

1. Why did the Board go ahead and make a decision that affects eligibility for membership, without a vote of the membership?

The Board did consider the matter of placing this issue before the membership for a vote. However, through intensive analysis of historical voting patterns and precedence on membership matters, they determined that they would be exposed to a greater sense of the membership's opinion on this matter if they sought feedback through more meaningful channels that would reach a wider audience than previous voting matters have demonstrated to reach in the past.

Historically, the percentage of past mail referenda participation from the membership has been disappointingly low and therefore, not representative of the entire membership. This issue impacts more than just a small percentage of the membership, so the board sought channels of communication that would reach a greater audience than the mail referenda.

As stated earlier, precedence was also a factor in the board's decision to not call for a membership vote. RID is an organization of professionals entrenched in strong tradition. When NAD interpreters joined RID, there was no call for a membership vote, and when ACCI members (under NAD), joined RID, again, there was no membership vote.

The RID Board stands behind its decision and the methods by which they reached out to members for over a year to collect and explore all of the feedback. These communication tools include the following: e-mail, articles in *VIEWS*, affiliate chapter leadership, RID committees, 30+ e-mail discussion groups, 40+ state conferences, five regional conferences, as well as workshops, business meetings, and communication with the members and leaders of sister organizations. The consensus of opinion from all of these efforts were in support of the board's decision and in fact, helped the board and executive director to shape the negotiations to match the majority of members' vision for having EIPA interpreters held to the same standards as RID certified members who participate in RID's CMP and EPS systems.

To demonstrate that the board took a careful and thoughtful approach to this issue, they asked the executive director to undertake an extensive review of past membership votes regarding certification tests. The information that was available shows that the only time members had voted directly on establishing specific certification tests was for what is now the CDI, SC:L, and OTC tests (C89.04-C89.06). No member votes were found for the establishment of the first testing system, which had no formal name; the components of the CSC system, which included, among others, the IC and TC tests; or the CI and CT system.

As you can see, historically, the decisions to establish which certification tests would be established and/or recognized have been made by the board of directors through the years.

To further validate the board's action regarding this matter, legal counsel was consulted and it was determined that the board was entirely within the power given to it by the membership to move forward in this matter.

Taking into consideration the following: historical membership voting matters, the considerable amount of input gathered from members for well over a year, a strong recommendation from a task force with extensive credentials and experience in the field, and analysis that the EIPA tools met every psychometric standard; the board felt it had all the information needed to move forward with a decision that will have a positive impact on the profession as a whole.

The RID Board of Directors continues to respect and listen to those who differ with this decision. That input is important to the board, and they continue to weigh the thoughts of all the membership.

2. Why was the membership not included in the decision-making process regarding a certification issue, i.e. recognition of a score on the EIPA test as meeting the requirements for Certification, when this is a membership decision, according to the bylaws?

In addition to the information on question number one above, here is information from the RID Board of Directors response to a member's concerns about the EIPA on page 9 of the October 2006 VIEWS: "Members have the opportunity to bring any issue to the biennial business meeting floor for a vote, insofar as it's a duly made motion (in keeping with the bylaws, conference standing rules and *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*). Between conferences, the responsibility to carry out the business of the association rests with the RID Board's work and informed members' involvement. The RID Board truly stands by the concept of RID being a member-driven organization. Every action the Board takes has this concept at its core. Being a member-driven organization means that member thoughts and visions of the future of the association are considered on many levels. In the beginning of RID's history, there did not exist the luxury of rapid response times with e-mail, inexpensive phone access for dialogue, and frequent face-to-face interactions with members. Business HAD TO BE brought to conference. As the membership has grown (nearly tripled in the past 10 years), business practices have changed. For the past several years, more and more business is being conducted during the time between conferences in order to meet the market demands and to better serve interpreters and consumers. This has not been done without great care and concern for the membership. By having the board move forward in the manner in which we are currently moving (soliciting input on multiple levels and in a variety of venues before making decisions), we are ensuring MORE member input and involvement than ever before and much more impact on a variety of issues and levels than just a simple yes or no vote at conference."

