

APPROVED MINUTES – MOTION 2011.20

22nd National Conference of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf Business Meeting Called to order July 20, 2011, 8:00 am ~ Atlanta, GA

The meeting was called to order, with President Cheryl Moose presiding. A quorum was not seen, so the meeting's start was delayed in anticipation of sufficient additional members arriving so as to exceed a quorum.

The meeting proceeded at 8:10 a.m. Vice President Rachel Coppelli offered some opening remarks, introducing Parliamentarians Bummy Burstein and Libby Pollard, and Computer Operator Bram Weiser. The Parliamentarians offered introductory remarks as well.

President Moose introduced and thanked the members of the Bylaws Committee.

President Moose then introduced the Minutes Review Committee, comprised of members of each of RID's five (5) regions, and described what will happen to the Business Meeting Minutes after the meeting has concluded.

President Moose introduced Secretary Kelly Flores who asked for a count of voting cards to indicate whether or not a quorum was present. 192 voting members were announced as being present. (200 would signify a quorum.) A recount was performed which then resulted in a total of over 200 voting members being shown as present. As such, the meeting officially commenced.

President Moose then introduced the members of the board and explained their individual voting rights. The new representatives from regions IV and V were asked to stand and be introduced as well.

As Standing Rules were discussed by the membership in various forms in the months leading up to the Conference, President Moose asked the members to approve the Standing Rules, as shown.

Anthony Aramburo moves to approve the Standing Rules, and David Evans seconded. A 2/3 vote being required for passage, a count of those in opposition was undertaken, and none being seen, the Standing Rules were approved.

A discussion of the motions began.

(Please note that, for ease of reading, all changes are formatted differently. Stricken language is ~~struck through~~ and new language is **bolded**.)

Motion A.

That RID adopt the Region V Communication Policy for National Conferences of RID beginning in 2013. Region V

Rationale:

1. To create an environment that demonstrates respect and access via a common language.
2. To promote a bilingual philosophy of communication within our organization.
3. To foster greater collaboration between RID and the Deaf Community to create a space for dialogue.
4. Increase exposure to and use of formal ASL.
5. To decrease communication via a third party.
6. To enhance the use and comprehension of ASL discourse among the membership.

7. To create a welcome environment that engenders a heightened interest from Deaf leaders, consumers, linguists, professionals, interpreters, teachers, and researchers, to share their knowledge base with the membership.

Historical Information: During the 2008 RID Region V Conference in Sacramento California the membership presented and passed the RID Region V Conference Communication Policy. Motion C08:02 We move to amend the RID Region V Conference communication policy to reflect the organization's philosophy of diversity and inclusion by using direct communication in our shared language of ASL.

Within the motion, ASL is defined as the language used by D/deaf people throughout the United States that naturally contains a wide range of variation and dialects- from language that is highly visual/space-reliant, to language which is highly linear-reliant. Individuals can reference <http://www.nad.org/issues/american-sign-language> for more information on this philosophy.

Region V determined the communication policy goal(s) would be met through efforts to:

1. Provide educational opportunities in our shared language of ASL, affording direct communication amongst conference participants.
2. Provide networking opportunities in our shared language of ASL, affording direct communication amongst conference participants.
3. Provide association related business opportunities in our shared language of ASL, affording direct communication amongst conference participants.

Diversity Committee comments: The Diversity Committee is NOT in favor of Motion A. While the Diversity Committee does support and strongly encourage that signed communication should be used and accessibility be priority in all settings, formal and informal (ASL, Captioning, English transliterating, etc.) this accessibility should be for all attending, therefore the Diversity Committee is not in favor of mandating ASL to be the sole/only method of communication.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Critical. Increased costs for interpreting, audio-visual and captioning are high. Participants need to understand this would have an impact on registration costs.

Board comments: The board supports inclusive communication at all times during the conference for all participants.

National office comments: The national office believes the designated official languages of the conference should be accessible to all participants.

Bylaws Committee comments: The motion asks that RID adopt the Region V Communication Policy, yet that policy is not stated anywhere. Therefore, the Bylaws Committee believes that this motion should be returned to Region V for clarification. We cannot ask the membership to adopt a policy unless that policy is given as part of the motion.

Member comments (summary of comments at conference – same for all motions):

Motion A was withdrawn by proposer Loriel Dutton.

Motion B.

*That RID enter into ~~negotiations~~ **dialogue** with Texas Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services/Office for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services/Board for Evaluation of Interpreters (DARS/DHHS/BEI) for the purpose of RID **potentially** recognizing BEI certification as an appropriate credential for certified membership in RID, **after the guidelines of the motion passed in 2007 are approved by the members and implemented.** (Texas Society of Interpreters for the Deaf)*

Certification Council Comments: The Certification Council does not recommend passage of this motion.

Rationale:

- 1. RID would have no authority with the BEI test administration practices nor have any oversights regarding changes to the BEI.**
- 2. Because RID did not create nor administer this testing instrument, RID would not be able to maintain standards of certification and hear appeals of BEI candidates when testing conditions are less than ideal.**
- 3. Having BEI assessed interpreters would be problematic. The BEI is a certification that is not within the control of RID. RID would not be able to revoke or suspend a BEI assessed interpreter's BEI certification. Thus, any ethical grievances about an interpreter would not be under the jurisdiction or purview of the RID Ethical Practices system. The only power RID would have is to revoke a person's membership in RID, not their certification. Should a state choose to administer a grievance process, it would be separate from any oversight by the RID. Additionally, RID would not have any knowledge of any state actions taken.**
- 4. There is no measure of a BEI's candidate's understanding of the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct.**
- 5. If BEI assessed interpreters were to become certified members of RID, the BEI certified members would be able to vote on RID and RID-NAD certification issues.**
- 6. There would be no incentive for BEI credentialed members or new ITP graduates to take the NAD-RID NIC exam.**
- 7. The term RID certified interpreter would lose credibility. The hearing/hiring and deaf communities would not know or understand the difference between an NAD-RID NIC certified or BEI certified "RID" interpreter.**
- 8. States that require RID certification would then have to include the BEI.**
- 9. The only requirement to take the BEI is a high school diploma or equivalent.**
- 10. Other states could also apply to have their assessments approved for inclusion as RID certified which would impair the integrity of the NAD-RID NIC.**
- 11. There is currently a confusing alphabet soup of titles and certifications. Adding BEI basic, advanced, and master, to the mix adds confusion.**
- 12. The motion does not address if the BEI interpreter would be able to sit for a RID specialist certification.**

RID already has a valid and psychometrically sound testing instrument. The CC sees no reason for recognizing the BEI certification as an appropriate credential for certified members in RID.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Not applicable at this point. Procedural in nature at this time. If the motion is passed, negotiations conducted and it was determined to move forward with a recommendation for recognition of the credential, then motion C2009.02, which states in the RID Bylaws that the board may add certificates to or add or change categories for membership in RID only with prior approval of 2/3 of the eligible membership voting on the issue and the board may enter into a contract that changes, adds to, or amends certification or membership status only with prior approval of 2/3 of the eligible membership voting on the issue, would come into effect and the recommendation would have to be voted on by the membership as specified.

Board comments: The board is split and trusts the members to decide.

National office comments: The national office believes a strategic approach to viewing other testing/credentialing entities for the association should be in place prior to considering/recognizing any other credentials for certification. Should the membership see fit to pursue this review, it would need to be incorporated into the strategic planning process.

