

Gatekeeping in ASL-English interpreter education programs: Assessing the suitability of students for professional practice

Danielle I. J. Hunt¹ and Brenda Nicodemus²

Gallaudet University

Abstract

Over the past two decades, educational programs in disciplines including medicine, nursing, social work, dentistry, psychology, and occupational therapy have begun to assess their students' fitness to practice in the profession. In what ways can interpreter education programs assess and guide students who do not behave in accordance with values and norms of the profession or the Deaf community? If guidance is not successful, how do departments decide that a student's pattern of behavior is potentially harmful to future consumers? This paper addresses one attempt to operationalize the dimensions of personal and professional suitability with guidelines that are sufficiently concrete and specific. We begin by providing background into the history of gatekeeping in human service education programs and the responsibilities of postsecondary institutions in this role. We outline the process of establishing a Student Code of Professional Conduct within our department at Gallaudet University. Finally, we discuss gatekeeping in relation to ASL-English interpreter education programs in general.

Keywords: Fitness to practice, professional suitability, student conduct, interpreter education

¹ Correspondence to: danielle.hunt@gallaudet.edu

² Correspondence to: brenda.nicodemus@gallaudet.edu

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

In higher education, *gatekeeping* refers to the process of assessing students to determine their fitness to practice in a profession (Heller, 2004; Lafrance, Gray, & Herbert, 2004). Gatekeeping requires that academic programs establish and adhere to protocols and policies designed to evaluate students' suitability for a professional practice. Assessing a student's suitability to practice is an important component in human service programs since graduates take jobs in which they hold power and influence over people's lives (Cole & Lewis, 1993). As with other human service professions, graduates of signed language interpreting programs work closely with people in critical areas (e.g., healthcare, education, vocational, and judicial settings), and their work can significantly impact the lives of their consumers.

How are ASL-English interpreters vetted into this practice profession? Historically, members of the Deaf community identified and encouraged individuals to become interpreters by informally evaluating their signed language competence and attitude toward signing and the Deaf community (Cokely, 2005). As signed language interpreting developed as a profession in the United States, various institutions (e.g., interpreting agencies, academic programs, and credentialing bodies) began determining who could enter the field (Bridges, 2014; Brunson, 2014). Deaf people continue to informally encourage people to become interpreters; however, formal evaluations of potential interpreters now take place primarily through the programs and institutions that are managed by both deaf and non-deaf people.

There are approximately 150 postsecondary ASL-English interpreter education programs currently in operation across North America³. Interpreter education faculty and administrators face a myriad of questions in their role as gatekeepers into the interpreting profession. How can their programs capture and perpetuate the "received wisdom" (Cokely, 2005, p. 4) of the Deaf community that once identified the potential and trustworthiness of an individual and nurtured them into interpreting? How can interpreting faculty assess the conduct of students who do not behave in accordance with values and norms of the profession and the Deaf community? In what ways can programs determine that a student's pattern of behavior is a sufficient indicator of potential harm to future consumers?

In this paper we describe how the Gallaudet University Department of Interpretation responded to these questions by developing a system of assessing student conduct. We outline the steps taken in collaboration with students, faculty, and community members to define the behaviors expected of interpreting students. Finally, we discuss how this assessment process supports student growth for moving into professional practice.

Gatekeeping in Postsecondary Programs

The determination of who may enter a profession is expressed by a variety of terms: *gatekeeping*, *professional suitability*, *personal suitability*, *fitness to practice*, and *student conduct*. Regardless of its label, assessment of suitability to practice is generally measured by a combination of academic achievement, cognitive abilities, and traits and aptitudes of a student. The goal of human service programs is to graduate students who will behave knowledgeably, responsibly, and ethically within their chosen profession. Upon graduation, professional associations monitor the behaviors in practitioners by adherence to a professional code of ethics and satisfying continuing education requirements.

In the past decade, the issue of students' professional suitability has been addressed in a variety of higher education programs, including medicine (Schneidman, 1994; Whiting, 2007), nursing (Sasso, Stievano, Jurado, & Rocco, 2008), social work (Curren 2008; Curren & Atherton, 2008, Tam & Coleman, 2009, Younes, 1998), dentistry (Ozar & Sokol 2002), psychology (Rosenberg, Getzelman, Arcinue, & Oren, 2005), and occupational therapy

³ For a list of interpreter education programs in the United States, see Discover Interpreting at <http://www.discoverinterpreting.com>. For a list of interpreter education programs in Canada, see the AVLIC website at <http://www.avlic.ca>.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

(College of Occupational Therapists, 2007; Occasional Paper on Professional Suitability, 2010). Each of these fields has grappled with how to monitor and assess the professional and ethical conduct of their students and their fitness to practice in their various professions.

