**BUDGET NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPLICATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Person Submitting Request: | **Kathi Pryor** |
| Program or Service Area: | **Disabled Student Programs & Services** |
| Division: | **Library & Learning Resources** |
| When was the last Program Efficacy document completed? | **02/15/07** |
| What rating was given? | **continuance** |
| Amount Requested | **$50,000** |

1. Provide a rationale for your request.

|  |
| --- |
| In fiscal year 2009-10, DSPS received $130,100 from CCCCO categorical funding to provide services to Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH) students. However, our costs exceeded this amount totaling $236,742 for American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters and classroom captionists. The increase can be attributed to the 30% rise in the number of D/HH students attending SBVC from 2007 to 2010. Drastic action was taken by reducing staff during 2009-10 to manage the budget reduction (adjunct counselors not hired back for Spring 2010 semester and two classified positions were recommended to be cut). |

1. Indicate how the content of the EMP One-Sheet and latest Program Efficacy Report support this request. How is the request tied to program planning? *(reference the page number(s) where the information can be found on the EMP and Program Efficacy).*

|  |
| --- |
| The EMP (p. 77) shows the age and ethnicity of DSPS’s student population for 2008-09 and the number of students with disabilities in the Efficacy Report at 957 (p.3). At that time, the number of D/HH students (students using interpreters or captionists) was approximately 20. CCCCO Data Mart shows 2009-10 students with disabilities at SBVC as 1,163 (20% increase) with our current number of D/HH students at 28 (30% increase). The number of DSPS students, and in particular, the number of D/HH students has risen, increasing the need for funds for ASL interpreters. |

1. Indicate if there is additional information you wish the committee to consider *(for example: regulatory information, compliance, updated efficiency and/or student success data or planning etc).*

|  |
| --- |
| The need to provide qualified ASL interpreters is mandated by Title 5 of the Education Code Section 56026 (b) (2) Interpreter services, which enable students to participate in regular activities, programs and classes offered by the college. D/HH students that have qualified interpreters have success and retention rates the same as their college peers. |

1. Evaluation of related costs (including any ongoing maintenance or updates) and identification of any alternative or ongoing funding sources. (for example Department Budget, VTEA or Perkins)

|  |
| --- |
| Although measures have been taken to maximize the use of interpreters in the classroom, the cost of providing this accommodation is very expensive. DSPS has avoided using outside agencies to contract for interpreters which can cost twice as much as we normally pay. Interpreters qualified for raises have been temporarily denied the increase while we sort out how DSPS will manage without cutting any more staff. |

1. What are the consequences of not funding this budget request?

|  |
| --- |
| DSPS could lose more staff which has already been reduced by 50%. More staff cuts will result in reduced services to students with disabilities thus impacting student equity and SBVC’s goals and objectives to “support a diverse community of learners”. |