Bylaws Committee comments: The Bylaws Committee feels the wording “to enter into negotiations ... for the purpose of recognizing...” assumes that the credential has already been deemed an appropriate credential. If the intent is to determine whether or not this credential is appropriate, then the wording should be changed to state that clearly.

If that is the intent of the motion, then this motion should be tabled until the SCBRTF has completed its task of developing a proposed organizational structure of "membership categories, credential definitions and voting privilege categories". If the motion is not tabled or referred to the SCBRTF, then there is a process in place for the membership to approve another credential (motion C2009.02), which is to do so by approval of 2/3 of the eligible membership voting on the issue.

Member comments:

Proposer Erma Webb noted that Rationale #9 is expected to change so as to include an Associate's Degree by 2012. Rationale #12 is premature as this motion is specifically for dialogue though what this item addresses may be anticipated as taking place in the future.

Amendment... change “recognizing BEI” to “potentially recognizing BEI” – Amy Seiberlich, seconded by Loycene Sollman.

Motion to close discussion on the Amendment – Janet Jurus (seconded by Lisa Bolding) – carries – no count necessary.

Amendment (Seiberlich) carries – no count necessary.

Amendment... substitute “dialogue” for “negotiations” – Erma Webb, seconded by David Evans.

Motion to close discussion on the Amendment – Janet Jurus (seconded by E.J. Cohen) – carries – no count necessary.

Amendment (Webb) carries – no count necessary.

Motion to suspend discussion on Motion B and refer it to the Certification Council – Stephanie Feyne (seconded by David Evans) – withdrawn by the Proposer (Secunder concurs) – no count necessary.

Amendment... add “, after the guidelines of the motion passed in 2007 are approved by the members and implemented” at the end of the motion – Margaret Ransom Cobb, seconded by Jimmy Beldon.

Amendment (Ransom Cobb) carries – no count necessary.

Motion to close discussion – Elisa Mlynar (seconded by Joan Wattman) – carries – no count necessary.

Chair indicated that motion C2009.02 trumped the 2007 motion (C2007.04) cited in Amendment (Ransom Cobb).

Motion, as amended, fails after a count.

President Moose delegated responsibilities of being Chair of the Business Meeting to Vice-President Rachel Coppelli.

Motion C.

RID research a mechanism for the ~~identification endorsement~~ of reputable agencies and organizations providing sign language interpretation services in community settings and report back to membership by the 2013 RID National Conference. (Region III)

Rationale: An endorsement system that would allow customers, consumers and interpreters a means to make educated decisions about which agencies/organizations with which to establish business relationships and a means to express concerns about them, is in line with RID's mission and philosophy to support the continued growth and development of the profession and the insurance of effective communication through excellence in the delivery of services.

A national certification system currently exists for customers and consumers as a means by which to make hiring decisions based on a level of assurance that they are receiving services from a competent individual practitioner. However, no such system exists when services are purchased through an agency or organization. Likewise, there is no recourse for customers, or consumers against agencies that are not reputable or conforming to standard business practices as there is for individual interpreters.

In addition, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of agencies providing sign language interpreter services across the country and in the nationalization of these providers seeking to secure work outside of their geographical location. A large number of these agencies are spoken language provider agencies with no direct relationship to the field of sign language interpretation, with interpreters in a given area of the country or familiarity with the local deaf community. Given this nationalization of agencies, interpreters have no guidance by which to make decisions regarding whether to contract with a particular agency. Contract interpreters are thus vulnerable to unscrupulous business practices by out of state agencies with little ability for recourse.

A national system to recognize reputable interpreter provider agencies is in the best interest of the consumers and customers who need qualified interpreter services.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Minimal to significant on a yearly basis. Cost of a committee varies from several hundred dollars per year when conference calls are sufficient to approaching \$10,000 for face-to-face meetings, including all associated costs for travel, per diem, hotel, interpreting and audio-visual costs, depending on size of committee, location of meetings, etc.

Board comments: The board is deeply concerned about possible conflicts of interest and the ramifications of monitoring agencies and feels this is a consumer issue better led by NAD.

National office comments: The national office does not oppose an RID task force (with appropriate subject matter experts and significant topic research) determining if a consensus can be developed on this topic. Should the membership see fit to pursue this, it would need to be incorporated into the strategic planning process.

Bylaws Committee comments: First, the motion must be amended to change the date of reporting since it is not feasible that this motion can be passed at the conference in 2011 and also report the results at the same conference.

Second, there are two other wording "issues":

- a) What is to be reported back—whether this is feasible, whether this is even appropriate for RID to do, the actual mechanism that would be developed?
- b) Related to the previous issue, will the report decide what "reputable" means?

Finally, there is some concern about the legal ramifications of RID endorsing agencies. While RID can and should be able to "police" its own members (and thus could set up some system for organizational members who are agencies addressed in this motion), how can it do so for those with no relationship to RID? We recommend that, if some form of this motion is passed, that RID seek advice as to the legalities involved.

Member comments:

Motion to suspend discussion on Motion C and refer it to a new task force – Kate Robertson (ruled out-of-order by the Chair, and withdrawn by the Proposer).

Amendment... substitute “identification” for “endorsement” – Jennifer Moyer (seconded – no name given).

Amendment (Moyer) carries after a count.

Motion to close discussion – Holly Miles – carries – no count necessary.

Motion, as amended, carries – no count necessary.

Motion D.

*That all RID National conference sessions be accessible in ASL, English and Spanish, **but not necessarily all in open microphone.*** (Region II)

Rationale: RID is a diverse and growing population. We come from many different backgrounds and experiences and not all are fluent in second (or more) languages. RID (we) must respect all participants (interpreters, future interpreters, guests and other interested parties)

The RID conference has grown into a very large conference with overcrowded sessions which make visibility for attendees difficult, therefore by making all sessions accessible by any and all means (open microphone voicing, large screen with captioning, etc.)*

*(NAD is a good model for us to follow in the accessibility they provide for their conferences)

Additionally RID certifies members with the OTC (Oral Transliteration Certification), thus, certified members of RID are welcome to attend conferences to earn necessary CEUs and knowing sign language is not a requirement for those who hold an OTC.

Diversity Committee: comments: The Diversity Committee is in favor of ensuring that RID conferences are accessible which would currently be in English, Spanish and American Sign Language (as was noted in Motion A captioning and English/transliterating access as well).

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Critical. Increased costs for interpreting, audio-visual and captioning are high. Participants need to understand this would have a prominent impact on registration costs.

Board comments: The board supports inclusive communication at all times during the conference for all participants. (Same comments as for Motion A.)

National office comments: The national office believes the designated official languages of the conference should be accessible to all participants. (Same comments as for Motion A.)

Bylaws Committee comments: The committee sees no problems with this motion as written.

As to the possible conflict between Motions A and D, we are unable to determine whether or not this motion is in conflict with Motion A since that motion was not specific about the policy which would be adopted. If Motion A’s policy mandates everything be presented in ASL but allows interpretation, then this motion is still in order because it would then require that the conference provide interpretation into English and Spanish.

Member comments:

Amendment... add “, but not necessarily all in open microphone” at the end of the motion – Tricia Frank (seconded).

Amendment carries – no count necessary.

Motion to close discussion – Alexis McMannis – carries –no count necessary.

Motion, as amended, carries – no count necessary.

Chair mentions that Motion I was withdrawn prior to the Business Meeting.