The process the board used to make its decision included gathering member feedback that was over 75% in favor of moving forward with a partnership with Boys Town and the administrators of the EIPA, keeping members informed every step of the way by publishing reports and articles in the RID VIEWS, appointing a task force of concerned members that reviewed the EIPA with a psychometric consultant from CASTLE Worldwide, Inc. and consulting with RID legal counsel to ensure the board was acting appropriately. The EIPA Review Task Force, in a meeting held June 2-4, 2006, carefully examined the EIPA interpreting assessment tools and found that the tools met psychometric test development and maintenance standards. In a letter to the board the following month, the psychometric consultant confirmed the EIPA written and performance tests were well constructed and that both examinations met the standards required by RID.

3. By whom/why was the decision made to allow Ed K-12 members to be eligible to sit for the SC:L test when previous promises were made that that would not be the case?

All programs and activities in RID are subject to periodic review. Changes occur over time with virtually all of those programs and activities.

It is correct that the first analysis in this area yielded the frequently asked question and answer below:

"29) Can EIPA credentialed members sit for any RID specialty tests?

No: while EIPA individuals are recognized as certified members of RID, a person must have passed the NIC, RID or NAD generalist test to move to one of the RID specialty tests. The EIPA test is an educational generalist test for those practicing in the educational arena."

This was clearly the opinion of the board and the national office at the time. As we completed the details of integrating the EIPA interpreters into RID, a member's question caused further, extensive discussions lasting over several board meetings. A well-respected then-board member asked, upon a close review of the eligibility requirements for the test, why they would not be able to take the test. The eligibility requirements, from the time that the SC:L test was originally

implemented in 1995, specified that only persons with RID certification could take the test. In 2005, long before the EIPA agreement was reached, the Certification Council, composed of deaf and hearing members of RID and NAD, made a recommendation to change the eligibility requirements for the SC:L. The wording follows: "Certification Council recommendation #2005.17 - Which changes the requirement for the SC:L written test from "For Category 1,2,3" to read "Possess valid RID certified membership" which will replace "possess valid CSC, CI and CT, or MCSC."

Rationale: Due to RID entering into partnerships and collaborations with other certifying/testing entities in the field of sign language interpreting, it is essential for RID to be inclusive to all certified members of the organization.

This recommendation was passed by the Certification Council unanimously and was subsequently passed by the board unanimously as well. The motion, 2005.29, was printed on page 21 of the December 2005 *VIEWES*.

In revisiting the question posed by the board member, it became evident that no matter what national certification someone held, if they met the eligibility requirements, they had the requisite legal experience needed to stand for and to have a reasonable chance of passing the test. Accordingly, the interpretation of the rules allowed for any certified members of RID to take the test. See the requirements below.

Eligibility

An individual interested in taking the SC:L exam must either currently possess a valid legal interpreting certificate issued prior to 1987 or satisfy all of the eligibility criteria in at least one of the following categories:

Category #1 - Be a current certified member of RID, successful completion of a bachelor's degree in any field or an associate's degree in interpreting and documentation of at least 50 hours of legal interpreting/mentoring experience and 30 hours of formal legal training. In addition, five years of general interpreting experience (post certified member of RID status) is strongly recommended.

Category #2 - Be a current certified member of RID, successful completion of an associate's degree in any field and documentation of at least 75 hours of legal interpreting/mentoring experience and 50 hours of formal legal training. In addition, five years of general interpreting experience (post certified member of RID status) is strongly recommended.

Category #3 - Be a current certified member of RID and documentation of at least 100 hours of legal interpreting/mentoring experience and 70 hours of legal training. In addition, five years of general interpreting experience (post certified member of RID status) is strongly recommended.

Category #4 – Possess a current SC:L.

