



Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.

SCBRTF

Strategic

Challenges

Bylaws

Review

Task

Force

The SC/BRTF was established in 2008 to conduct a thorough review of Motions E – S from the 2007 RID Business Meeting, research the impact to the association bylaws and other governing documents and to make recommendations to the board on potential changes to membership categories, credential definitions and voting privilege categories. The SC/BRTF was also asked to develop a proposed organizational structure that clarifies the membership categories, voting rights and defines credentials for RID Certified, NAD Certified, Ed:K-12 Certified, Associate, Student, Senior Citizen and other affected members of RID.

The enclosed three (3) working concepts have incorporated the member feedback provided to the SC/BRTF members through various regional conference forums, state conferences, e-mails, etc. during the first stage of their work.

Please review the enclosed working concepts and provide your comments, opinions and feedback to taskforcefeedback@rid.org.

Look for more information, including history, Motions E-S and more at <http://www.rid.org/aboutRID/leadership/index.cfm/AID/169>

RID MEMBER FEEDBACK NEEDED

Click to read the **RATIONALE** for Working Concept #1

Working Concept #1 - Redefining Categories of Membership, Eligibility Requirements and Voting Rights

CATEGORY ¹	BENEFITS	ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES
VOTING MEMBER	<p><i>VIEWS;</i> <i>RID e-NEW;</i> <i>Interpreting in the News</i> CMP/ACET; Member Discounts; <i>Journal of Interpretation;</i> Listed in the online directory Members only section Special group discounts Grants & Awards Full voting rights</p>	<p>ALL interpreters who are "Certified Members," as defined in the current RID Bylaws. (http://www.rid.org/education/edu_certification/index.cfm)</p> <p>ALL future interpreters who obtain Certification through an RID Testing/Certification process AND/OR obtain a credential from an outside entity whose credential has been approved by the Voting Membership of RID as a "partial fulfillment" of Certification, as per Conference Motion 2009.02 (http://www.rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/2009_Conference/RID_2009_Minutes_Final_Motions_Resolutions_text_091609.pdf)</p>	<p>Voting: current voting rights as outlined by the bylaws and voting on appointment of committee members (TBD) that have the potential of influencing the direction of the association (i.e., Certification Council; Bylaws Committee; Ethics Committee)</p> <p>Adhere to the RID-NAD Code of Professional Conduct</p> <p>Meet the CEU requirements for certification maintenance.</p> <p>Bound by the Ethical Practices System</p> <p>Annual Dues (National & Affiliate Chapter)</p>
LIMITED VOTING MEMBER <i>(i.e., Candidate for Certification)</i>	<p><i>VIEWS;</i> <i>RID e-NEW;</i> <i>Interpreting in the News</i> CCEP (understood loosely to be the current ACET but limited to those who have become Candidates for Certification); Member Discounts; <i>Journal of Interpretation;</i> Listed in the online directory Members only section Special group discounts Grants & Awards Limited voting rights</p>	<p>Passed the knowledge portion of a recognized exam (to be understood as an exam that has been accepted as a partial requirement of a certification/credential that has been formally recognized by RID); a Member in Good Standing (National and Affiliate Chapter)</p> <p>²This category would have an "individual sunset clause," based on obtaining certification within X number of years. Unlike the current Associate Member category, this would not be a continuing membership category beyond a prescribed limit of time.</p>	<p>Voting: on all issues except those related to certification and testing, certification maintenance and ethical practices.</p> <p>Adhere to the RID-NAD Code of Professional Conduct</p> <p>Meet the Candidate for Certification Education Program (CCEP)³ requirements (TBD).</p> <p>Bound by the Ethical Practices System</p> <p>Annual Dues (National & Affiliate Chapter)</p>
NON-VOTING MEMBER <i>(e.g., Supporting, Retired, Student according to current definition in the Bylaws)</i>	<p><i>VIEWS;</i> <i>RID e-NEW;</i> <i>Interpreting in the News;</i> Member Discounts; <i>Journal of Interpretation;</i> Listed in the online directory Members only section Special group discounts Grants & Awards</p>	<p>Any individual with an interest in supporting the purposes and activities of the corporation who does not meet eligibility requirements for Voting Member or Limited Voting Member status.</p>	<p>Annual Dues to RID (National)</p>

¹Student and Senior Citizen discounts offered for each membership category.