1st-day session adjourned 11:57 am, July 20, 2011

2nd-day session called to order 8:12 am, July 21, 2011

President Moose called for a count of voting cards to indicate whether or not a quorum is present. Secretary Kelly Flores confirmed that a quorum (>=200 voting members) is present. As such, the meeting officially re-commenced.

President Moose presented the President’s Award to Parliamentarians Bummy Burstein and Libby Pollard.

The discussion of the motions continued.

Motion E.

~~That a new position on the RID Board of Directors be created as the CODA Member At Large. Region II~~

*Move that the Board of Directors charge the Bylaws Committee, in consultation with the leadership of the IDP Member Section, to develop bylaws amendments that establish a position on the Board of Directors to represent RID members who were raised by a Deaf parent or Deaf parents, together with appropriate qualifications and duties for this position. The Bylaws Committee is to present these bylaws amendments to the RID membership **Board of Directors, and then the membership**, for a vote no later than December 15th, 2012, but no earlier than the conclusion of all 2012 Regional Conferences. (Randy Chappell)*

Rationale: Children of Deaf Adults (CODAs) have exhibited unique skill, cultural understanding, and advocacy for citizens who use American Sign Language. Notwithstanding the countless interpreters who learned the skill through education and exposure later in life, CODAs have been in Deaf culture from birth. Therefore, in honor of the late Lillian Beard, Lou Fant, and so many others who have dedicated their personal and professional lives to this profession and to RID, we move that this new board position be created. Such a voice on the board would insure that tradition and dual cultural perspectives remain in the decision making processes of the board of directors.

Diversity Committee comments: The Diversity Committee is not in favor of Motion E. However, the Diversity Committee strongly encourages RID seeking a diverse population to serve in leadership roles at all levels of the organization.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Significant. Increased costs for interpreting for conference calls and costs for travel, per diem and hotel.

Board comments: The board feels that recruiting and developing leaders who are CODAs to take on leadership roles is preferable to creating a position that will create an even numbered board.

National office comments: The national office believes that sufficient opportunities currently exist for any qualified members to serve on the board of directors as well as in numerous other leadership positions. The national office believes that, for positions like this as well as others in RID, additional, personalized recruitment efforts can serve to assure continued diverse representation.

Bylaws Committee comments: This motion would require Bylaws amendments, and should be worded so that the actual changes to the Bylaws are included in the motion. Sections of the bylaws that may need to be included (or at least considered) would be Duties, inclusion or exclusion on the Executive Committee, Qualifications, Term of Office, and Nominations requirement. In addition, with the recently added Deaf Member-at-Large and the possibility of a CODA Member-at-Large, the quorum requirements for the Board may need to be revised.

A Bylaws amendment needs 90 days notice to the membership, and since this motion did not specifically state that it would be a change to the Bylaws, the committee does not feel that it meets the 90 days notice requirement.

A wording change to Amendment E to direct the Board to develop the bylaws changes necessary and then have membership vote by mail referendum would be possible, and would allow for some debate of the merits of the idea to occur on the floor.

Member comments:

Motion to substitute the following text for Motion E: "Move that the Board of Directors charge the Bylaws Committee, in consultation with the leadership of the IDP Member Section, to develop bylaws amendments that establish a position on the Board of Directors to represent RID members who were raised by a Deaf parent or Deaf parents, together with appropriate qualifications and duties for this position. The Bylaws Committee is to preset these bylaws amendments to the RID membership for a vote no later than December 15th, 2012, but no earlier than the conclusion of all 2012 Regional Conferences." – Randy Chappell (seconded)

Amendment... change "membership" to "Board of Directors, and then the membership," – Randy Chappell (seconded) – carries – no count necessary.

Substitution carries – no count necessary.

Amendment... add "Certified" immediately preceding "RID members who..." – Ben Hall (seconded) – withdrawn by the Proposer.

Motion to close discussion – Hartmut Teuber (seconded) – carries – no count necessary.

Motion, as amended, carries – no count necessary.

Motion F.

For RID to create a committee to investigate the feasibility of, and procedures to implement, a system of specialization recognition. This paradigm is an expansion of RID's current CMP and would be to encourage interpreters to develop specialization skills and to have those skills officially recognized within the field of interpreting for the Deaf.

Said committee must include a specialist in interpreter education, national office personnel experienced in RID's Certification Maintenance Program and other interested and affected stakeholders. Bryon Rowe and Katherine Dudina

Rationale: Whereas Deaf individuals have had many barriers to achieving their full potential removed in recent decades, and the Deaf community is comprised of an extremely diverse population with wide scopes of interests, needs, and goals. This removal of barriers has resulted in many Deaf individuals obtaining advanced degrees or training in highly specialized fields of study.

Whereas a generalist certification is a requirement to begin interpreting for the Deaf it is in and of itself insufficient to meet the needs of an extremely diverse and increasingly specialized population of Deaf individuals and Deaf professionals.

Whereas many higher education entities in the US provide degrees of interpreting in a specialization (educational, medical, etc.) however successful graduates have no officially recognized way to inform interested stakeholders that He / She possesses specialized training. As well many individual interpreters have spent years developing and honing skills in a specific specialty to better serve the Deaf community and also have no way to have their skill recognized.

Whereas RID still maintains the word Registry within its name (registry is defined as an official list) historically RID was created to provide a list of persons capable of interpreting for the Deaf and currently maintains a list of said persons, detailing their name, location, contact information, Certificates held, Category, Freelance Status as a service made available for all stakeholders. However does not contain information on an interpreters expertise in any specialization. (except Legal, performing arts)

Whereas it is financially unfeasible for RID to develop myriad specialization certification exams to meet the wide variety of possible special needs Deaf people have.

Whereas RID currently has a CMP system well established that includes an independent studies component.

Whereas technology and VRI continue to improve it may be possible for a Deaf consumer to request the services of a specialized interpreter who may be located at a great distance (perhaps in conjunction with a local interpreter) with the goal of availing themselves of the best possible expert interpreter in His or Her field.

This motion proposes that:

RID will constitute a committee tasked with:

1. Delineating which specializations will require development of a standardized certification test and which would not. For areas not requiring a specialization certification test develop the following:
 - a. The development of criteria that will be disseminated to all stakeholders detailing how to develop and maintain requirements of a curriculum by either an individual interpreter, group of interpreters, or a body of higher learning that when completed will provide interpreters with the prerequisite skills to effectively interpret in a given specialization.
 - b. Develop criteria of what would be the minimum information to be contained in a portfolio to demonstrate an interpreter has the requisite skills to effectively interpret in the specialization he/she is seeking.
 - c. Develop a general example of core competencies and minimum requirements for a specialization (Linguistic skills, content mastery, ethical considerations, practicum requirements).
 - d. Outline what is required to satisfactorily complete all competencies as well as how to verify competencies were satisfactorily completed.
 - e. Determine the most efficient and effective way to identify what specialization(s) a member(s) hold(s). (ex: RID membership card, RID Web-based database, etc).

- f. Detail what requirements will be needed to maintain said specialization.
- g. Identify costs of implementation and possible income sources (ex: additional dues) this expansion of the CMP will incur.
- h. Outline grievance procedures and revocation protocols.
- i. Other issues deemed integral to this project.

2. Report back to the membership of RID for input and modification in preparation for a vote to establish this specialization recognition paradigm at the 2013 RID national conference.