Signed language interpreting has become increasingly visible in the public realm, which has led to a burgeoning interest in interpreting as a professional option. However, according to Born and Carroll (1988), the desire to enter a profession does not necessarily translate into an entitlement to do so. The decision to accept or terminate a student from any program is precariously balanced between a university's enrollment policies, a student's right to pursue her vocation of interest, and the rights of the individuals with whom that person will come into contact with as a professional (Sofronoff, Helmes, & Pachana, 2011). The title of *interpreter* is not yet protected by law and can be used freely by individuals with a variety of educational backgrounds, linguistic abilities, and perspectives on professional and ethical conduct. The 2009 United States Department of Justice indictment of individuals who were engaged in fraudulent business practices in video relay interpreting services⁴ brought ethical conduct of signed language interpreters into sharp focus. Such high profile incidents point to the need for vigilance about professional and ethical decision-making and the assessment of professional conduct.

To be a *professional* means to have "advanced expertise...in a society-granted monopoly over services, and...shared commitment to promote the public good" (Audi 1999, p. 749). *Suitability* is defined as the state of being appropriate to a particular purpose; thus, *professional suitability* is the condition of being suited for the purpose of providing professional services to the public. How does the concept of professional suitability apply to the education of ASL-English interpreters? First, students of signed language interpreting must be able to achieve a high degree of bilingual fluency in preparation for the work of rapid language transfer between two languages. Research suggests that certain aptitudes in language learning may be necessary for success as an interpreter (Gómez, Molina, Benítez, & de Torres, 2007; Shaw & Hughes, 2006). Further, students must be knowledgeable in the language and culture of deaf and hard of hearing persons, as well as the spoken language and norms of the majority culture (AVLIC, 2014). Indeed, interpreting students are entering a complex linguistic and social activity that requires certain aptitudes, personality traits (Bontempo, Napier, Hayes, & Brashear, 2014) and cognitive skills (Macnamara & Conway, 2014; Stone, 2014).

The practice of gatekeeping within an educational program first necessitates knowing the skills that are required for professionals to do the job. In interpreting, some students may be identified as not possessing sufficient linguistic capabilities, some struggle with the required academic rigor, while others may not exhibit the requisite traits or aptitudes for the work. Students may have an inability to master the interpersonal skills necessary for working with others, display mental health issues that impede their work, or exhibit a pattern of not adhering to ethical principles. Issues of dishonesty, criminal records, immaturity, indications of substance abuse, a history of unsuccessful work experiences, limited intellectual capacity, and frequent career changes need attention in the gatekeeping process (Koerin & Miller, 1995; Miller & Koerin, 1998; Moore & Urwin, 1990). While some of these factors may be detected during the admission process, or early in the student's educational experience, dealing with them can present some unique difficulties for interpreter education programs, especially in an era when individual rights require considerable sensitivity.

Many of the skills necessary for professional success as an interpreter are difficult to institute as entry requirements into a program. There is growing recognition among interpreter educators for the need to establish and improve admission policies for students; less frequently discussed is the need for systems that *exit* students from programs. Explicit standards that guide decision-making about the personal dimensions of interpreting practice are not easily measured, making it difficult to guide students out of a program. Without established behavioral standards required of their students, faculty members can have difficulty in terminating students for reasons other than poor academic performance.

Can interpreter educators justify excluding or dismissing students from their programs? It is certainly possible that faculty may err in their assessment of a student who later becomes a successful practitioner in spite of a teacher's

⁴ See <http://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/2009/November/09-crm-1258.html>.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

misgivings. But of greater concern is the realization that a student who performed adequately in the academic environment is practicing in a less than competent or unethical manner after graduation. Students with personal issues but who are open to self-reflection and a willingness to examine their beliefs, values, and attitudes, could be assessed as being very well suited for the profession.

How do interpreting programs integrate conduct assessments into a curriculum? In professional programs, appropriate professional behavior may be best viewed as an academic requirement, rather than a misconduct issue (Cobb & Jordan, 1989; Moore & Urwin, 1990). In this approach, incoming students should be made aware of certain behaviors that exhibit “emotional intelligence” and that are expected of professionals (along with other behaviors that will not be tolerated). Bracy (2000) suggests that emotional intelligence has two dimensions that can serve to inform the development of criteria and measures for admissions and retention in education—the intrapersonal and the interpersonal. She defines *intrapersonal intelligence* as “... the capacity to access one’s own range of affects or emotions, to discriminate among these feelings, label them, and then to draw upon them as a means of understanding and guiding one’s behavior” (p. 92). She further suggests that it is from this source of intelligence that one forms an accurate model of oneself and the ability to use that model to operate effectively in life. *Interpersonal intelligence* is the ability to understand other people, what motivates them, how they work, and how to work cooperatively with them. It is the capacity to notice and distinguish among the motivations, personalities, and intentions of others that drives the capacity for genuine empathy.

