

SB

420

Introduced: 2/12/88
Referred: Health, Education and
Social Services

5-1894A

1 IN THE SENATE

BY KERTTULA

2 SENATE BILL NO. 420

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 FIFTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the curriculum required in public
7 schools."

8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9 * Section 1. AS 14.07.020(a)(4) is amended to read:

10 (4) prescribe by regulation a minimum course of study for
11 the public schools; the regulations must provide that if a course in
12 American Sign Language is given, the course shall be given credit as a
13 course in a foreign language;

14
15
16
17 *NO Degree - Com. Schools*
18 *Devt Ed / Specialst*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2-17-88

Sponsor Summary

SB-420: "An act relating to the curriculum required in public schools."

SB-340 would require school districts to give credit for American Sign Language as a foreign language if American Sign Language is taught.

At least two states presently allow this, California and Ohio. As information from Ohio notes:

Ohio needs many more sign language interpreters. American Sign Language skills are the most important skills of any good interpreter. Students that take these classes, but do not become interpreters, will be able to use their ASL skills in whatever jobs they take after graduation. Deaf high school students will have more people to communicate with, which means less isolation.

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: _____
Title: . . . curriculum required in
public schools. . .
Sponsor: Kerttula
Requestor: Senate HESS

Agency Affected: Education
BRU: _____
Components : _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING		Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
CAPITAL						
REVENUE						

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND		Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by: Steve Hole Phone: 465-2800
Division: Commissioner's Office Date: 2-19-88

Approved by Commissioner: William G. Demmert Date: 2-19-88
Agency: Department of Education

Distribution (by preparer):
Legislative Finance
Legislative Sponsor
Requestor
Office of Management and Budget
Impacted Agency(ies)

Assembly Bill No. 51

CHAPTER 256

An act to amend Section 51225.3 of the Education Code, relating to secondary education.

[Approved by Governor July 24, 1987. Filed with Secretary of State July 27, 1987.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 51, O'Connell. Education.

Existing law, which will become operative on July 1, 1988, requires pupils to complete a minimum number of courses in specified subjects in order to receive a high school diploma, including one course in visual or performing arts or foreign language.

This bill would provide that for the purposes of satisfying this requirement, a course in American Sign Language shall be deemed a course in foreign language.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 51225.3 of the Education Code, as added by Section 2 of Chapter 1158 of the Statutes of 1985, is amended to read:

51225.3. (a) Commencing with the 1988-89 school year, no pupil shall receive a diploma of graduation from high school who, while in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, has not completed all of the following:

(1) At least the following numbers of courses in the subjects specified, each course having a duration of one year, unless otherwise specified.

(A) Three courses in English.

(B) Two courses in mathematics

(C) Two courses in science, including biological and physical sciences.

(D) Three courses in social studies, including United States history and geography; world history, culture, and geography; a one-semester course in American government and civics, and a one-semester course in economics.

(E) One course in visual or performing arts or foreign language. For the purposes of satisfying the requirement specified in this subparagraph, a course in American Sign Language shall be deemed a course in foreign language.

(F) Two courses in physical education, unless the pupil has been exempted pursuant to the provisions of this code.

(2) Such other coursework as the governing board of the school district may by rule specify.

(b) The governing board, with the active involvement of parents, administrators, teachers, and pupils, shall adopt alternative means

for students to complete the prescribed course of study which may include practical demonstration of skills and competencies, supervised work experience or other outside school experience, interdisciplinary study, independent study, and credit earned at a postsecondary institution. Requirements for graduation and specified alternative modes for completing the prescribed course of study shall be made available to pupils, parents, and the public.

This section shall become operative on July 1, 1988.



OHIO ASSOCIATION OF THE DEAF, INC.

a non-profit organization promoting the best interests of the deaf of our state

SIGN LANGUAGE OMNIBUS BILL: WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT WILL DO

The Ohio Association of the Deaf asked Representative Judy Sheerer (D-Cleveland) to introduce the Sign Language Omnibus Bill. The idea for this bill was to increase understanding and appreciation for deaf people's need for sign language in their lives. We strongly encourage you to get involved and support this bill.