It is hoped that as more curricula are approved and are easily accessed by the interpreting community, via RID's website, more interpreters will avail themselves of the independent studies option within the CMP or decide to attend specialized training offered through institutions of higher learning. Seasoned interpreters who have been interpreting in a specialized field will create and submit a portfolio to obtain official recognition and validation of His / Her specialization. With more interpreters adding specialization(s) to their generalist certification hopefully we will accomplish the ultimate goal of better services being provided to the Deaf community.

Certification Council comments: The Certification Council **does not recommend** passage of this motion.

Rationale:

1. The motion seeks actions that are already being addressed by the NIC Task Force, many which have actually already been developed into recommendations from that task force.
2. The motion is based in a great part on an assumption that a system of professional development (i.e., attending workshops, independent studies, mentorships, etc.), years of working in a "specialty area", and a collection of individual documents would have the same validity of determining a specialization as a formal test developed to be psychometrically valid and reliable.
3. The process suggested in tasks 2-9 will require a substantial investment of both volunteer and paid leadership/staff time.
4. It would not be possible to mandate (nor maintain oversight of) that institutions of higher learning nor independent trainers utilize the suggested required curriculum (see task 2).
5. The use of a portfolio system of credential/experience verification would prove to be unmanageable by the RID national office staff and maintaining consistent, objective review of such a document would be difficult.
6. Some requested tasks (task 6 for example) is already in place (current specializations are identified in the online database as well as on members' cards issued by RID).
7. The motion also seems to suggest that specialization exams are not necessary. Current literature on the concept of specialization does point to examination as part of the process to document the skills in specialty areas. Fields such as education and medicine (nurses, doctors) use exams and continuing education beyond the exam to award and maintain specializations.

Professional Development Committee comments: After consideration of this motion, the committee feels that, though the idea of specialization is certainly timely and is garnering much attention in our field, the motion is rather broad and attempts to request a feasibility study as well as outlining program design. Until the feasibility of such a system is investigated, proven to be timely and relevant, and approved by the membership, discussions of program design would be premature. Additionally, a program of the design outlined in the motion would be extremely cumbersome from the perspectives of time, resources, and finances.

As a side note, we would like to add that a program of this nature could possibly be seen as existing more under the 'Certification' umbrella than in the 'Education' realm. It is possible that the Certification Council would have additional insight and feedback about this motion.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Critical. As proposed, would need the services of psychometricians/test developers in the process.

Board comments: The board recommends referring this concept to the NIC Review Task Force.

National office comments: The national office believes this should be referred to the NIC Review Task Force.

Bylaws Committee comments: The committee does not see any problem with the motion, but does wonder if the makers of the motion intend to require the tasks stated in the rationale. If so, those tasks should be moved to the motion. In addition, the rationale should not be written in resolution format. The suggested wording for the motion and rationale (if tasks are moved to the motion itself) would be:

Move that RID create a committee to investigate the feasibility of, and procedures to implement, a system of specialization recognition. This paradigm is an expansion of RID's current CMP and would be to encourage interpreters to develop specialization skills and to have those skills officially recognized within the field of interpreting for the Deaf.

Said committee must include a specialist in interpreter education, national office personnel experienced in RID's Certification Maintenance Program and other interested and affected stakeholders.

The committee will be tasked with:

1. Delineating which specializations will require development of a standardized certification test and which would not. For areas not requiring a specialization certification test develop the following:

a. The development of criteria that will be disseminated to all stakeholders detailing how to develop and maintain requirements of a curriculum by either an individual interpreter, group of interpreters, or a body of higher learning that when completed will provide interpreters with the prerequisite skills to effectively interpret in a given specialization.

b. Develop criteria of what would be the minimum information to be contained in a portfolio to demonstrate an interpreter has the requisite skills to effectively interpret in the specialization he/she is seeking.

c. Develop a general example of core competencies and minimum requirements for a specialization (Linguistic skills, content mastery, ethical considerations, practicum requirements).

d. Outline what is required to satisfactorily complete all competencies as well as how to verify competencies were satisfactorily completed.

e. Determine the most efficient and effective way to identify what specialization(s) a member(s) hold(s). (ex: RID membership card, RID Web-based database, etc).

f. Detail what requirements will be needed to maintain said specialization.

g. Identify costs of implementation and possible income sources (ex: additional dues) this expansion of the CMP will incur.

h. Outline grievance procedures and revocation protocols.

i. Other issues deemed integral to this project.

2. Report back to the membership of RID for input and modification in preparation for a vote to establish this specialization **recognition paradigm at the 2013 RID national conference.**

Member comments:

Motion withdrawn by the Proposer (seconder doesn't object) – No objections from the membership.

Motion G.

That RID establish an ad hoc committee to develop a position paper addressing the role of interpreters in the specialized setting of performing arts. Emily Haynes and Jennifer Kamin

Rationale: The RID Website states that standard practice papers exist to “articulate the consensus of the membership in outlining standard practices and positions on various interpreting roles and issues.” Currently, RID recognizes no standards of practice for performing arts interpreters. Over the last three years, interviews conducted across all five regions of the country show that understanding of the roles, qualifications, and credibility of performing arts interpreters varies widely.

The formulation of a standard practice paper focusing on performing arts would:

- Increase the professionalism of this branch of our field.
- Provide stakeholders (performers, professionals, and patrons) in performing arts venues with a source of concise information concerning interpreting services.
- Grant third parties who promote accessibility (such as the National Endowment for the Arts, Everyone's Invited, etc.) the resource of our national organization's position on interpreters in performing arts settings.
- Allow interpreters of all backgrounds to approach performing arts settings with more unified expectations and information.
- Expand the resource base for deaf and hard of hearing consumers who struggle for access in the performing arts setting.
- Ease actual or perceived barriers between interpreters, deaf patrons and performing arts professionals through education.
- Standardize quality of services provided.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Minimal to significant on a yearly basis. Cost of a committee varies from several hundred dollars per year when conference calls are sufficient to approaching \$10,000 for face-to-face meetings, including all associated costs for travel, per diem, hotel, interpreting and audio-visual costs, depending on size of committee, location of meetings, etc.

Board comments: The board is split on this motion and defers to the will of the membership.

National office comments: With many pressing current strategic priorities, the national office believes this item, while having merit, should be reconsidered with other proposals at the board level within two years.

Committee position: The Bylaws Committee does not see any problems with the wording of this motion.

Member comments:

Motion to close discussion – Jean Plant (seconded) – carries – no count necessary.

Motion carries – no count necessary.

Motion H.

That the RID national office maintains continuing education transcripts for all certified interpreters for a period not less than 35 years. Jennifer Moyer and Charlene Lavine

Rationale: Currently, the RID national office maintains continuing education transcripts for five years, after which time, records are purged from the system. This period is inadequate, especially for interpreters who must produce documentation for previous training; likewise, maintaining personal paper files is cumbersome and not failsafe. By keeping transcripts on file electronically, RID can provide a centralized means for interpreters to access these records and provide documentation as needed for a period of time of not less than 35 years which is approximately the length of one's employment career.

Professional Development Committee: The PDC feels that, though it is ultimately the member's responsibility to maintain all records of their continuing education (each member having the choice to maintain their records on paper or electronically), investigating the financial feasibility of keeping records for 10 years (which would be just a few years more than two full cycles), would be recommended.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: To be determined.