In sum, gatekeeping in human service programs is important for a number of reasons. First, and of primary importance, the assessment of a student’s suitability to practice is needed as a means of protecting public welfare of individuals who make contact with professionals that impact their lives. In addition, gatekeeping helps guard the overall status of a profession in society and the degree of trust – or mistrust – of its practitioners. Further, assessments have the potential to foster students’ empathy and emotional intelligence. Finally, gatekeeping serves as a means to protect the reputation of particular educational programs.

One Journey in Establishing Gatekeeping Policies and Protocols

In this section, we provide an overview of the steps taken by the Gallaudet University Department of Interpretation (DOI) to address the issue of students’ suitability to practice in the interpreting profession. In this journey, we acknowledge the shifting role of academic institutions in assuming the role of gatekeepers into the profession, and we are still considering the tensions surrounding ownership of this role. In sharing our process with the reader, we are not advocating a one-size-fits-all approach for every program, nor are we attempting to be prescriptive about establishing policies and protocols. Rather, we offer this description as an example of one department’s journey with the hope that it may be useful to other programs.

The gatekeeping journey began for Gallaudet University with the establishment of the Associates of Arts in Interpreting in the late 1970s when professional expectations for conduct were incorporated into coursework. With the launch of the Masters of Interpretation (MAI) in 1988 and the Bachelors in Interpretation (BAI) degree in 2005, the DOI considered how to distinguish the programs from one another and how to address concerns about personal suitability for professional practice (Shaw, Collins, & Metzger, 2006). As part of program entry, students were required to sign a one-page form that broadly outlined the “essential qualities” expected of students in the program, including:

...tact; sensitivity to the needs and interests of consumers, colleagues and supervisors; appropriate judgment; and awareness of, and ability to follow, ethical and moral constraints.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

This form, entitled “Evaluation of Personal Suitability for Work in Interpretation,” also provided a brief description of the departmental process if a student demonstrated behaviors in conflict with behavioral expectations, including the possibility of dismissal from the program.

The department continued to grow in student numbers, both in the BAI and MAI programs. In 2010, a PhD program was initiated⁵ in the department and doctoral students were placed in teaching roles as part of their coursework. With these advancements, the department recognized a need to more clearly operationalize professional suitability as a teaching and learning concept. A rubric was needed to assess student behaviors that was in alignment with the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the department. In 2013, two DOI faculty members assumed the responsibility of investigating best practices for professional suitability in postsecondary education and devising an updated system for gatekeeping within the department. The first step involved gathering information from other practice profession programs at the university. This was followed by creating an annotated bibliography of publications on fitness-to-practice, personal suitability, professional suitability, and student conduct. The literature repeatedly advised that policies and protocols be in alignment with professional code of ethics from the specific discipline the student would be entering. In addition, documents within the university were reviewed, including the Gallaudet University Student Handbook and policies in other practice profession programs (Counseling, Education, Social Work, and Clinical Psychology). A meeting was held with personnel in the Gallaudet University Office of Student Conduct regarding logistical and legal issues for establishing policies for student termination.

Using the collected information and resources, faculty members drafted a Student Code of Conduct (S-CPC). Following the recommendations of other disciplines, the S-CPC aligned with the structure and content of the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct and other learning benchmarks for student development. The S-CPC is comprised of four documents: (1) an overview, (2) tenets, (3) a discussion form for documentation purposes, and (4) a flow chart denoting the administrative processes of documenting and addressing student behaviors. The DOI faculty reviewed the draft and their feedback was incorporated into the documents.

A critical step in the process was the establishment of a stakeholder task force consisting of students, interpreters, administrators, and Deaf community members and who reviewed the drafted documents and provide critical feedback. After their feedback was incorporated into the documents, the draft was again presented to the department faculty for final suggestions and revisions (See Appendices A-D for the final documents). The process of creating the S-CPC required approximately two academic years. The steps in creating the S-CPC are listed in Figure 1.

⁵ Entry to BAI and MAI program within the Department of Interpretation requires a specific score on an ASL performance evaluation (ASLPI), the submission of a separate English and ASL sample of the applicant, and a response to an ethical dilemma. PhD admission is based on a specific score on the ASLPI, submission of a research paper written in English, interpreter certification, and five years of experience as a professional interpreter.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

Figure 1. Steps taken to create Gallaudet Department of Interpretation Student Code of Professional Conduct.

#	Action Steps
1	Identified need for change in policies and procedures for assessing student conduct.
2	Reviewed literature on gatekeeping, personal and professional suitability, and fitness to practice.
3	Reviewed university documents (e.g., Handbook of Student Conduct) relevant to professional suitability.
4	Met with university administrators in the Office of Student Conduct regarding policies in addition to logistical and legal issues for establishing a DOI S-CPC.
5	Consulted with program chairs in other practice profession education programs.
6	Created first draft of S-CPC incorporating literature, university documents, and in line with the NAD-RID CPC.
7	Created first draft of S-CPC administration protocol.
8	Shared initial draft of all documents with full-time interpreting faculty.
9	Shared revised drafts of all documents with stakeholder panel comprised of a student from each program (BAI, MAI, PhD), Deaf community members, a professional interpreter, and two administrators from the Office of Student Conduct (43% of the panel identified as Deaf).
10	Gathered input from stakeholder panel.
11	Created revised draft of all documents based on stakeholder input.
12	Shared revised drafts with full-time interpreting faculty.
13	Received approval from all relevant parties on each document.
14	Created final draft of all documents.
15	Received final approval of all documents from department chair.
16	Released documents to all full-time faculty and stakeholders.
17	Trained faculty on implementation procedures.
18	Created ASL translation of S-CPC.
19	Implemented procedures with all students.
20	Revisit and revise documents on biannual basis.