The bill has three important parts. If the bill becomes law, the Ohio state government will:

1. Recognize American Sign Language (ASL) as a foreign language. ASL would then be allowed to be taught in high schools and college for credit.

(Purpose: Ohio needs many more sign language interpreters. ASL skills are the most important skills of any good interpreter. Students that take these classes, but do not become interpreters, will be able to use their ASL skills in whatever jobs they take after graduation. Deaf high school students will have more people to communicate with, which means less isolation.)

2. Choose three cities to set up pilot or experimental programs in which sign language classes would be offered to hearing students below the 9th grade.

(Purpose: Most deaf children are now mainstreamed into schools with other hearing children. Those deaf children, who depend on sign language for full communication, need to be able to have other children to talk with and develop relationships with. These classes which will not be required, will encourage hearing children to learn sign language. If deaf children take these classes, it will be voluntary and left up to the parents to decide. (Cleveland, Columbus and Dayton are the most likely cities to be chosen.)

-MORE-

CLEVELAND No. 1 • CINCINNATI No. 2 • COLUMBUS No. 3 • AKRON No. 4 • TOLEDO No. 5
DAYTON No. 6 • FINDLAY No. 7 • MANSFIELD No. 8 • YOUNGSTOWN No. 9 • PORTSMOUTH No. 10

• A COOPERATING MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE DEAF •

Page Two
Sign Language Omnibus Bill

3. Hire six new staff people who would work in the Ohio Department of Education. These six people would be experts in deafness and sign language.

(Purpose: The Ohio Department of Education does not have any consultants or experts in deafness and sign language at this time. Consultants are needed to help the local school programs provide educational services deaf children. Consultants will also be needed to help the schools develop the sign language classes and to be sure they use qualified sign language interpreters in the classrooms with deaf children.)

The Bill is to be introduced in the House of Representatives by Rep. Judy Sheerer in December. A public hearing is expected to be held in January.

For more information:

Alan R. Parnes
Chairperson
Sign Language Omnibus Bill
615 McAlpin #1-A
Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
(513) 221-4717 (Home-TDD ONLY)
221-3300 (Work-TDD ONLY)
221-3300 (Work-Voice)

states to establish and maintain standards consistent with state approved or recognized certification, licensing, registration, or comparable requirements which apply to particular professions or disciplines.³⁰

In assisting the states to develop personnel standards for professionals in deaf education, ED should consider the Council on Education of the Deaf's standards for the certification of professionals involved in the education of hearing impaired children and youth.

Draft Recommendation 16: The Department of Education should provide guidelines for states to include in their state plans such policies and procedures, which relate to the establishment and maintenance of standards, to ensure that professionals in special programs for students who are deaf are adequately prepared and trained.

XIII. Educational Interpreters

Discussion: Communication in the classroom is crucial not only to the educational process, but also to student participation in the classroom. Utilizing interpreting services is one way of providing communication for students who are deaf in classrooms with hearing peers. The classroom setting presents a challenge for educational interpreters because they must consider: The varying linguistic and cognitive developmental levels of the child; the differing sign/oral systems employed for interpreting; the appropriateness of performing other duties; and the need to work cooperatively with regular classroom teachers, administrators, and other support personnel.

The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID), the national certifying organization for interpreters, has established guidelines for the professional interpreter's role and functions but has not established special provisions for educational interpreters. In 1985, the National Task Force on Educational Interpreting (NTFEI) was formed to "examine and clarify roles and responsibilities, training and certification, working conditions, and other needs concerning educational interpreters and their services to mainstreamed deaf students at all educational levels." NTFEI is also seeking to establish standards for educational interpreters and to promote "equitable salary ranges as determined by skill level required and advanced training expectations."