Board comments: The board has concerns about financial impact, staff impact and cost to the membership. The board recommends referring the motion to the national office and the Professional Development Committee for a feasibility study.

National office comments: The national office is currently working on initiatives related to the database in the current fiscal year. This item will be added to the effort as we consider the feasibility of this proposal.

Bylaws Committee comments: The Bylaws Committee has no problems with the motion wording and it is not in conflict with RID Bylaws. However, we do have a few questions that would need to be answered if this motion passes: What about transcripts for ACET participants? What happens if the interpreter is no longer an RID member (for whatever reason) before the end of the 35 years?

The calculation of a fiscal impact will need to reflect changes/updates in technology. Who knows how many times in 35 years the way this info is stored will change?? The national office might also have feelings as to how much work is required to not only store this information but also make it readily available to the members upon request.

Member comments:

After a point claimed that a quorum was no longer present, a recount was taken and a quorum was re-confirmed.

Motion to refer Motion H to the National Office & the Professional Development Committee for a feasibility study – Chris Grooms.

(Matthew O'Hara from the National Office could not yet describe the specific costs, financial and otherwise, of the technology necessary were Motion H to be passed.)

Motion to close discussion on the motion to refer – Deborah Gunter – carries – no count necessary.

Motion to refer carries – no count necessary.

Motion I.

To allow Puerto Rico RID (PRRID) to participate in the development of a Spanish/Sign Language Test for Puerto Rico (PR) by participating as a stakeholder with representation and vote capacity in the

Committee for the Development of a Screening Test for PR Spanish/Sign Language Interpreters. Ricardo Ortiz and Myrelis Aponte Samalot

(This motion, if passed, would be an exception to C89.07, which reads: *Effective January 1, 1990 the RID prohibit all its affiliate chapters and their subchapters, if any, from developing, implementing and/or administering any Quality Assurance or State/Chapter interpretation and/or transliteration testing programs.*)

Rationale:

1. When this motion passed, RID didn't have a PRRID affiliate chapter where more than 95% speak Spanish as a first language and where most of our members either don't have English fluency or don't speak it at all.
2. When this motion passed, the requirement of Spanish/ASL service by video relay service (VRS) providers wasn't approved yet by the federal government. The NIC test doesn't qualify people to work in such a platform. Who is responsible to look for the quality of that service? More so, who is qualified to qualify people in the Spanish/ASL setting?
3. Only the state of Texas provides a test to qualify individuals to work as trilingual interpreters. Still it requires interpreters to be either Board for Evaluation of Interpreters (BEI) or RID certified prior taking the test, which limits the possibility of the vast majority of PR interpreters of getting credentialed.
4. PR interpreters do not have a bilingual tool to measure their Spanish/ASL skills other than the screening that companies provide, which in many cases is not culturally and linguistically adapted to PR deaf and interpreter needs.
5. PRRID is the only interpreter association in PR and its members hold PRRID accountable to provide them with a tool to measure their skills and therefore, credentials. PRRID has the obligation to better serve the specific needs and demands of our membership and their consumers. That includes the participation in such an important project.
6. Neither RID or any other organization provides bilingual tools for the particular needs of Spanish/ASL interpreters who are strictly bilingual and who are not interested in working in English settings. This type of training and testing is still not available in the commonwealth of PR or in the mainland. These bilingual interpreters are not ready to take the NIC, given their limited English background, yet they have very competent skills in ASL/Spanish and should have their well deserved credentials.
7. By ignoring the specific needs of PR Deaf and interpreters communities, both RID and PRRID would be in conflict with the tenet 4.0 of the Code of Professional Conduct:
4.0 RESPECT FOR CONSUMERS Tenet: More specifically the:
4.1 Consider consumer requests or needs regarding language preferences, and render the message accordingly (interpreted or transliterated).
8. We would like to further the profession in PR by providing interpreters with resources, materials and tools for their professional growth

Affiliate Chapter Relations Committee: The ACRC supports Puerto Rico RID being involved in the development of a Spanish/Sign Language test.

Certification Council comments: While the Certification Council understands the need and request from Puerto Rico RID (PRRID) to have a sound and valid screening test for PR Spanish/Sign Language

Interpreters, the motion is unclear on how and what role the Puerto Rico RID would have in the development of such a test. It is also unclear as to who is developing the test. The Certification Council believes that more background information is needed. The testing experts that will be used to develop the test and how will the PRRID fit into the process is unknown. To ensure that the screening test being developed is valid, reliable, impartial and legally defensible, more information is needed about the process and all participants involved in the development of the screening test.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Not applicable. Procedural in nature.

Board comments: The board supports Puerto Rico RID being involved in the development of such a test but not in the administration of same.

National office comments: The national office supports Puerto Rico being involved in the development of such a test but not in the administration of same.

Bylaws Committee comments: The motion is unclear as to who or what "Committee for the Development of a Screening Test for PR Spanish/Sign Language Interpreters" is, or who its parent organization is, or whether or not this is a government initiative. This is required information in order for the membership to adequately debate the motion. It is important for the motion to be specific about what they are referring to with regard to the "Spanish/Sign Language Test for Puerto Rico" and "Committee for the Development of a Screening Test for PR Spanish/Sign Language Interpreters".

For this motion to be passed as an exception to C89.07, it should be very clear what the membership is permitting--is this an effort that PRRID wants to lead and just in the planning process (and these are just general descriptive names), or is this an already-in-existence effort that PRRID wants to have a voice in as representatives of PR interpreters?

Because the previous motion was a membership motion (C89.07), then it will require a membership vote to nullify in part or entirely. This is, in effect, a motion to "amend something previously adopted" and will, according to *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*, require a 2/3 vote of those voting at conference to pass, or a majority of the entire membership if the vote is conducted by mail.

Member comments:

Motion I was withdrawn before this Conference began.

President Moose delegated responsibilities of being Chair of the Business Meeting to Vice-President Rachel Coppelli.

Motion J.

*That RID ~~provide~~ **conduct a new feasibility study** regarding group rate comprehensive health insurance options for members ~~to be implemented~~ **and report back to the membership** by the 2013 RID National Conference. Judith Kroeger and Ruth Usher*

Rationale: Many members function in the capacity of an interpreter as an independent contractor and pay out of pocket for comprehensive health insurance, without the benefit of collective group rate prices. At the same time, interpreters are seeking alternative employment due to the instability of compensation benefits. Many other members are employed in positions that are not conducive to their health and safety in order to obtain comprehensive health care coverage at an affordable rate. As current trends dictate not only after-care, but preventative care in order to ensure the health, safety, and longevity of interpreters in the profession, RID can make a significant impact in the field by providing comprehensive group rate health insurance.

Referred to the national office.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: To be determined.

Board comments: The board recommends referring to the national office for feasibility study with a deadline of 2013 for the study.

National office comments: Historically, the insurance industry has found the volume in the field to be inadequate to underwrite a dedicated policy. The national office recommends this be referred to the national office to conduct a survey and then a feasibility study.

Bylaws Committee comments: Although RID does offer a health insurance option for members, it is a limited benefit indemnity coverage that pays specific amounts for different services (e.g., \$50 towards a doctor visit, up to 3 visits per year; \$800 towards outpatient surgery 1 time per year). It is not considered basic health insurance, or major medical coverage, and it is also only offered to just over half of the fifty states. In addition, the RID Member Benefits page directs the user to go to the DHH Insurance Agency's page and to click on the RID Program link there for more info on their "Health, Disability, Life, Dental, and a Pharmacy Program." Then on DHH's site, it says the RID Health insurance page is "not active." Regardless of whether or not the current insurance option is available, the motion asking for "group rate comprehensive insurance" is requesting a different type of insurance coverage, and is therefore not moot.