Despite the effort that has gone into creating the Student Code of Professional Conduct, work remains to be done. The next phase in the project involves the creation of a rubric to accompany the tenets, based on the belief that professional behaviors should be viewed as an academic requirement, rather than as misconduct. The rubric will provide a standardized format for observing and tracking suitability concerns for every student enrolled in the BAI, MAI, and PhD programs. In addition, the rubric will provide a means to document improvements in behavior. The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for each course also need to be reviewed to ensure that elements of the S-CPC are included in relevant coursework, including professional practice and skills courses in which students represent themselves professionally (during observations, at service learning activities, and in conduct with peers and instructors). The rubric will serve as the measuring instrument, and the SLOs will be updated to include the learning

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

outcomes provided in the rubric. As noted in Figure 1, the final step in the process is to revisit and revise all documents, policies, and procedures on a biannual basis; the first revisions will take place in the Spring semester of 2015. At that time, faculty and stakeholders will have the opportunity to give feedback and suggest modifications to be applied the following semester.

Discussion

In this paper, we review the role assumed by interpreter education programs as gatekeepers for students who want to enter the interpreting profession. We provide a summary of one program's process in assuming the gatekeeper role and suggest that interpreter education programs need assessments that reflect professional suitability to practice. As a field, we must define the professional suitability of interpreters, whether as personal traits or as a set of skills that can be learned and developed. Expectations of conduct in interpreter education programs should be made available to all students and should be applied uniformly. Lack of a consistent policy increases the risk of bias or unfairness, which, in turn, may lead to litigation as students challenge decisions they perceive to be unfair or unfounded. By establishing gatekeeping procedures, programs can make decisions on professional suitability with confidence, supported by sound policies and procedures.

Having systems to guide interpreter education programs with the gatekeeping process may be advantageous in several ways. First, a system provides a means to support students as they consider their chosen profession and their own motivations and suitability to become an interpreter. A system also provides students with a clear set of behavioral expectations, promotes fair, equitable, transparent procedures while offering a useful feedback mechanism. Finally, a system provides a structure for documenting observations of student behavior and a standard of measurable criteria against which to evaluate and act upon unsuitable behavior.

It must be acknowledged that even broadly drawn criteria may result in a "slippery slope" which leads to an increase of fear, competition, criticism, and other harmful social conditions for students. Further, the use of certain personal criteria may blur the distinction between faculty-as-academic-advisor and faculty-as-counselor, creating the potential for role conflicts. There are also conceptual difficulties with notions like "maturity" and "integrity" that can lead to a lack of clarity and negative labeling. It is important to exercise caution in the development of criteria lest they contradict values that promote a non-judgmental acceptance of individual differences, a belief in the capacity for change, and respect for individual rights and self-determination. Programs must also guard against the possibility of punishing students who are not yet ready for practice, rather than identifying those who are likely to continue unsuitable conduct.

We argue that an essential prerequisite for professional work is for students to demonstrate the ability to think critically about interpreting practice and about the environments in which they will work. Without this capacity, new graduates entering the field could become overly identified with the business practices of their work and lose sight of the goals of social justice, language, and the social pre-conditions that reflects interpreters special bond and allegiance to the Deaf community (Witter-Merithew, Johnson, & Nicodemus, 2010). One of the problems with gatekeeping is timing; by the time a student gives evidence that they are not suitable, they have already invested a great deal of time and money in their degree. In the Bachelors program, faculty most often see issues arise in the junior year, which, with remediation, results in additional time delays. Here, the importance of working this into courses from the start would benefit students in leaving sufficient time for teaching, learning, and assessment before graduation looms. When it is determined interpreting is not the right profession for an individual, students can be guided into a profession that better suits their particular skills, attributes, and traits.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

Conclusion

Undoubtedly some students enter interpreter education programs with personal issues that could affect their future practice. The days of “counseling out” students on the basis of subjective judgment are over. Faculty impressions must be replaced by concrete and documented facts. Interpreter education programs hold an obligation to assess the professional suitability of students, and if conduct issues go unresolved, serve as gatekeepers for the profession. Educational programs designed to prepare students for work in human service fields should include a number of ways to support their learning. If there is general agreement that suitability for interpreting practice is a substantive issue, the ramifications for educational progress need to be seriously considered by educational institutions, faculty members, professional associations, and potential employers. The challenge for interpreter education programs is to develop relevant assessment exercises, criteria, and procedures. An additional challenge will be to find better ways to deal with the determination of suitability within the parameters of university regulations and provisions for appeals. In an era where human rights are paramount and students have legitimate appeal mechanisms, faculties of interpreter education programs must have structured systems. Ultimately, gatekeeping must be addressed by interpreter education programs because of an obligation to the Deaf community, to the profession of interpreting, and to society at large.