Although NTID's 1986 Interpreter Training Programs resource guide lists 48 interpreter training programs in 30 states, none are specifically designed for educational interpreters. Interpreters, themselves, recognize that they do not receive adequate training in such subjects as child and language development, cognitive processing, the various sign/oral systems, and educational settings that require special knowledge and expertise. Serious concern has been expressed about the lack of understanding of the interpreter's role by deaf students, classroom teachers, parents, administrators, and interpreters themselves. Another serious concern is that states and local educational agencies have not treated interpreters as "professionals," in terms of status and salaries.

Draft Recommendation 17: The Department of Education, in consultation with consumers, professionals, and organizations, should provide guidelines for states to include in their state plans such policies and procedures, which relate to the establishment and maintenance of standards, to ensure that interpreters in educational settings are adequately prepared and trained.

This recommendation is intended to include interpreter standards in the personnel standards as required by section 613(a)(14) of the EHA Amendments of 1986. The Commission proposes that ED should recognize interpreters as professionals and should continue working closely with RID, NTFEI, and other groups in developing and providing guidelines to states to establish and maintain standards for interpreters in educational settings. ED should especially define the appropriate role of interpreters in these settings. The Commission emphasizes that the term "educational interpreters" includes sign language, cued speech, oral, and deaf/blind interpreters.

Draft Recommendation 18: Federal funding should be provided to develop training programs, design curricula, and award stipends to recruit and train potential and working educational interpreters.

There are currently no interpreter training programs specifically designed for educational interpreters. Training programs should offer courses addressing special issues, such as: The various sign systems used in educational settings; oral and cued speech interpreting; manual communication with deaf/blind persons; the need for collaboration between teachers, administrators, and counselors; and the cognitive and

language development processes of hearing and deaf children. Section 304 of the Rehabilitation Act currently provides an average of \$18,000 per state for interpreter training programs. That amount is not enough to pay for even one qualified instructor let alone pay for additional faculty, curriculum development, and support services that would be needed for a quality training program.³¹

Part D of the EHA allocates monies to promote staff development of special education personnel. These monies could be used to provide stipends to potential and working interpreters who seek training in the field of educational interpreting.

Draft Recommendation 19: Congress should fund section 315 of the Rehabilitation Act. The Department of Education should establish standards for interpreters in the field of rehabilitation.

Section 315 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, authorizes the Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services to make grants to states for establishing interpreting services for individuals who are deaf.³² Interpreters participating in the programs are required to meet minimum standards.³³ Section 315 has never been funded and consequently no interpreter standards have been established for the states by the Commissioner.

XIV. American Sign Language

Discussion: Researchers examining the linguistic characteristics of American Sign Language (ASL) have determined that it is a natural and complete language, comparable in complexity and expressiveness to other languages. ASL should not be confused with manually coded English sign systems (e.g., Seeing Exact English, Seeing Essential English) which are not considered languages but which have become widely used in educational settings. Some educational institutions also recognize ASL as a distinct language and grant foreign/second language credit to students who master ASL.

Approximately 10 percent of deaf children have parents who are deaf and many of these children learn ASL as their native language and acquire English as a second language. Deaf children of hearing parents often choose to learn ASL later in life. Psycholinguists studying second language acquisition have found that language learning is

³¹ 29 U.S.C. 774.

³² *Id.* at 777(c).

³³ *Id.* at 777(b)(5).

enhanced when both languages and cultures are viewed positively by the society in which the individual interacts and when there is complementarity, rather than competition, between linguistic systems.³⁴

*Draft Recommendation 20: The Commission on Education of the Deaf recognizes American Sign Language as a legitimate language.*³⁵

It is not the intent of the Commission that ASL be used as the primary method of English instruction for all students who are deaf; however, it should be emphasized that this recommendation recognizes ASL as a language in its own right and as an educational tool.

