



**Visual Language  
Professionals**  
*Promoting high standards in sign  
language interpreting*



**10<sup>th</sup> December 2012**

Dear Mr Thomas

Earlier this year, VLP sent a survey to its members asking a number of questions relevant to our membership, and to the interpreting profession in general. Following this survey, in which we received a fifty per cent response rate, the results indicated members would like us to represent their views on continual professional development (CPD). We discussed this further at our conference in November. The steering committee now feel we have a clear mandate to continue opposing the compulsory CPD that NRCPD have imposed.

We recently held talks with Unite; the union involved with the Speak-Out Campaign. The results of these meetings were discussed with members at the conference. This means that should any member of VLP be removed from the Register for failing to complete their CPD hours, we feel there are legal options available to challenge the Boards decision. VLP is happy to support our membership through a test case.

Grounds for the challenge are as follows:-

1. NRCPD's own consultation document clearly showed that membership, at the time, did not want CPD to become compulsory.
2. This is now reflected in the survey carried out by VLP, with seventy per cent of respondents stating they did not want compulsory CPD.
3. As it stands, CPD is not equitable for full or part time workers. In addition, it does not take into account those who may be pregnant, or suffer a long term illness, etc.
- 4 It is felt that NRCPD's actions contravenes Employment Law, that removing an interpreter from the Register restricts their ability to trade. This is especially the case for freelance interpreters who are registered as sole traders or as a company.
- 5 That the Board are behaving in a dictatorial way by increasing fees in the current financial climate, with no consultation or explanation for the increase.
- 6 The Practitioners Forum, which should meet on a regular basis (twice so far), has no influence on any decision that the Board might make, and is merely a token gesture to placate the organisations represented at the Forum.

7 Interpreters are not represented on the Board; therefore the Board is not in a position to appreciate the day to day life of an interpreter.

8 The Board are not taking into consideration the knowledge and expertise a majority of VLP members have acquired during the many years in the profession.

9 A significant number of VLP members were heavily involved in the establishment of ASLI and CACDP (which became Signature and the Register).

10. The Board are behaving like Employers, which is not their remit.

It is not the intention of VLP to subvert the NRCPD, but we will fully represent the majority view of our members. With that in mind, VLP feels the Board are following the previous actions of ASLI which eventually led to the birth of VLP. At this stage, we do not want to see the establishment of an alternative register but wish to work further to find a solution to this situation.

As CPD is a requirement as of the 1st of January 2013 we would ask for an urgent meeting to discuss the above points before chaos ensues to the detriment of everyone concerned!

Yours sincerely,



Alan Haythornthwaite  
VLP Steering Group.