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due for the support by faculty members of the Gallaudet University Department of Interpretation, especially Melanie Metzger for her review of the document. We are grateful to the insights of the individuals on the S-CPC stakeholders panel: Matthew Kanka, Darla Konkel, Tamar Jackson Nelson, Amy Lanasa, Hillel Goldberg, Eloise Molock, and Gina Oliva. We also extend our thanks to Lauri Metcalf from San Antonio College for graciously sharing information with us.

References

- Audi, R. (1999). *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- AVLIC. (2014). FAQ page. Retrieved from <http://www.avlic.ca/faq> (April 19, 2014).
- Bontempo, K., Napier, J., Hayes, L., & Brashear, V. (2014). Does personality matter? An international study of sign language interpreter disposition. *Translation & Interpreting*, 6(1), 23–46. DOI: ti.106201.2014.a02
- Born, C., & Carroll, D. (1988). Ethics in admissions. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 24(1), 79–95.
- Bracy, W. D. (2000). Gatekeeping in social work education: Achieving diversity and excellence. In P. Gibbs and Eleanor H. Blakely (eds.) *Gatekeeping in BSW programs* (pp. 73–106). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bridges, B. (2014, March 30). Understanding what DEAF HEART means. [Video file]. Retrieved from Facebook.
- Brunson, J. (2014, March). Consumers, colleagues, and certification: Exploring the politics of interpreting. Presentation at the International Symposium of Signed Language Interpreting and Translation Research. Washington, DC.
- Cobb, N.H., & Jordan, C. (1989). Students with questionable values or threatening behavior: Precedent and policy from discipline to dismissal. *Journal of Social Work Education* 25, 87–97.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

- Cokely, D. (2005). Shifting positionality: A critical examination of the turning point in the relationship of interpreters and the deaf community. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, and E. A. Winston (Eds.) *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education* (pp. 3–28). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, B. S., & Lewis, R. G. (1993). Gatekeeping through termination of unsuitable social work students: Legal issues and guidelines. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 29(2), 150–159.
- College of Occupational Therapists. (2007). *Professional standards for occupational therapy practice*. London: College of Occupational Therapists.
- Currer, C. (2008). Assessing student social workers' professional suitability: Comparing university procedures in England. *British Journal of Social Work* 1–18.
- Currer, C., & Atherton, K. (2008). Suitable to remain a student social worker? Decision making in relation to termination of training. *Social Work Education* 27(3), 279–292.
- Gómez, M. J. L., Molina, T. B., Benítez, P. P., & de Torres, J. S. (2007). Predicting proficiency in signed language interpreting: A preliminary study. *Interpreting*, 9(1), 71–93.
- Heller, D. A. (2004). *Teachers wanted: Attracting and retaining good teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Koerin, B., & Miller, J. (1995). Gatekeeping policies: Terminating students for nonacademic reasons. *Journal of Social Work Education* 31(2), 247–260.
- Lafrance, J., Gray, E., & Herbert, M. (2004). Gate-keeping for professional social work practice. *Social Work Education* 23(3), 325–340.
- Macnamara, B. & Conway, A. (2014, March). Cognitive enhancement from sign language interpreting: The interpreter advantage. Presentation at the International Symposium of Signed Language Interpreting and Translation Research. Washington, DC.
- Miller, J., & Koerin, B. (1998). Can we assess suitability at admission? A review of MSW application procedures. *Journal of Social Work Education* 34(3), 437–453.
- Moore, L. S., & Urwin, C. A. (1990). Quality control in social work: The gatekeeping role in social work education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work* 4(1), 113–128.
- Occasional Paper. (2010, January). College of Occupational Therapists. Southwark, London.
- Ozar, D. T., & Sokol, D. J. (2002). *Dental ethics at chairside: Professional principles and practical applications* (2nd edition). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2014). Home page. Retrieved from <http://www.rid.org/interpreting/overview/index.cfm> on April 19, 2014.
- Rosenberg, J. I., Getzelman, M. A., Arcinue, F., & Oren, C. Z. (2005). An exploratory look at students' experiences of problematic peers in academic professional psychology programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36(6), 665–673.
- Sasso, L., Stievano, A., Jurado, M. G., & Rocco, G. (2008). Code of ethics and conduct for European nursing. *Nursing Ethics*, 15(6), 821–836.
- Shaw, R., Collins, S. D., & Metzger, M. (2006). MA to BA: A quest for distinguishing between undergraduate and graduate interpreter education. In C. B. Roy (ed.) *New approaches to interpreter education*. (pp. 1–21). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Shaw, S., & Hughes, G. (2006). Essential characteristics of sign language interpreting students. *Interpreting*, 8(2), 195–221.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