XV. The Role and Impact of Research, Development, and Evaluation Activities at Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf

Discussion: The Commission examined several related questions concerning the role and impact of research, development, and evaluation activities conducted by GU (including KDES and MSSD) and NTID. The Commission emphasizes that it has not attempted to evaluate the quality of research at GU and NTID; however, it has considered how research, development, and evaluation priorities should be established, whether there has been adequate oversight to ensure cost-effectiveness and quality, and whether research, development, and evaluation projects should be funded through Congressional appropriations, competitive grants, or both.

Funding of Research, Development, and Evaluation Projects

Discussion: GU and NTID are authorized by law to conduct research, development, and evaluation. There is significant value in having extensive and high quality research, development, and evaluation programs at GU and NTID. The Commission commended the valuable contribution to the field made by the Annual Survey of Hearing Impaired Children and Youth and it expressed interest in exploring ways in which the Survey might provide important data about specific groups,

such as the rural student populace. However, it recognized that other research centers are also conducting a significant amount of research on deafness and deaf education. These centers would benefit from increased opportunities to compete for larger amounts of funding. Similarly, requiring GU and NTID to participate in more competition for funding could be expected to enhance the quality of GU's and NTID's research, development, and evaluation activities.

The Commission's recommendation is intended to encourage competition, innovation, and diversity in research and development projects on deafness. The Commission certainly does not recommend any reduction of funding for deafness-related research.

*Draft Recommendation 21: Only a base level of Congressionally appropriated line-item funding should continue to be allocated to GU and NTID for research, development, and evaluation projects. Specifically, funding should be adequate to provide a robust research agenda which would include the Annual Survey of Hearing Impaired Children and Youth conducted by Gallaudet. An overall reduction in the current funding provided to these two institutions should be made and the remaining monies should then be set aside and used for competitive grants for deafness-related research. Any research center with adequate capacity in the field, including GU and NTID, could compete for the funds on a multi-year basis.*³⁶

The Commission welcomes comments on how to set the "base level" for GU and NTID: one-third, one-half, two-thirds, or some other proportion of what Congress now appropriates to them for research, development, and evaluation activities. The current appropriations for GU (including KDES and MSSD) and NTID total approximately \$8 million for these activities.

XVI. Employment and Advancement of Persons Who Are Deaf at Federally Funded Postsecondary Education Institutions

Discussion: The Commission requested information regarding the employment of deaf persons at GU and

NTID, and the employment of blacks and women at Howard University and Wellesley College, respectively. At GU, the overall employment rate for persons who are deaf is 22% (18% executive, 33% professional, 38% technical, 7% secretarial, 7% maintenance, and 6% service positions). At NTID, the overall employment rate is 12% (12% executive, 12% faculty, 15% professional, 20% technical, and 6% secretarial positions). At Howard University, a primarily black university in Washington, DC, the overall employment rate for black persons is 87% (91% administrative, 77% faculty, and 89% staff positions). At Wellesley College, a women's college near Boston, the overall employment rate is 74% for women (50% administrative, 83% faculty, and 91% staff positions).

The Commission recognizes that the pool of deaf applicants is not as extensive as the pool of female and black applicants; however, these federally-funded postsecondary institutions for the deaf should take initiatives to recruit, hire, and promote deaf persons similar to the initiatives taken by Howard and Wellesley. The Commission acknowledges the efforts made by GU and NTID and supports further efforts, by these institutions and others, to employ and advance persons who are deaf.

Draft Recommendation 22: GU, NTID, and the schools participating in the RPEPD should continue to strengthen the positive efforts they have already made in recruiting, hiring, and promoting qualified applicants and employees who are deaf.

Records of the comments received will be available for public inspection at the office of the Commission on Education of the Deaf, GSA Regional Office Building, Room 6648, 7th and D Streets SW., Washington, DC.

Pat Johanson,

Staff Director, Commission on Education of the Deaf.

October 8, 1987.

[FR Doc. 87-23732 Filed 10-13-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-50-M

³⁴ Beardsmore, H. B. (1982). *Bilingualism: Basic principles*. England: Tieto.

³⁵ The Commission has not reached full consensus on this recommendation.

³⁶ The Commission has not reached full consensus on this recommendation.