**RESNET SDC 200 Training TG Meeting**

May 27th, 2025

Second & Fourth Tuesdays of the Month

11:00 AM – 12:00 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/0mq8GCGIhq221VhabwPkgpfx_uKp0wtgBPbryxYfGgybnBNR9fDUxOcIRaVCUugM.xVn_j69D1QhPAwu0)

Passcode: !Z&=U6td

Present: Sharla Riead, Robert DuTeau, Doug McCleery, Eurihea Speciale, Mark Schroer, Tei Kucharski

Staff: Laurel Elam, Katie Stewart

Meeting began at 11:01 AM ET

Welcome and Introductions

1. Identify Multiple-QA Provider Issues Requiring Edits in Chapter 2.
Sharla Riead started the discussion by providing updates on two groups:
	1. **Exam Subgroup:** Sharla reported feedback from RESNET® indicating that the team should wait for the psychometrician to be in place before proceeding with the HERS® rater exam questions. However, the group agreed to move forward with practical exams, simulations, and HERS modelers. A meeting is pending to begin working on these exams without access to the written exam questions.
	2. **Training Curriculum Updates:** Sharla raised an issue regarding individuals being certified without completing the required training. She pointed out that training is happening, but it does not meet the required standards. A review of Chapter 2 was conducted, and it was concluded that the real issue lies not in documenting the requirements, but in enforcing them. Sharla reached out to John Hensley from SDC 900, who agrees that this group must be responsible for ensuring RESNET's quality checks and the training field work of certified Quality Assurance Designees (QAD) and credentialed candidate field assessors. A new work item will be created for SDC 900, and once approved, the joint group will begin working on this issue.

Robert DuTeau mentioned that texting is prohibited in the standards, but querying AI is not explicitly mentioned. Robert raised concerns about how this can be enforced, especially with advancements like voice commands, which students might use to read exam questions aloud and inadvertently query AI.

Tei Kucharski asked whether the equipment can be modified to block AI assistance during testing. Eurihea responded that using a third-party or professional testing center would resolve this issue. Doug McCleery suggested reviewing the proctoring standards to determine if updates are needed.

Sharla shared information about an external proctoring program that restricts AI use, suggesting it might be a potential solution.

Doug asked if Robert’s group could investigate the technical feasibility of these solutions further. Eurihea clarified that the responsibility for setting up proctoring rules lies with organizations requiring the testing, and that established testing centers like SPI could be relied upon. However, there would be an added cost to using these centers.

Robert expressed concerns about the Rater Written Exam, stating that while the practical exams and RESCaz exams are not vulnerable to cheating, the written exam still requires attention.

1. **Training Provider Update:** It is currently unclear whether a solid foundation has been established for the topic of training provider certification and its maintenance. The most recent communication from Zak Shadid, two weeks ago, was an email aimed at coordinating interested parties, but this effort requires further attention and progress. Doug will follow up with Zak after the meeting.
	1. The group, which includes Eurihea Speciale, Zak Shadid, Robert DuTeau, and Doug McCleery, to provide updates on the progress of defining the requirements for training provider certification and its ongoing maintenance.
2. **Multiple QA Providers Issue:** Doug outlined the issue of multiple QA providers and the need for changes in Chapter 2. Specifically, the team reviewed sections related to:
	1. **Accredited Training Providers (Chapter 2, 203):** It was proposed that training providers should be responsible for maintaining records in the RESNET registry and uploading documentation on field evaluations, energy modeler ratings, and mentoring sessions.
		1. **203.2.4 and 203.2.5** were highlighted as sections requiring additional information.
		2. **206.2 Certification:** The certification process should be updated to ensure that a candidate’s ID number can be used to link all required data, which should be made transparent in the registry.

Tei asked if multiple QA providers should have the ability to make comments on a candidate’s profile. Doug clarified that the registry is not currently equipped to handle this.

The issue was also raised under 207.2 Recertification; it was pointed out that language needs to be updated to address multiple QA providers and their role in enforcing disciplinary actions across different training providers. Eurihea clarified that this topic belongs to SDC 900 and is more related to software solutions, which are not under the purview of the current committee.

1. **Software and Registry Issues.** The team discussed potential changes needed for the RESNET registry and software to accommodate multiple QA providers:
	1. **Probationary Ratings:** Current standards do not address the need for documentation to support probationary ratings. It was suggested that RESNET needs a platform to upload and store this data, with transparency for both candidates and providers.
	2. **Multiple Software Platforms:** There was a discussion about how to handle candidates using different software for certification. The suggestion was made to include a dropdown menu in the registry to track which software was used for each exam and designation.

**Next Steps**

* Doug McCleery (Lead) will poll the group to identify who is willing to help with the documentation of language changes in Chapter 2.
* Doug or Sharla will send an email to the working group outlining the subgroups and expectations moving forward.
* Doug will also reach out to RESNET to discuss the necessary updates to the registry and software solutions.
* The potential for a meeting time change will be assessed and updated as needed.

Meeting ended at 12:09 PM ET