- Sofronoff, K., Helmes, E., & Pachana, N. (2011). Fitness to practice in the profession of psychology: Should we assess this during clinical training? *Australian Psychologist* 46, 126–132.
- Schneidman, B. S. (1994). Fitness to practice. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 22(87), 36–38.
- Stone, C. (2014, March). Cognitive development during university interpreter training. Presentation at the International Symposium of Signed Language Interpreting and Translation Research. Washington, DC.
- Tam, D. M.Y., & Coleman, H. (2009). Construction and validation of a professional suitability scale for social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Education* 45(1), 4763.
- Urwin, C. A., Van Soest, D., & Kretzschmar, J. A. (2006). Key principles for developing gatekeeping standards for working with students with problems. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 26(1-2), 163–180.
- Whiting, D. (2007). Inappropriate attitudes, fitness to practise and the challenges facing medical educators. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 33, 667–670.
- Wiley, L., & Burke, D. D. (2011). A constructivist approach to ethics: Developing a student of professional conduct. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 28(1), 1–38.
- Witter-Merithew, A., Johnson, L., & Nicodemus, B. (2010). Relational autonomy and decision latitude of ASL-English interpreters: Implications for interpreter education. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth National Convention of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers*. San Antonio, Texas.
- Younes, M. N. (1998). The gatekeeping dilemma in undergraduate social work programs: collision of ideal and reality. *International Social Work* 41, 145–153.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

Appendix A Student Code of Professional Conduct (S-CPC) Overview

Interpreting is a challenging and rewarding profession that requires a high degree of knowledge, linguistic competence, decision-making skills, and interpersonal capabilities. Interpreters interact with people whose lives are touched in various ways by their work. Since monolingualism and audism are pervasive in society, interpreters should be cognizant of how these attitudes influence their work with the American Deaf⁶ community. Thus, professional acts and practices must be negotiated with the Deaf community. As a result, it is the obligation of every interpreter to demonstrate maturity, exercise judgment, employ critical thinking, and reflect on past actions in the practice of their profession. The Department of Interpretation (DOI) Student Code of Professional Conduct was created as a means to assist students in moving toward professional interpreting practice both during their education and upon graduation.

The Department of Interpretation admits students who meet department criteria of being academically, professionally, and personally suited to work as interpreters. Admission into the program is judged by previous academic work, letters of recommendation, work history, and the student's professional goals. Adherence to standards of conduct and communication are essential elements of professional competence that are to be developed and expanded upon in the students' program of study. The Department of Interpretation has a responsibility to students, the Deaf community, and society at large to ensure that they can perform the duties required by the profession.

In addition to academic competence, students must demonstrate conduct and communication skills consistent with professional standards. These skills are to be demonstrated in the classroom environment and critically, in interactions with members of the Deaf community and other communities. Students are expected to adhere to the S-CPC, which is based on the tenets in the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) and the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) Code of Professional Conduct. Breaches of the S-CPC may be reported by faculty, staff, fellow students, or others. Students should be aware that breaches of the S-CPC may be grounds for a recommendation of academic probation or dismissal from the Department of Interpretation.

The DOI seeks to prepare its graduates to be practitioners who apply critical thinking skills in their interpreting practice and adhere to the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct. Thus, the principles for student conduct reflect the concepts of confidentiality, professionalism, civility, communication, respect for others, ethical practices, and commitment to the profession.

In the 2013-14 academic year, the Department of Interpretation saw a need to create a set of expectations that align with the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct.

Department of Interpretation faculty members who reviewed the S-CPC were:

Melanie Metzger, Chair	Paul Harrelson
Jeremy Brunson	Danielle Hunt
Keith Cagle	Brenda Nicodemus
Steven Collins	Cynthia Roy
Valerie Dively	Christopher Stone

In addition, a stakeholder task force was formed to review the document and their input is included in this final version of the S-CPC. The task force was comprised of the following individuals:

⁶ "American Deaf community" is taken from the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct and is intended to represent individuals who are Hard of Hearing, D/deaf, and Deafblind.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

BAI Student – Matthew Kanka
MAI Student – Darla Konkel
PhD Student – Tamar Jackson Nelson
Gallaudet Interpreting Service – Amy Lanasa
Community member and educator – Gina Oliva
Gallaudet Office of Student Conduct – Hillel Goldberg and Eloise Molock

The S-CPC was officially adopted by the Department of Interpretation in May 2014 and was implemented in the Fall Semester of 2014. The S-CPC will be reviewed and revised by DOI faculty and stakeholders on a regular basis.

