**RESNET® SDC 200 Training Curriculum Subgroup Meeting Minutes**

May 21st, 2025

2:00 PM – 3:00 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/DMSGBCdjKcBDSe6xrhk_obLhhEm2rLa8COwMrMvCh3AmlUh7kAjoAb7SFTAUfvsg.etvCfU5MtOVwFJZp)

Passcode: k#6m37sd

Members Present: Sharla Riead, Mark Schroer, Tei Kucharski

Staff: Katie Stewart

Meeting started at 2:03 PM ET

**Opening Remarks**

Sharla Riead welcomed members and outlined the new subgroup's goal: to update and clarify training curriculum requirements. Sharla raised concerns about inconsistencies among direct providers who also train, noting some are not meeting required standards.

Tei Kucharski supported the initiative, citing their experience evaluating Rating Field Inspectors (RFIs). Tei shared an example where a trainee was unaware of a key three-page evaluation form, calling it ineffective without proper training. Tei emphasized that data collection must be based on understanding, not just trainer preferences.

Tei stressed the need for greater oversight and standardization of training delivery by providers. Sharla noted recent RFI group updates, including new building science and continuing education requirements, but Tei questioned if those steps are sufficient. Tei emphasized that evaluation roles need to be clearly defined and not rest solely with QA Providers. **Questions Raised:**

* Should there be two separate curricula? One for general training, and one for QA Providers overseeing field training.
* Who should be responsible for trainer evaluations?

**Meeting Recap and Key Discussion Points**

The group reviewed the historical model for HERS® Rater training, which originally included comprehensive classroom instruction covering all RESNET standards, followed by two field ratings with hands-on equipment usage. After this, candidates would complete a minimum of three probationary ratings under a QA Provider to become certified. This structure eventually shifted due to complaints from QA Providers who were frustrated with having to retrain raters to meet their specific field procedures. In response, RESNET moved more of the training online, making it more accessible and reducing the amount of time required away from work. Although the requirement for five probationary ratings remained, the responsibility for this practical training was shifted to QA Designees or qualified Candidate Field Assessors.

1. **Concerns Over Current Practice:** Despite the original intent, concerns have emerged that in practice, the hands-on field component is being replaced by video watching. This shift undermines the intent of the standards, which explicitly require in-person, field-based instruction followed by an evaluation conducted by a qualified individual. There is concern that this deviation may lead to insufficiently trained raters entering the field without proper experience.
2. **Oversight and Role Confusion:** Tei raised concerns about unclear distinctions between the roles of trainers and QA Providers. Cited instances where individuals acting as “QA Managers” were conducting evaluations without being certified raters or having proper training. This role confusion between training providers and those handling certification was highlighted as a key issue for clearer role definitions, noting challenges of navigating overlapping responsibilities in the field.
3. **Standard Language and Enforcement Gaps:** Sharla highlighted Section 206.1.5 (Probationary Work), recommending clearer language to distinguish training activities from the certification evaluation process. Probationary work is meant to provide hands-on experience under qualified supervision, while certification evaluation determines readiness for certification. However, these stages are increasingly being blurred, with some unqualified individuals—such as uncertified QA Managers—conducting evaluations, which violates RESNET standards. A Candidate Field Assessor must be a certified HERS Rater in good standing with at least 25 compliant ratings, verified by the QA Provider. Mark Schroer noted that while Chapter 2 outlines requirements, it lacks enforcement language found in Chapters 1 and 9. Mark urged revisiting Chapter 9, potentially with help from the SDC 900 group, to strengthen accountability. The group emphasized the need for clearer standards, qualified evaluators, and stronger enforcement to uphold certification integrity.
4. **Improving Oversight and Accountability:** The group discussed the idea that RESNET should take a more active role in monitoring training sessions, potentially through regular attendance and spot checks. There was general agreement that RESNET should conduct annual or biannual reviews of certified individuals’ training paths to ensure that the field components are being executed as intended.
5. **Cross-Provider Confusion and Certification Transfer:** An additional concern involved candidates who completed field components with one provider but were told these would not count when they switched to a different QA provider. This results in confusion and financial loss for trainees who have paid for training they believed would count toward certification. The group acknowledged the need for clearer, standardized recognition of probationary ratings across providers and better communication and transparency of what is transferable.

**Next Steps and Action Items**

The subgroup members agreed to begin a review of Chapter 9, with the goal of identifying areas where clearer language and stronger enforcement mechanisms are needed. As part of this effort, Sharla plans to coordinate with John Hensley, SDC 900 chair, to explore adding members from his task group to support the review and revision process.

* **Action**: Katie Stewart, RESNET staff, will upload a copy of Chapter 9 to the group’s shared Dropbox folder for initial review.

The next meeting is scheduled of the **Training Provider & Training Program Oversight Working Group is scheduled** for **May 27th, 2025, at 11:00 AM ET**, which will be led by Doug McCleery.

Sharla Riead will provide a report following the May 27th meeting to help guide the subgroup in mapping out the next steps based on that discussion.

* **Action:** Ensure that Mark Schroer is added to the subgroup member list.
  + Current members include Sharla Riead, Mary English, Eurihea Speciale, and Tei Kucharski.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM ET