

I hold national certification through RID and have for many years, it is an important credential for community

interpreting. I also hold a TX BEI level V. These certifications do not necessarily make me the best VI or the worst. They certify that I did well on the test on a given day. An interpreter must make an ethical decision in preparation including honestly choosing assignments that match their skill and comfort level when working as a freelance interpreter.

Working as a Video Interpreter (VI) involves a completely different skill set. Managing technology and 'phone culture' are key components that make VRS interpreting different from anything in the community and these things are NOT covered well in the RID/NAD national certification exam. Additionally, as a member of RID that I have misgivings about the validity of new certification RID is currently using labeled the NIC exam. I know some highly qualified interpreters who are stellar VIs who have not passed the NIC exam and conversely those of questionable ability who have passed. Other VRS companies may have different feelings, I know Sorenson has provided me top-notch training from day one of my employment and at regular intervals in how to keep abreast of those skills needed as a VI as well as workshops related in general to ASL and interpreting. These have been offered for free. In short, Sorenson values the same professional development and high skill level that RID works to uphold in our industry; they however tailor the trainings they give to the specific needs of VRS interpreters and consumers.

Having or getting NIC certification is by no means the only valid read of an interpreter's ability to provide skilled VRS interpreting services. However, I do believe VIs should be held to a certain standard and I'm happy to say that Sorenson has developed an assessment that all new hires need to pass at a certain level and that current employees all have to take as well; anyone who does not score within a certain range will be given support to meet a higher standard of service. This evaluation is called the QSSR.

I appreciate the efforts of the FCC to provide ever-improving VRS services to our Deaf and hearing consumers, perhaps continuing to micro manage the VI's who work in VRS is not a way to improve services to our deaf, hard of hearing, and hearing consumers. I believe that this approach of "one-size fits all" does not work for interpreters in VRS. I pray that the FCC will see that this Proposal 10-51 is not in the best interest of all who are providing and using VRS services no matter which VRS provider they are using or work for, and reject this Proposal 10-51.