Appendix B Student Code of Professional Conduct (S-CPC) Tenets

1.0 CONFIDENTIALITY

- *Tenet:* Students adhere to professional standards of confidential communication.
- *Guiding Principle:* Interpreters hold a position of trust in their role as linguistic and cultural facilitators of communication. Students will maintain confidentiality about professional activities and classroom communication.
- *Illustrative behaviors for students:*
 - 1.1 Honor commitments to keep information in confidence.
 - 1.2 Do not share personal or private information from classroom discussions with others.
 - 1.3 Do not share details of professional activities (e.g., observations, mentoring, interpreting, and other required activities) outside of their respective environments. Specifically, do not share information regarding professional activities via: text messaging, email, third-party conversations, and postings to social media.

2.0 PROFESSIONALISM

- *Tenet:* Students possess the professional skills and knowledge required for academic and interpreting situations.
- *Guiding Principle:* Interpreters are expected to stay current with language use, cultural norms, and changes in the profession of interpreting and be able to apply this knowledge in their work. Students must also be actively engaged in learning and adhere to the ethical and professional standards of the interpreting community and Gallaudet University.
- *Illustrative behaviors for students:*
 - 2.1 Adhere to educational commitments by attending classes, being punctual, and being prepared for active learning.
 - 2.2 Demonstrate ability to work within a professional context by adhering to institutional norms and expectations, and by showing respect to others (e.g., faculty, staff, student peers, Deaf community members, and professional interpreters).

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

- 2.3 Accept interpreting assignments (pro bono or for pay) with regard to full and thorough analysis of your knowledge, skills, integrity, language expectations, setting, and the needs of the people who are receiving your services.
- 2.4 Abide by linguistic, social, and ethical norms when interacting with interpreters, members of the Deaf community, and other individuals.
- 2.5 Seek further knowledge about aspects of Deaf culture.
- 2.6 Stay abreast of past and current empirical research in Interpretation Studies related disciplines.
- 2.7 Abide by national and international codes of conduct established by professional interpreting associations.

3.0 CONDUCT AND CIVILITY

- *Tenet:* Students conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to specific situations.
- *Guiding Principle:* Students are expected to present themselves appropriately in demeanor and appearance. Further, students avoid situations that result in conflicting roles or perceived and/or actual conflicts of interest.
- *Illustrative behaviors for students:*
 - 3.1 Convey an attitude of respect for the capabilities and worth of others, in both verbal and non-verbal communication.
 - 3.2 Refrain from rejecting or minimizing the capabilities and worth of others or attempt to impose your views and values on others.
 - 3.3 Respect differences among individuals.
 - 3.4 Demonstrate sensitivity to the feelings and opinions of others.
 - 3.5 Convey openness to those who have backgrounds that are different than your own.
 - 3.6 Ask questions and actively listen to others.
 - 3.7 Refrain from non-constructive criticism of others.
 - 3.8 Demonstrate professional decision-making skills in public.
 - 3.9 Adhere to the guidelines in the Gallaudet University Student Handbook.

4.0 COMMUNICATION

- *Tenet:* Students demonstrate an ability to take time to understand others, to manage emotions effectively, to use humor appropriately, and to allow people the opportunity to make mistakes.
- *Guiding Principle:* Students are expected to maintain professionalism in communication with others, including members of the Deaf community, faculty and staff, fellow students, and working interpreters. Professional communication includes giving and receiving feedback, observing the work of others, and asking questions.
- *Illustrative behaviors for students:*
 - 4.1 Communicate in a professional, courteous manner in online communication (e.g., emails, social media, texting) and face-to-face communication.

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

- 4.2 Avoid language that may be perceived as a put-down by the listener.
- 4.3 Learn and follow the chain of command within institutions.
- 4.4 Communicate in a manner that is respectful and promotes collaborative results.
- 4.5 Represent yourself as a member of the Department of Interpretation, Gallaudet University, and the interpreting profession in a positive manner.

5.0 RESPECT FOR OTHERS

- *Tenet:* Students express respect for members of the faculty, staff, Deaf community, fellow students, and working interpreters while demonstrating humility, honesty, and integrity.
- *Guiding Principle:* Students demonstrate the ability to work within a professional context by understanding and adhering to organizational norms and expectations, demonstrating respect for other professionals, deferring to those more advanced in the field, and supporting and mentoring others who have less experience. At times these contexts may include emotionally charged situations in which respect for your own responses and others' reactions require thoughtful and mature consideration.
- *Illustrative behaviors for students:*
 - 5.1 Use ASL in public spaces on campus (e.g., the cafeteria, Market Place, Rathskellar, Bison Shop, and the library). It is recognized that there may be times when spoken language is appropriate, such as when communicating with campus visitors who are not fluent in ASL.
 - 5.2 Demonstrate listening and attentive behaviors when conversing with others through posture, eye contact, and body language.
 - 5.3 Respectfully consider the ideas and themes raised by others.
 - 5.4 Express yourself with self-assurance by articulating thoughts and feelings in a clear, deliberate, and unassuming manner.
 - 5.5 Demonstrate honesty and trustworthiness in interactions with others.
 - 5.6 Avoid deceit or stretching the truth.
 - 5.7 Do not take credit for work done by others.
 - 5.8 Admit and accept shortcomings and limitations in knowledge and skills.
 - 5.9 Do not flaunt knowledge or skills.
 - 5.10 Do not display anger, annoyance, frustration, defensiveness, excessive self-criticism, or withdrawal when given feedback.