That said, there are also clearly some ongoing concerns over this area, especially with regard to the topic of generalist and specialist certificates. Under our current system, there is no easy classification that fits the EIPA as either a generalist or specialist certificate and where it was placed on the RID website has caused a great deal of confusion. The board identified issues in membership categories a few years ago and approved appointing a task force (the Strategic Challenges/Bylaws Review Task Force (SCBRTF) to consider this and other bylaws issues. When members found similar issues in the bylaws and made motions for the 2007 RID business meeting pertaining to such, the SCBRTF was the perfect group to take on the board's directive to review the RID Bylaws and membership categories and the Motions E - S that were proposed at the 2007 business meeting. The SCBRTF has made great progress and has will address this particular issue and will also address the legal testing area as well as a host of other ancillary matters. The frustrations with the current nomenclature related to the legal test will remain until change is effected. Thankfully, the process is underway with the task force.

4. Why was a contract entered into with Boys' Town that included terms that would change membership eligibility/ designations, without consent of the voting members?

This has been covered in earlier questions.

5. Why did RID enter into a contract with Boys Town without the input of Deaf members of RID and members of the Deaf Community?

The ongoing discussions with Boys Town was an agenda item at several meetings of the National Council on Interpreting, the committee, composed of multiple NAD members as well as members of several other deafness-related organizations. Concerns from that group were considered by the board. Additionally, the input of all members, in various forms, was sought as noted in question number one.

6. How do EIPA interpreters become Certified Members of RID?

All EIPA credentialed interpreters are encouraged to fill out the special application for EIPA credentialed members. For questions related to membership and certification, please e-mail membership@rid.org. For all other questions, contact the communications department at publications@rid.org.

Here is the information on the RID Web site at <http://www.rid.org/content/index.cfm/AID/72>

Joining as an EIPA Interpreter

Interpreters who have passed the EIPA written test and scored at least a 4.0 on the EIPA performance test may join RID as certified members and maintain certification through the RID [Certification Maintenance Program](#) (CMP) and [Ethical Practices System](#) (EPS). New and current members of RID who wish to do so must use this [membership application](#) or call the RID national office at 703-838-0030.

7. How many ED K-12 members does RID have now? (What percentage of the voting membership?)

As you may be aware, membership numbers change daily. As of June, 2009, 270 current members held the ED:K-12 certification. That number amounts to just over two percent of the overall voting membership and just over three percent of the certified membership. However, approximately one-half of the 241 hold other certifications. Accordingly, certified members with the ED:K-12 only constitute approximately one percent of the voting membership of the association and approximately one and one-half percent of the certified membership.

8. How many ED K-12 members could RID potentially have, if all those eligible joined RID? (What percentage of the voting membership?)

Even if every single eligible person joined, they would constitute substantially less than 20 percent of the voting membership and substantially less than 30 percent of the certified membership.

9. What is being done to prevent ED K-12 members from misrepresenting their credentials as "RID Generalist Certification"?

All certified members of RID are expected to represent their credentials appropriately. Should any member not do so and the matter is brought to our attention, we have processes in place that will actively and aggressively seek resolution, up to and including, if needed, legal action.

Additionally, as then-President Angela Jones noted in her column in the September 2006 edition of *VIEWS*, "It is sad, but true, to say that with our without the EIPA, we have interpreters who are misrepresenting themselves now. The RID Educational Interpreting Committee will work tirelessly to educate interpreters, parents of deaf children, the deaf community at large, agencies, organizations and companies who hire interpreters on the meaning of all certifications."

10. What is being done to prevent those who have taken the EIPA, but have not met the requirements for "ED K-12 Certification" from misrepresenting their credentials?

All interpreters, whether certified members of RID or not, should represent their credentials appropriately. Should anyone who is not a member of RID not do so and the matter is brought to our attention, we have processes in place that will actively and aggressively seek resolution, up to and including, if needed, legal action.

11. How much control does RID have over the EIPA test?

Boys Town allowed the member task force and RID's psychometricians full freedom to view any and all needed materials when determining the validity and reliability of the assessment instrument. Subsequently, RID has the ability to further view the test as needed to determine if it still meets validity and reliability standards. Should the association feel that is no longer the case, RID has the right to act as is needed to ensure that the test does or to withdraw its recognition of the instrument.