduate with different exit points.
    - A center for excellence could also become a model for how best to support deaf and hard of hearing students.
  - Etc.
  - Etc.

Each subcommittee is charged with investigating/researching some of these major issues before the next June meeting.

1. Central Funding - Accessibility/Technology Subcommittee partnering with Governmental Policies/Research Subcommittee
2. Center of Excellence – Educational Curricula Subcommittee partnering with Governmental Policies/Research Subcommittee
3. Pipeline Programs—Educational Curricula Subcommittee partnering with Governmental Policies/Research Subcommittee
4. Policy Changes - Governmental Policies/Research Subcommittee
5. Technical Standards – Kellye Nelson, Carolyn Stern, and Bob Pollard

Suggestions/Questions about technical standards:
• The short-term or long-term efforts in the report should be providing advice and assistance to professional schools in how to write or rewrite their technical standards in a functional way. Organic technical standards don’t hold up in a law suit.
• The discussion about testing or standards, do we recommend that organizations that are responsible for standards must be sure they take into account disability? That has probably already been said. Or do we recommend another group take on the project of developing training materials about these disabilities?

Break sessions to discuss how to proceed from now to June
• We will use email or the Google share documents on the task force Web site.
• In June, we will wrap up the short-term recommendations, proceed with long-term recommendations.
• Each subcommittee will have to present some concrete information and recommendations.

Last comments regarding the June Meeting
• Request to have Rosenbaum who is a lawyer already on board as the chief of NAD address us on some of the issues with health care task for members.
• A series of links of publications and reports will be send to all next week. Those links may be helpful for the different groups from our resources lists.
• The short-term report due in June is a summary of what was found and short-term recommendations as starting points.
• The long-term report, due next year, expands and links to the short-term recommendations and makes more in-depth longer future oriented recommendations.
• Those two documents will be fairly different and separate.
• The long-term report will be built on the short-term report.
• The four institutions will be the audience for both reports, but both documents will become public documents which will be sent to all possible potential alliances helping to achieve those recommendations. Those alliances can be with the Congress and the White House

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: Gallaudet University, Washington, D.C.
Date: June 8, 2011