

RESNET® Standards Public Comment and Proposed Change Form

Comment/Explanation*:

Include your justification for your proposed change to the draft standard below.

We support the proposed changes in Addendum 108f. A failed QA review should be an opportunity to identify what went wrong, provide coaching, and help the Rater or RFI improve, not simply impose a penalty.

These changes align with our perception of RESNET's goal of using QA to correct problems and strengthen the quality of future ratings. We especially appreciate that the proposed process clearly states the required opportunity for coaching and improvement while still allowing further action when someone is unwilling to cooperate or correct recurring issues.

We support this proposed change. However, we believe that a definition of "low-volume Rater/RFI" in 905.6.4.4 would allow Providers to apply the requirement consistently, if it were added to this proposed changes of this addendum.

Proposed change: strike, "low-volume Raters/RFIs", add "Raters/RFIs who complete (100) or few ratings during the calendar year", so that the final section reads:

905.6.4.4 If the noncompliant ratings are due to inaccurate or incomplete field work, the Rater and/or RFI Field QA reviews shall be increased by 1 rating for ~~low-volume Raters/RFIs~~ Raters/RFIs who complete (100) or fewer ratings in a calendar year or 2 ratings for all other Raters/RFIs.

Proposed Change to the Draft Standard*

Use "strikethrough" and "underline" formatting to indicate all proposed changes. Changes must be shown with "hard-formatting" strikethrough and underline, not "track changes".

Use a color other than red to indicate proposed changes to the draft.