6.0 ETHICAL PRACTICES

- *Tenet:* Students maintain ethical practices.
- *Guiding Principle:* Students demonstrate the ability to hold, understand, and value multiple perspectives, and worldviews. Students exhibit the ability to eliminate previously held stereotypes and beliefs about individuals from different cultural groups. Students recognize their larger role as citizens within a society and act according to ethical norms.
- *Illustrative behaviors for students:*

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

- 6.1 Know the tenets of the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct.
- 6.2 Follow best practices within the profession when faced with ethical conflicts including practicing discretion when accepting interpreting assignments, following standard billing practices, and discussing individual terms and conditions.
- 6.3 Demonstrate willingness to change or compromise in the face of new information.
- 6.4 Demonstrate flexibility when considering the opinions of others.
- 6.5 Recognize that there are multiple ways of doing things that are reasonable and appropriate for the situation.

7.0 COMMITMENT TO THE PROFESSION

- *Tenet:* Students exhibit a commitment to the interpreting profession. In addition, students demonstrate the ability to be depended upon to undertake and complete activities that support this commitment.
 - *Guiding Principle:* Students are expected to foster and maintain interpreting competence and the stature of the profession through ongoing development of knowledge and skills.
 - *Illustrative behaviors for students:*
 - 7.1 Value potential avenues for learning, including classroom discussions, readings, activities, assignments, and feedback from members of the Deaf community, peers, colleagues, faculty, and staff.
 - 7.2 Take initiative to acquire new information, improve, and change when a gap in knowledge is discovered or a deficit in a personal quality is uncovered.
 - 7.3 Demonstrate dependability, reliability, and follow through with tasks and assignments by meeting deadlines, being punctual, being prepared, and working as team member.
 - 7.4 Go beyond the minimum expectations in learning and professional activities.
 - 7.5 Be reflective about all learning opportunities.
-

Appendix C

Student Name: _____

This discussion form is offered as a learning opportunity for students' professional growth. During this meeting we will discuss the behavioral concern, share perspectives, and collaboratively develop an action plan.

1. S-CPC tenet under discussion – Circle tenet(s) under discussion

(Note: To be completed by DOI faculty member prior to meeting with the student.)

1.0 CONFIDENTIALITY

Tenet: Students adhere to professional standards of confidential communication.

2.0 PROFESSIONALISM

Tener: Students possess the professional skills and knowledge required for academic and interpreting situations.

3.0 CONDUCT AND CIVILITY

Tenet: Students conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to specific situations.

4.0 COMMUNICATION

Tenet: Students demonstrate an ability to take time to understand others, to manage emotions effectively, to use humor appropriately, and to allow people the opportunity to make mistakes.

5.0 RESPECT FOR OTHERS

Tenet: Students express respect for members of the faculty, staff, Deaf community, fellow students, and working interpreters while demonstrating humility, honesty, and integrity.

6.0 ETHICAL PRACTICES

Tenet: Students maintain ethical practices.

7.0 COMMITMENT TO THE PROFESSION

Tenet: Students exhibit a commitment to interpreting and the interpreting profession. In addition, students demonstrate the ability to be depended upon to undertake and complete activities that support this commitment.

2. Behavioral concern – List the parties involved and briefly describe the behavioral concern being discussed.

(Note: To be completed by DOI faculty member prior to meeting with the student.)

--

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

3. Discussion Summary – In this section, both student and faculty perspectives can be documented regarding the behavioral concern.

(Note: To be completed collaboratively by DOI faculty member AND student during the meeting.)

4. Action Plan and Timeline

(Note: To be created collaboratively by DOI faculty member AND student during the meeting. If no action plan can be agreed upon, please note here.)

Action Step	Target Date for Completion

Students may provide a statement regarding the incident separately to be attached to this document.

We have met to discuss a behavioral concern regarding the DOI Student Code of Professional Conduct. We have discussed the concern, created a summary of our discussion, and outlined an action plan.

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____

I understand that unsatisfactory progress on the action plan within the targeted timelines will result in a referral to the program coordinator and the DOI chairperson. I understand that I am responsible for completing the steps created in the action plan and informing the DOI faculty member when finished. I also understand that failure to comply with the action plan could lead to academic probation or dismissal from the program. I have received a copy of the action plan.

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

☐ This action plan has been completed.

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____

Gatekeeping in Interpreter Education

Appendix D Student Code of Professional Conduct (S-CPC) Flow Chart