Member comments:

(Ryan Butts from the National Office said that insurance is currently offered through DHH Insurance though some members have concerns about what DHH offers in this regard, particularly as it varies from State-to-State.)

Amendment... substitute "conduct a new feasibility study regarding" for "provide", and then substitute "and report back to the membership" for "to be implemented" – Mala Poe (seconded).

Amendment (Poe) carries – no count necessary.

Amendment... strike "conduct a new feasibility study" and reorganize the Motion's text – Tricia Frank – ruled out-of-order by the Chair as it would amend text that the membership had already, recently approved by a formal vote.

Motion to close discussion – Hartmut Teuber – carries – no count necessary.

Motion, as amended, carries after a formal count.

Motion K.

That RID request the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) set up compensation for certified deaf interpreters in the video relay services industry. Branton Stewart and Jimmy Beldon

Rationale: The FCC has recognized certified deaf interpreters in video relay services. However, no industry members are willing to hire certified deaf interpreters due to lack of reimbursement for such work. There is no certified deaf interpreter compensation from the FCC.

Referred to the national office and the Government Affairs Program.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Not applicable. Procedural in nature.

Board comments: The board believes the concept has merit and recommends referral to the Government Affairs Program.

National office comments: As the RID Government Affairs Program (GAP) has previously included advocacy for certified deaf interpreters within its advocacy efforts with the Federal Communications Commission, we believe this motion to be moot.

GAP welcomes the opportunity to work directly with the motion makers to further our efforts and support in this area.

Bylaws Committee comments: The Bylaws Committee does not see any problem with this motion, although we are unsure why a motion is needed to ask RID to write a letter. Also, the wording could be clearer as to the position the makers wish RID to express to the FCC.

Member comments:

Motion carries unanimously.

President Moose resumed responsibilities as Chair of the Business Meeting.

Motion L.

That RID work, in collaboration with appropriate stakeholders, on the development of a standard practice paper for Trilingual (Spanish-English-ASL) Interpreting. David Quinto-Pozos and Yolanda Chavira

Rationale: Trilingual (Spanish-English-ASL) interpreting occurs regularly throughout the United States. Such services are supported by various VRS providers, and multiple communities throughout the country utilize trilingual interpreters regularly across multiple domains (e.g., community, educational, social service, and legal settings). As one example, trilingual interpreters appear often in Individual Education Plan (IEP) Conference meetings throughout the K-12 educational system (e.g., to interpret amongst the deaf/hard of hearing signing children, the Spanish-speaking parents, and the English-speaking school personnel). Additionally, the Gallaudet Research Institute (GRI) reported that, in 2008, nearly 22% of deaf and hard of hearing children in K-12 programs throughout the country come from households where Spanish is the dominant language. These facts provide evidence that trilingual interpreting is growing, and it will likely continue to increase in demand over the next several years.

Currently, an RID standard practice paper does not exist for Trilingual (Spanish-English-ASL) Interpreting. Yet, we feel that the need for such a document is imminent. We suggest that various aspects of trilingual interpreting should be considered for inclusion in the document (e.g., protocol for team support, need for appropriate remuneration for services rendered, trilingual certification as available, and guidelines for using trilingual interpreters).

Diversity Committee Comments: The Diversity Committee is in favor of RID, in collaboration with appropriate stakeholders, developing a Standard practice paper for Trilingual interpreting. While the focus, due to national demographics, is on Spanish/English/ASL, the principles should consider the circumstances surrounding **all** trilingual (and poly-lingual) working conditions.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Minimal to significant on a yearly basis. Cost of a committee varies from several hundred dollars per year when conference calls are sufficient to approaching \$10,000 for face-to-face meetings, including all associated costs for travel, per diem, hotel, interpreting and audio-visual costs, depending on size of committee, location of meetings, etc.

Board comments: The board supports the motion.

National office comments: The national office believes the association should move forward on this salient issue.

Committee position: The Bylaws Committee does not see any problems with this motion.

Member comments:

Motion carries unanimously.

Motion M.

That the RID national office investigate how to improve the visual accessibility to viewing ASL content by creating minimum specifications standards to be met within region conferences by the 2012 regional conferences and in workshop rooms in national conferences by 2013. Bill Moody and Jeanette Welch

Rationale: Access to ASL in RID meeting rooms is no longer just about interpreter services, it is about our commitment to ASL and the visual environment where ANY member present should be able to see it. Currently, this is not the case.

As our profession continues to evolve, our commitment to Deaf-friendly/ASL RID activities is increasing. This example is highlighted by the Region I conference "ASL commitment" buttons, encouraging all social, business, plenary and entertainment conducted in ASL. While Region I is not the first, nor the last to promote ASL as the conference language, it is of note that access to seeing it from a distance/in a large room has not kept up with the technology available to make full membership participation a reality.

National conferences large audience events (1000+) have begun to demonstrate a high quality visual access to the presenters on stage and activities in the front of the hall that are visually accessible throughout the room through the use of high-definition and professional quality camera/projection equipment. However, some national conferences workshops, and both plenaries and workshops at regional conferences in general, are woefully far from meeting even a minimum standard of visual accessibility for signers sitting midway in a medium sized room.

Issues to address:

Here we will highlight areas of concern and include a few recommendations.

1. Lighting: Recommendation: separate and controllable lights for speakers, interpreters, participants, and PowerPoint screens are needed in RID-sponsored presentations:

SIGNING SPEAKER(S): for large groups, the lighting should include 2 frontal side lights and at least one backlight (from the ceiling would be most appropriate so that the light does not shine in participants eyes). Only in groups of less than about 100 people can such lights on the speaker(s) and the projection of the speaker(s) on a screen be dispensed with, and then only if a test has proven that the presenter or his/her image is clearly visible from the back of the room and the signer's facial grammar and sign inflections are clearly visible.

INTERPRETERS for SPEAKING PRESENTERS: for large groups, the lighting on interpreters also should include 2 frontal side lights and at least one backlight (from the ceiling would be most appropriate so that the light does not shine in participants eyes). Only in groups of less than about 100 people can such lights on the interpreter and the projection of the interpreter on a screen be dispensed with, and then only if a test has proven that the interpretation is clearly visible from the back of the room and the interpreter's facial grammar and sign inflections are clearly visible.

PARTICIPANTS: ability to see each other throughout the presentation, unless there is a compelling reason to bring house lights to black.

POWERPOINT: There should be a separate screen for a signing presenter's Power Point (one screen may be sufficient for a speaker presenting in English). Often the lights that are for the speakers impact the PP screen, making it impossible to see. PowerPoint screens must be far enough from a signing presenter to avoid light spill on the Power Point screen.

2. Screens: In rooms that accommodate over 100 participants, there should be two screens, one for the PowerPoint and one for the signer (speaker or interpreter). Participants who are seated in the middle to back of the room cannot see the ASL content clearly enough for comprehension and engagement without a quality image. LCD screens are much preferable to 1950s-style home movie fold-up screens often offered by hotel media departments. If the hotel does not have quality screens, maybe RID should consider renting quality equipment which will include signing participants (either Deaf or hearing members desiring immersion in conference ASL). In larger rooms, there may be a need for larger screens or more than 2 aligned with the stage that does not provide any support for those in the back of the room.

