

I want to talk about Deaf interpreting. There are two perspectives, the old and the new. Historically, the perspective on Deaf interpreting is that Deaf interpreters were only used on a special need's basis, or what we used to call, "lower functioning" Deaf individuals or those with "limited language skills." The need for Deaf Interpreters was seen as taboo.

Historically, a hearing interpreter would be interpreting for a situation and after many failed attempts at interpreting they would ask for a Deaf Interpreter. Deaf interpreters were seen as a last resort and were rarely utilized. The new perspective on Deaf Interpreters is that it really is best practice for many interpreting situations, depending on the situation, such as high-risk situations, the goal of the Deaf consumer, and the necessity of full inclusion.

Oftentimes this will be the first time the Deaf consumer has experienced full inclusion. We need to start looking at Deaf interpreters as the norm and not as a unicorn. We are seeing DI's being used more and more at conferences. What does the use of Deaf Interpreters look like in your area? How is your perspective? Has that changed?

"CDIs are valuable because they have an 'uncanny ability to communicate concepts that elude even the most talented hearing interpreter...[and] are able to draw upon connections and examples that make sense only in the deaf world.'" Tuck, B. M. (2010). PRESERVING FACTS, FORM, AND FUNCTION WHEN A DEAF WITNESS WITH MINIMAL LANGUAGE SKILLS TESTIFIES IN COURT. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 158(3), 926. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20698348>