COMMISSION ON CREDENTIALING PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH BEHAVIOR BY A CANDIDATE TAKING A QUIZ IN RP STEP ONE PARTS 1-7 IDENTIFIED AS SUSPICIOUS BY RESPONDUS MONITOR

1. Once a Commissioner serving as a reviewer has determined that there is suspicious behavior by a candidate taking a quiz in RP Step One Parts 1-7 that is confirmed by the video provided by Respondus Monitor, the Commissioner who is doing the review will send an email to the candidate from the Commission’s email informing them that it appears that some suspicious behavior occurred during the exam and asking them for an explanation on the behavior.
2. The reviewer will share both the video of the suspicious behavior and the candidate’s response with the entire Commission on Credentialing.
3. If the behavior is blatant and can be confirmed, e.g. , there are notes and papers on the desk/table that were not removed, the reviewer needs to notify the Chair of the Commission on Credentialing so a determination can be made if the candidate’s access to taking further quizzes should be stopped until there is a resolution of the behavior that appears to have violated the honor code.
4. When the full Commission meets following individual Commissioners’ review of the video and the candidate’s response:
	1. The Commission will first determine either (i) to notify the candidate that upon preliminary review no basis to challenge the validity of the quiz-taking has been found, with or without instructions to be more careful about avoiding whatever behavior was flagged when taking future quizzes or (ii) to notify the candidate that a hearing will be required, with information on the process to be followed; if the candidate’s ability to take further quizzes was not previously suspended under (3), the candidate will be informed of a suspension pending the hearing.
	2. The candidate will be provided with access to the video recording, and a written explanation of the concerns, based upon the video, that the candidate may have engaged in cheating. The candidate will be given a reasonable deadline to submit any additional written information, told of the right to request an extension of that deadline if good cause is shown, and told of the right to participate in a subsequent hearing during which the candidate will have the opportunity to provide an oral argument and evidence, while being subject to questioning by Commissioners.
	3. A hearing via Zoom will be scheduled at a mutually convenient time.
	4. At the hearing: (i) the candidate will first be accorded a reasonable time to show cause why the candidate ought not be found to have cheated and be sanctioned accordingly, through oral argument and presentation of evidence; (ii) Commissioners will ask questions of the candidate; (iii) the candidate will be given a reasonable time to present a final argument.
	5. Following the hearing, the candidate will be excused and the Commission will deliberate. A finding of guilt requires a 2/3 vote of the entire Commission; if guilt has been found, the discipline to be applied will be separately voted upon, also requiring a 2/3 vote of the entire Commission to be imposed.

Discipline

Candidates who are judged by the Commission to have violated the instructions for using Respondus and/or the Honor Code may be disciplined as follows:

1. Barred from continuing the RP process for up to two years.
2. Anyone barred from taking the RP quizzes must start over from the beginning once they are reinstated.
3. To start the process again, the member must send a written request to be reinstated to the Commission on Credentialing.
4. If, after investigation, the Commission is convinced that while there was a violation, it was not one that altered the exam results, a warning could be given to the candidate. For example, say there is a post-it note on the wall, but the candidate never got up during the exam and looked at the note: that could be considered an infraction that violates the environmental scanning rules, but does not rise to the point of being suspended from the RP process.
5. Anyone suspended from the RP process may also have charges sent to the NAP Professional Responsibility and Member Discipline Committee.