



The Chair
NRCPD Board
Mersey House
Mandale Business Park
BELMONT
Durham
DH1 1TH

24 February 2012

Dear Chair

I am writing regarding the recent consultation of the 'Setting the Standard' document, and in particular, the Boards decisions linked to the expressed views of the interpreters and organisations that responded to it.

In particular I would like to highlight the results published regarding the issue of compulsory CPD. On this particular point, the board has ignored the majority view of interpreters, even though you accepted the majority view on ALL the other consultation points.

Visual Language Professionals has always supported the idea of on-going training to improve personal working standards. However, we believe that this on-going training should be decided by the interpreter themselves and should not be imposed by any other organisation. As a membership organisation we feel that it is more productive to offer support and encouragement to our colleagues in their professional development.

The main catalyst for setting up Visual Language Professionals was the interpreters' reactions to ASLI's decision to make their CPD compulsory. The VLP Steering Committee feels we should

Steering Committee
Linda Ahmed, Melissa Barker -Simpson
Alan Haythornthwaite, , Van Holtom, David Wycherley,

inform the Board that we are currently witnessing the same reaction from our members to the decision to make CPD compulsory for registration with the NRCPD. The stated aim of the Board is to "Drive up the standards and profile of the registration service through making its procedures more credible, professional and accessible." However, nowhere is it stated exactly how the logging of CPD hours will actually improve the standards of the profession, and how the Board intends to measure this improvement.

We also feel we need to bring to your attention that interpreters are starting to raise questions about a Registry which doesn't allow the individuals on that Register to call themselves Members of that Register. The consultation exercise last year demonstrated that the views of interpreters are secondary to that of the Board. The Board does not have working interpreters as part of its membership. This has allowed such language as tokenism to be used when the Board talk of considering the views of working interpreters, and representing them at a national level. One has to seriously ask, "What is the point of having meetings and consultations when in fact our views are overruled by the Board.

Could the Board respond to the following points?

How will the Board measure the submissions on CPD and to what criteria will they be using?

What is the measure that you will be using to show an increase in standards and how do you expect to prove an increase?

Will the Board consider at the earliest time to include practising professionals as a part of the membership of the Board?

In light of the majority views of the consultation, will the Board respond to those clearly expressed views and rescind the 'compulsory' element of the CPD scheme?

We are aware that much of the thrust of the Boards decisions were made before VLP was in existence and therefore a balanced view on many of these issues was not available. However now that there is an alternative viewpoint in the marketplace it would seem a viable option to revisit some of the aforementioned decisions.

Regards

Alan Haythornthwaite
Visual Language Professionals Steering Committee