²During forums with the membership, there was expressed support in a sunset of the Associate category.

³CCEP would replace the current ACET program to reflect the change in membership category Candidate for Certification

CONSIDERATIONS / QUESTIONS

Consideration #1:

The Organizational Member category would remain as is.

Consideration #2: Cost Per Member/Fiscal Impact:

The addition of elections for specific committees may increase the operating costs of the organization. The extent to which the cost would be increased is unknown.

In addition, while we would hope that current Associate Members would move into the Voting Member, Limited Voting Member or Non-Voting Member categories after the sunset of the Associate Member category, it is possible that there could be a decrease in members due to this change, therefore a possible decrease in revenues.

Questions Still Left Unanswered:

1. Which committees should be subject to membership vote and ratification?
2. What would be a feasible way to conduct the elections for these committee positions?
3. Should the voting occur during the Biennial Conference or through some other mechanism? If other mechanism, what?

Click to read the **RATIONALE** for Working Concept #2

To distinguish Membership from Certification by offering a Certification Maintenance option as well as a Membership option to Certification holders. Under Working Concept #2, one may be a Certified Interpreter without being a member of RID.

MEMBER RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES	NON-MEMBER RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES
Participation in the Certification Maintenance Program	Participation in the Certification Maintenance Program
Participation in the Ethical Practices System	Participation in the Ethical Practices System
Annual Certification Maintenance Fee	Annual Certification Maintenance Fee
Voting Membership Annual Dues (proportionate to Membership Category)	
<i>IEWS, RID e-NEWS, Interpreting in the NEWS, Journal of Interpretation</i>	
Access to Members Only Section of the Web site	
Discounts on publications, conference registrations, exams, etc.	
Voting Rights, where applicable	
Eligibility to run for Board/Committee positions, where applicable	

CONSIDERATIONS / QUESTIONS

Consideration #1: Cost Per Member/Fiscal Impact:

Because we are unsure as to how many current members would opt to only maintain their certification it is difficult to determine the fiscal impact. It is assumed that members and non-members would pay a fee that is equal to the current cost of certification maintenance, which would include overhead costs, CMP, and EPS. Those wishing to be members, however, would pay a fee above and beyond this certification maintenance fee. It is hoped that the fee would be nominal. Furthermore, we are unsure how this separation would impact the national office staff. As an example, maintaining separate databases for certification and membership may add to operating costs and workload.

Questions Still Left Unanswered:

1. What is the current cost of certification maintenance?
2. What is a reasonable fee for membership and for certification maintenance?
3. Is it feasible to maintain two separate databases; one for members and one for certificate holders?

Click to read the
RATIONALE for
Working Concept #3

***Change the current governance system from a
“democracy” to “a republic.”***

OUTLINE OF THE DELEGATE SYSTEM

Any voting member would be permitted to vote for a delegate. However, only certified members in good standing for a minimum number of years would be eligible to run for and hold delegate appointments. The number of delegates would be based on the number of members who are registered with the Affiliate Chapter and National. Each Affiliate Chapter would be permitted to elect a minimum number of delegates through a local election process coordinated through the national office. Affiliate Chapters that, because of lack of interest or qualified applicants, were unable to appoint a delegate in one year would not lose their number of delegate spots and could, when their situations changed, appoint their allotted delegates.

Each member would have the right to cast her or his vote in any delegate election as long as he or she is a member in good standing of an Affiliate Chapter in the state for which delegates are to be elected.

There would be a maximum number of delegates from any given state, as well as a minimum number. To determine the number of delegates per state, a specific formula would be used.

There would be a biennial Delegate Assembly where delegates would conduct business of the organization and represent their constituents. It was the vision of the Task Force that these meetings would happen either immediately prior to, or immediately following the biennial conference. These meetings would be open to the membership. The conference could be scheduled for 5 days (similar to the current biennial conference schedule), but the delegates would meet for the first 2.5 or 3 days and the rest of the time would be reserved for professional development.