3. Multiple screens: For large, plenary/banquet events (300+) where participants are seated throughout, multiple screens should be installed around the room for access.

4. Presenter/interpreter monitors: Monitors for visual access for presenters and panelist should be provided for important meetings. Often these monitors are also crucial for the working interpreters in larger meetings.

5. Closed microphone systems: The RID should evaluate how open and closed microphones impact participant's experience, and provide closed FM systems or loops for participants who are not ready to access content solely through ASL (it should be noted, however, that students may stand the most to gain by immersing themselves in the ASL presentations without English interpretations...).

6. Hotels?: Maybe hotels (which have the convenience of centralized accommodations, food, and meeting facilities for conferences for hearing people) are not the ideal place for conferences which involve ASL access. Maybe RID should begin to look for other venues, like convention facilities, exhibition halls, or even camps (which have no union rules and may be amenable to bringing in rented A/V equipment) to find venues that might provide the quality of visual access required for the most reasonable price.

Fiscal Impact: This does require money. Without further investigation, it is hard to predict if a traveling kit (subject to wear and tear and falling behind technology) is preferable to renting equipment from city to city. But the issue is crucial to the future of Deaf-friendly events sponsored by RID.

Cost per member/fiscal impact: Highly significant to critical for region conferences. Minimal to significant for national conferences since numerous changes have been implemented for the 2011 Conference.

Board comments: In support of the concept, and to refer to the national office and the Deaf Advisory Council, when established, for further investigation.

National office comments: Thank you for this important information. In regard to the national conference, we have taken multiple steps in regard to audio-visual (AV) needs from member comments solicited by RID post-conference in 2009. As a direct response to comments received in 2009, we have increased screen sizes, added additional and brighter lighting in each room, placed more screens in larger rooms, set rooms wide instead of long where appropriate, and added CART services to the larger rooms.

The national office is unable to comment on past actions in regards to AV at regional conferences, as we were not involved in their events. However, as RID is now involved in the planning aspect of future regional conferences, processes from the regions are currently being reviewed. We have found discrepancies among regions in regards to AV provided in educational sessions, and we are discussing parameters which will assure that the basic needs in the arena of AV are met, and in addition, bring the AV at regional conferences more in-line with the AV present at a national conference.

Member comments:

Motion carries – no count necessary.

President Moose asked the assembled membership to accept all of the following resolutions:

Resolution A.

Whereas, The 2011 RID National Conference takes a great deal of financial investment, and;

Whereas, RID is committed to offering a valuable and enjoyable conference experience at an affordable cost, and;

Whereas, The financial commitment provided by sponsors enables RID to provide a more enhanced conference program;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation and gratefulness for the generosity of the sponsors of the 2011 RID Conference.

Board of Directors

- Paramount** Gallaudet Interpreting Service (GIS)
- Premier** Sorenson
- Platinum** ASL Services
Deaf Access Solutions
Purple
Siena Heights University
- Silver** Access Interpreting
ACS
The California Court Interpreters Programs
DHH Insurance Agency
National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC)
National Technical Institute of the Deaf (NTID)
Troy University
- Bronze** Communication Access Ability Group (CAAG)
Conference of Interpreter Trainers
Language Services Associates
Sign Language Interpreting Specialists
SignTalk
TIEM Center
- Partner** Georgia Interpreting Services Network
- Passport** CEUs on the Go, Inc.
Communication Access Ability Group (CAAG)
Dawn Sign Press
Maryville College

- REG BAG DROP** UNC - Do It Center
- Scholarship Sponsor** Sign Language Resources
- Spanish Translation of the Program Book** SWITS

Resolution B.

Whereas, The educational component of the 2011 RID National Conference offered a variety of professional development opportunities covering a wide range of topics and disciplines in the field of professional sign language interpretation and transliteration; and;

Whereas, Speakers and presenters at the 2011 RID National Conference have committed their time, attention and expertise to provide a wide range and depth of topics to the program schedule;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the speakers and presenters of the 2011 RID National Conference.

Board of Directors

Resolution C.

Whereas, The members of the RID national committees, task forces, work groups and member sections serve the organization with impeccable work ethic and passion; and;

Whereas, Committee, task force, work group and member section members devote countless hours, often away from their families and jobs, in the desire to advance the profession, and;

Whereas, Tremendous progress has been made to the RID programs and services during the service of these volunteer leaders;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the service of the members of the 2009 - 2011 RID committees, task forces, work groups and member sections.

Board of Directors

Resolution D.

Whereas, The 2011 RID National Conference Support Staff members serve long hours with no pay and little compensation for food and travel, and;

Whereas, The 2011 RID National Conference Support Staff members work from very early in the morning until very late in the night, and;

Whereas, The 2011 RID National Conference Support Staff members are a key component to the success of the national conference;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the service of the 2011 RID National Conference Support Staff members.

Board of Directors

Resolution E.

Whereas, The 2011 RID National Conference Interpreters are on a national platform in front of their peers and colleagues, working tirelessly to provide communication access for the 2011 RID National Conference, and;

Whereas, The 2011 RID National Conference Interpreters are an essential element to the success of the 2011 RID National Conference;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the service of the 2011 RID Conference Interpreters.

Board of Directors

Resolution F.

Whereas, Rachel Coppelli served on the RID Board of Directors as Region I Representative, from 2004-2007, Secretary, from 2007-2009 and as Vice President from 2009-2011, and;

Whereas, Rachel Coppelli served tirelessly and admirably with unwavering commitment to the growth and development of the organization; and;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the service of Rachel Coppelli to the association and to the profession.

Board of Directors

Resolution G.

Whereas, Amy Seiberlich served on the RID Board of Directors as Region IV Representative, from 2008-2009, and;

Whereas, Amy Seiberlich served tirelessly and admirably with unwavering commitment to the growth and development of the organization; and;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the service of Amy Seiberlich to the association and to the profession.

Board of Directors

Resolution H.

Whereas, Jonathan Webb served on the RID Board of Directors as Region V Representative, from 2007-2009, and;

Whereas, Jonathan Webb served tirelessly and admirably with unwavering commitment to the growth and development of the organization; and;

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved, That the membership of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf do hereby express their sincere appreciation for the service of Jonathan Webb to the association and to the profession.

Board of Directors

Motion to accept all of these Resolutions, in toto -- Debbie Matthews-Arment (seconded) – carries unanimously.

Motion N.

(from the floor)

That RID recognize and accept that a candidate who has passed either of the two sections of the NIC Interview and NIC Performance, but not both, be required to retake only the portion not passed, and that the fee be prorated to cover only the portion being retaken, and this action shall be retroactively applied to those candidates who have taken the NIC Interview and NIC Performance from 2009 to present excluding candidates who have successfully completed certification as of July 2011. Rebecca Visca

Rationale:

This change in the testing process is more efficient and cost effective for the RID in time, process and procedures. This change would still be in keeping with the integrity, validity and dignity of the NIC performance and NIC interview.

This will bring in line the consistency that the written section is treated as a separate entity to the two sections which is treated as one. Initially, the interview and performance sections would be given in tandem as they currently are.

The "retake" requirement would only be for that separate section the candidate failed. This process will allow more candidates through the testing process. This process will allow more time for the evaluators to evaluate more candidates. This process will allow the candidate to focus on the failed section and not the redundancy of preparing for the section of the exam that successfully was passed. The retroactive aspect is included because the motion was originally submitted in Philadelphia PA, 2009 conference.

