

Genetic Counseling Certification Eligibility Task Force
Guidance Document
Last revised April 2016

Rationale:

Recommendations from the Institute for Credentialing Excellence (ICE) include that sponsoring organizations, such as ABGC, must document the process and rationale used in setting or reviewing eligibility criteria for certification.

With the separation of the genetic counseling accreditation and certification bodies in 2013 into ABGC and ACGC, ABGC now recognizes the need for a defined mechanism for evaluating bodies that accredit genetic counseling training programs in order to ensure that applicants for the certification exam have met established standards of knowledge, skills and practice for the genetic counseling profession. As such, ABGC needs to establish a set of criteria to ensure an appropriate level of rigor/quality is employed in the accreditation of genetic counseling training programs whose graduates would be eligible for certification by ABGC. These criteria and the process for their evaluation should be such that they can be used to evaluate both ACGC, the current accrediting body recognized by ABGC, and other genetic counseling accrediting bodies, such as international ones.

The motivations for addressing these issues at this time are ABGC's responsibility to periodically review eligibility criteria for the examination based on current environment and requests for certification from graduates of genetic counseling training programs accredited by international accrediting bodies.

Charge:

- Review the components that constitute minimum competence as noted by ICE Eligibility Criteria Report.
- Compare the current examination eligibility criteria to the ICE elements and determine if the current criteria are sufficient and congruent with ICE or if changes are necessary.

Term: The work of the taskforce should be completed within 12-18 months.

Points to consider and key questions:

Minimal competence is conferred by more than just a passing score on the exam. The ICE Eligibility Criteria Report Task Force describes these as the four E's – Education, Experience, Ethics and Examination. In general, the non-examination requirements are those that are needed in order to be eligible to take the exam.

Are the current minimum standards adequate?

What is the process for evaluating these?

Should other minimum standards for the non-examination requirements be proposed?

What are the criteria of the other 3 Es?

Is there a need or should the taskforce exam if any other requirements or criteria be adopted to qualify for the examination? (e.g., medical degree, nursing degree plus genetics training)