CONSIDERATIONS / QUESTIONS

Consideration #1: Cost Per Member/Fiscal Impact:

To fund this system, the dues for each member would be increased by a nominal fee. This money would be used to cover expenses associated with the work of being a delegate.

Questions Still Left Unanswered:

1. What would be the role of the delegates?
2. How would the current board structure change in order to accommodate a delegate structure?
3. What kinds of changes in the National office would need to occur to make this successful?
4. How would RID establish the minimum and maximum number of delegates?

WORKING CONCEPT #1

RATIONALE:

In reviewing Motions E through S, the Task Force believes that the concerns of the members who submitted these motions, as well as the members who voted to refer them to this Task Force, are primarily the clear designation of membership categories, eligibility requirements for each category and assignment of voting rights for each category. Furthermore, these motions point to the desire for greater clarity in the language used in each of these sections of the bylaws.

The current system of governance, as outlined in the Association Bylaws, includes certain membership categories with specific voting rights. This system had worked well for many years. However, with the removal of the proxy system, the percentage of voting members participating in Business Meetings of the Association has dramatically declined over the years even as the membership numbers have dramatically increased. Alternative voting systems, such as online voting, surveys, and mail referenda have failed to significantly increase members' participation in decision-making.

RID Membership currently stands at over 15,000, and it is anticipated that the number will continue to increase. Given the size and complexity of the Association, many members have come to recognize that the current system of governance is no longer effective. While there are several areas of decision-making that can and should be handled by the Board of Directors, recent decisions have caused some concern among the members. That is, members would like to have a larger role in the governance of the organization. Therefore, this concept aims at modifying the current governance practice to promote more democratic involvement from the membership. This motion would allow voting members to participate in electing members of specific committees that have the potential to exercise significant that influence on the direction of the Association, in accordance with each member's voting rights.

[Click to return to Working Concept #1](#)

[Click to read Working Concept #2](#)

[Click to read Working Concept #3](#)

[Click to return to the Introduction](#)

WORKING CONCEPT #2 RATIONALE:

The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf categorizes members by their certification. While this may have been an effective approach in the early years of our Association, recent events have required a re-examination of this convention. In order to resolve the confusion inherent in the use of terms such as “Certified Interpreter”, “Certified Member” and “RID Certified”, the Task Force recommends that the designation for categories of membership no longer contain specific language referring to “certification” or “certified”. However, certification will still be a part of the Eligibility requirements for certain categories of membership. There will be three Membership categories for individuals: Voting Member; Limited-Voting Member; Non-Voting Member. There will also be an Organizational Member category. (For further detail, refer back to Concept # 1).

Under this concept, one may be a Certified Interpreter without being a member of the RID.

In response to many Certified Members of the Association who hold no interest in membership apart from Certification Maintenance, we suggest that RID create an option for Certification Maintenance, independent of Membership. The Association may benefit by directing the business of the Association to those with a vested personal and professional interest in the governance of the Association.

Finally, distinguishing “Certification” from Membership might reduce the confusion that persists for the communities we serve and for those within our own Association as to the difference between a CREDENTIAL that enables one to work in the marketplace and Membership in the professional Association.

Delineation of Rights, Responsibilities and Benefits of Membership vs. Certification Maintenance. (All of the details have not been worked out but here is the conceptual framework.

[Click to return to Working Concept #2](#)

[Click to read Working Concept #1](#)

[Click to read Working Concept #3](#)

[Click to return to the Introduction](#)

WORKING CONCEPT #3 RATIONALE:

In addition to our original charge of addressing the issues raised in Motions E-S, the SCBRTF was asked by Executive Director, Clay Nettles, to explore ways in which there could be more involvement from the membership. This concept, in our opinion, addresses that charge.

As stated earlier, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf has grown to over 15,000 members and it is expected that it will continue to increase. Furthermore, we have not been a true democracy for some time. In recent years the major decisions affecting the direction of the Association have been left, out of pragmatism, in the hands of a few. To promote member involvement we need to modify our approach to governance. Therefore, we recommend consideration of a delegate system.

[Click to return to Working Concept #3](#)

[Click to read Working Concept #1](#)

[Click to read Working Concept #2](#)

[Click to return to the Introduction](#)