Considering the turnaround time of 6 months between exam dates, it is unreasonable to require a candidate to focus on the added length of time and expense for this length time period to retake a section of the exam that was already successfully passed. This is unreasonable and redundant.

The testing process needs to be fair, equitable and consistent in the requirements. If you need to pass the written before you can take the interview and performance sections, then there is no need to retake the written again within a 5 year period because you have this amount of time to pass the other two sections. The same should apply to the other two sections of the exam. The section that is passed should be validated as complete same as the written with focus on retaking the section that was not achieved which needs to be retaken with the same 5 running year frame. It would be reasonable if the time frame between testing dates (6 months) would be reduced to 3 months. The time line of 6 months is asking a lot of the candidate, expense and focus.

A change would be cost effective to the candidate and RID. RID can process 2 candidates who are taking the sections of the exam they failed to 1 candidate who must retake both sections of the exam. This is very efficient as well for all concerned.

It is common sense that with this change that a candidate is now able to focus their time, energy and study on the section they failed rather than spread their energy and study on both sections, 1 that was passed and the other that needs passing.

EXAMPLES:

Teacher certification and credential process. The teacher passes one section of the exam, math but fails science. The state does not require the teacher candidate to retake the science and math portions again. The state requires that they take the section they failed only.

Driving test. The candidate takes the written exam first, similar requirement as RID, similar requirement as RID, and must pass before they can take the performance part exam (driving). The candidate driver does not need to retake a section of the test they already passed if they fail the performance part (driving). They need only take the part they failed.

In the GED testing process, need only take the failed sections.

Current NIC process: Looking at the testing process like a pie. There are three pieces to the pie. Once the candidate passes the written part (1/3), they are required to take 2/3 of the NIC test again and again until they pass both sections together.

If two candidates fail 1/3 of the 2/3rds of the test of the performance and interview portions, then both candidates are required to take 2/3rds of the test again. (The part they already passed and the part they failed) This is unreasonable and inefficient. This ties up the system's time line and places an unreasonable expectation and unfair burden on a candidate. Two candidates taking the 1/3rd section the exam they failed would be the same amount of time as 1 person taking both thirds. RID is getting 2 for 1 and the candidate is treated fairly.

Motion-Maker: Rebecca Visca, Associate, California

Seconder: Dwight D. Godwin NIC, Connecticut

This motion was originally submitted and accepted at the RID National Conference Business Meeting, August 2009, Philadelphia, PA.

Chair rules the motion out-of-order as it's being presented by an Associate member yet it deals with Certification issues.

Motion O.

(from the floor – a rewording of Motion F)

That RID create a committee to investigate the feasibility of, and procedures to implement, a system to recognize specialized skills not requiring a specialist certification.

The committee is to be tasked with:

- 1) For specializations RID, via the NIC Task Force, and its impending survey, determines do not require an independent certification exam, develop the following:*
 - a. Criteria that will be disseminated to all stakeholders detailing how to develop and maintain requirements of a curriculum by either an individual interpreter, group of interpreters, or a body of higher learning that when completed will provide interpreters with the pre-requisite skills to effectively interpret in a given specialized area.*
 - b. Criteria regarding the minimum information to be contained in a portfolio to demonstrate an interpreter has the requisite skills to effectively interpret in the specialized area he/she is seeking.*
 - c. A general example of core competencies and minimum requirements for a specialization (linguistic skills, content mastery, ethical considerations, practicum requirements).*
 - d. An outline what is required to satisfactorily complete all competencies as well as how to verify competencies were satisfactorily completed.*
 - e. Determine the most efficient and effective way to identify what areas of specialization a member has completed. (ex: RID membership card, RID Web-based database, etc.)*
 - f. Requirements that will be needed to maintain said specialization.*
 - g. Costs of implementation and possible income sources (ex: additional dues) this expansion of the CMP will incur.*
 - h. Outline grievance procedures and revocation protocols.*
 - i. Other issues deemed integral to this project.*
- 2) Report back to the membership of RID for input and modification in preparation for a vote to establish the specialization recognition paradigm at the 2013 RID National Conference. Bryon Rowe*

Rationale:

This paradigm is an expansion of RID's current CMP and would be to encourage interpreters to develop specialization skills and to have those skills officially recognized within the field of interpreting for the Deaf.

Deaf individuals have had many barriers to achieving their full potential removed in recent decades, and the Deaf community is comprised of an extremely diverse population with wide scopes of interests, needs, and goals. This removal of barriers has resulted in many Deaf individuals obtaining advanced degrees or training in highly specialized fields of study.

A generalist certification is a requirement to begin interpreting for the Deaf it is in and of itself insufficient to meet the needs of an extremely diverse and increasingly specialized population of deaf individuals and Deaf professionals.

Many higher education entities in the US provide degrees of interpreting in a specialization (educational, medical, etc.) however successful graduates have no officially recognized way to inform interested stakeholders that HE / She possessed specialized training. As well many individual interpreters have spent years developing and honing skills in a specific specialty to better serve the Deaf community and also have no way to have their skill recognized.

RID still maintains the word Registry within its name (registry is defined as an official list) historically RID was created to provide a list of persons capable of interpreting for the Deaf and currently maintains a list of said persons detailing their name, location, contact information, Certificates held, Category, Freelance Status as a service made available for all stakeholders. However does not contain information on an interpreter's expertise in any specialization. (except Legal, performing arts).

It is financially unfeasible for RID to develop myriad specialization certification exams to meet the wide variety of possible special needs Deaf people have.

RID currently has a CMP system well established that includes an independent studies component.

Technology and VRI continue to improve it may be possible for a Deaf consumer to request the services of a specialized interpreter who may be located at a great distance (perhaps in conjunction with a local interpreter) with the goal of availing themselves of the best possible expert interpreter in His or Her field.

It is hoped that as more curricula are approved and are easily accessed by the interpreting community, via RID's website, more interpreters will avail themselves of the independent studies option within the CMP or decide to attend specialized training offered through institutions of higher learning. Seasoned interpreters who have been interpreting in a specialized field will create and submit a portfolio to obtain official recognition and validation of His / Her specialization. With more interpreters adding specialization(s) to their generalist certification hopefully we will accomplish the ultimate goal of better services being provided to the Deaf community.

Member comments:

Seconded.

Motion fails – no count necessary.

Motion P.

(from the floor)

That all future National and Regional Conferences include a philanthropic initiative that benefits the Deaf Community as part of their respective Conferences. Jacqueline Emmart and Dennis Cokely

Rationale:

In honor of returning the deaf heart to RID, passing this motion would formalize that relationship and serve as one way to ensure our roots are strong. Region I included a philanthropic effort in our 2010 regional conference that was highly successful, as demonstrated by the overwhelming gratitude expressed by recipients, and resulted in strengthened ties to the deaf schools. The motion makers would like to see the spirit of "giving back" infused at all levels and carried forward.

Member comments:

Seconded.

Motion to close discussion – Jo Ann Kranis – carries – no count necessary.

Motion carries – no count necessary.

President Moose indicates that time has expired for the Business Meeting.

President Moose informed the assembled members that Joy Carney, a member of RID for more than 40 years, passed away yesterday (July 20, 2011).

Meeting concludes 11:58 am, July 21, 2011.