Qualifications and Training Subcommittee

April 14th , 2021

6-7PM meeting notes

***Attended:*** Sue Petersen, Cindy Koch, Vicki Steinhauer-Campbell, Jonathan Arteaga, Todd Luther, and Margie Propp

***Absent:***

***NDE/ NCDHH TA:*** Sue Czaplewski and Jessica Larrison

***Interpreter:*** Sharon Sinkler

\*\*\*\*\*Highlighted part is what the Subcommittee has agreed upon but still subject to change.

***GOALS:***

1. Identify qualifications of language professionals with knowledge of the use of evidence- based best practices in American Sign Language (ASL) and English and present reports at Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) and Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings.
2. Determine if the language assessment evaluator and language professional, as stated in the law, should be the same person.
3. Define roles of the language assessment evaluator and language professional who can advocate, whether the language assessment evaluator can be an advocate in the process.

***Subcommittee ideas***: law requirements: The assessment provider has to be a certified teacher; in Nebraska we use Teacher of the deaf or early interventionist to provide the assessments.

* Deaf Member:
  + Have a Deaf Member from the West, Central, and East if the assessment provider is not fluent in ASL to help pick up early ASL signs.
  + How to we assess their language and fluency skills?
    - SLPI (sign language performance interview)
      * Some providers can do conversational signs or basic but not fluent, makes it hard to pick up on noncorrect signs.
      * Concerns that some deaf are not fluent in ASL to help notice some small things. Most Deaf can do it but some deaf individuals become deaf later and would not be as fluent or know some early signs. Some deaf this is still not their first language or primary language.
      * Thinking Cindy Koch, Jonathan Arteaga, and heather E, might need to hire more than one in some areas
* Training:
  + They will need to be trained on the assessment before providing it.
  + They will have to be retrained if anything on the assessment changes.
  + Discussion on Yearly training so it stays Fresh, even if they use it often they could have been providing it wrong.
* State wide:
  + Discussion on if the state could have a meeting in order for everyone to share what is working and what isn’t compared to regions.
    - This could help with transparency and keeping some school districts on the same path.
    - This is also when the annual training/refresher happens

Committee task: check out the google drive and add any thoughts and documents you might feel are helpful.

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/17Df28lmQsDlY7B2KfZDePigDsrM3r2zF?usp=sharing>