

4. Kloster R, Engelskjøn T. Sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP): a clinical perspective and a search for risk factors. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1999;67:439-44.

Theodor W. May, Ph.D.
Bernhard Rambeck, Dr. rer. nat.
Department of Biochemistry
Epilepsy Research Foundation, Bethel
Maraweg 13
33617 Bielefeld
Germany

Ralf Schnabel, M.D.
Institute of Neuropathology
Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich
Thalkirchner Str. 36
80337 München
Germany

Author's Response

Sir:

I thank Drs. May and Schnabel for drawing our attention to work recently published in the neurological literature that has important ramifications for the practice of forensic pathology. Drs. May and Schnabel go on to distill the practical point of interpreting post-mortem anticonvulsant levels by saying that "It should be kept in mind that the individual therapeutic serum level may differ from the recommended therapeutic range and that the evaluation of serum levels should primarily depend on the clinical condition of the patient and not on the therapeutic ranges." We had hoped to make just this point in our article in the final paragraph of the Discussion. However the point is made, it is an important one. Ideally, a forensic pathologist will be able to discuss a specific case with the decedent's personal physician, thereby learning what was an effective therapeutic concentration in that particular individual.

Gregory G. Davis, M.D.
Assistant Professor of Pathology
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Associate Coroner/Medical Examiner
Jefferson County, Alabama

Commentary on the American Board of Criminalistics (ABC) Certification Process

Sir:

In the ABC Certification News (Volume 6, Issue 1, Summer 1999), we were notified that another route of certification was being implemented for Technical Specialists in Drug Analysis and Molecular Biology. The following letter was sent to the ABC Board of Directors & Examinations Committee on August 06, 1999. The opinions expressed in the letter may be of interest to the forensic science community.

Re: Technical Specialists—Drug Analysis, Molecular Biology

The American Board of Criminalistics (ABC) is a professional organization that "was formed by a majority of the nation's forensic science associations to establish a certification process." (1). This certification is defined as "a voluntary process of peer review by which a practitioner is recognized for attaining the professional qualifications necessary to practice in one or more disciplines of

criminalistics" (1). Nowhere in the purpose or definition of the certification process is there mention of certifying individuals whose nature of work is "Drug Analysis" or "Molecular Biology" in the absence of demonstration of competency in criminalistics. The ABC certification process does not include professional certification of "Technical Specialist—Drug Analysis" and "Technical Specialist—Molecular Biology."

As mentioned in the American Board of Criminalistics Certification Program document, the California Association of Criminalists (CAC) developed a program, which "recognized that the changing nature of the work required increasing specialization, but maintained a strong commitment to a solid foundation in the full range of criminalistics" (2). Since the incorporation of the American Board of Criminalistics in 1989, this organization "has seen basic knowledge of other forensic disciplines, as measured by a General Knowledge Examination, as essential to a certification program."

These statements indicate that a knowledge of criminalistics of a certified member is both important and essential. In fact, there was a need for the testing of the candidate's knowledge to be standardized. As such, the "ABC was incorporated in 1989 in response to a need perceived by many criminalists for a national certification program."

With the development of new scientific techniques and procedures for physical evidence analysis, there must necessarily be changes in the operation of the laboratories where the analyses are performed. The trend in most forensic laboratories is toward increased specialization and away from the generalist or "holistic" approach to problem solving.

Admittedly, increased specialization necessitates that forensic laboratories hire individuals with precisely defined skills. Many of these individuals do not have a sufficient understanding of the basic principles of criminalistics. Often, however, laboratories confer the title of "criminalist" upon these technical specialists. A technical specialist does not become a criminalist by virtue of a title or by working in a forensic laboratory but rather by the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA's) needed to be a criminalist. Criminalistics is "concerned with the recognition, identification, individualization, and evaluation of physical evidence using the methods of the natural sciences in matters of legal significance" (3). Thus, it is a science that draws on many disciplines. Technical specialists who work within a forensic environment can be exposed to many different disciplines during physical evidence analysis. Regardless of the specialization that practitioners engage in, the ABC "supports the philosophy that forensic scientists must have this broad understanding of many aspects of forensic science"(2). It is through the General Knowledge Examination (GKE) that this broad understanding is tested. To further this argument, the Certification Program Structure embodies a four concept approach whose second concept is "a general understanding of a field is needed before specializing." The GKE tests four subject areas, of which not any one subject area is more significant than another (4).

In a Certification News publication (Volume 6, Issue 1, Summer 1999), we were astounded to find that the ABC is assuming the responsibility of certification of Technical Specialists. The newsletter states that "these practitioners find themselves serving as specialists" and "many of these specialists may have little or no formal interactions with case investigators, and/or the nature of the samples provided for examination"(5). Paradoxically, the article also mentions "that all practitioners in any laboratory with the name "forensic" in its title should be expected to pursue opportunities to gain a well-rounded competence in understanding and managing multidisciplinary casework"(5).

Since the Technical Specialist Examination serves as “one important part of the overall measure of accomplishment necessary to become certified as a professional *criminalist*”(5), and since “many of these specialists may have little or no formal interactions with case investigators, and/or the nature of the samples provided for examination”(5), how does the Technical Specialist in drug analysis or molecular biology become a criminalist after successful challenge of the Technical Specialist Examination? For example, it can be argued that the responsibilities of a Technical Specialist employed in a forensic DNA laboratory and one employed in a research DNA laboratory are similar with the only difference being the nature of the workplace.

The introduction of this route of certification contradicts the original goals and objectives of the ABC. The ideological fault of this certification procedure is that it places the principles of criminalistics secondary to those of the specialty area. This aspect of the examination procedure is upsetting. Since the proposed Technical Specialist Examination contains a “Specialty Examination Component” and a “Forensic Science Core,” one wonders what the difference is between this examination route and the one already established, which is the combination of the GKE with the Specialty Examination (SE)?

We sincerely hope that we have conveyed to you our deepest concern at the direction the ABC is taking with the introduction of the Technical Specialist Examination. Our concern is selfish in that we do not desire to see the esteemed field of criminalistics reduced to a mere patchwork of scientific disciplines where falsely proclaiming criminalists tarnish the reputations of those who are truly knowledgeable. The introduction of this new examination cannot strengthen criminalistics, but has the potential to cripple it.

References

1. Certification Process, American Board of Criminalistics, Inc., ABC 102 3/97.
2. ABC Manual Section A, 11/97, Page 1 of 5.
3. De Forest, PR, Gaensslen, RE, and Lee, HC, *Forensic Science: An Introduction to Criminalistics* (McGraw-Hill, 1983), page 4.
4. Certification Process, American Board of Criminalistics, Inc., ABC 102 3/97.
5. ABC Certification News, Vol. 6, Issue 1, Summer 1999.

Robert Adamo, D-ABC
 Christopher Chany, D-ABC
 Fredrick Drummond, D-ABC
 Stewart M. Hung, (D-ABC), certification eligible*
 Ted Pool, D-ABC
 Lawrence Quarino, F-ABC*
 Ralph R. Ristenbatt, III, D-ABC*
 David San Pietro, D-ABC

ABC Response

Sir:

I thank the authors for taking the time to express your concerns and address your questions regarding the American Board of Criminalistics' Technical Specialist Certification program. I am grateful that we have had the opportunity to discuss this in person, as your sentiments are strongly felt and deserved the reasoned discourse that only face-to-face conversation allows.

As we discussed, there is no doubt that the provision of certification for Technical Specialists (TS) in both Molecular Biology and Drug Analysis represents a departure from the current ABC programs of certification. In fact, in all communications regarding TS certification, the Board has insisted that distinctions between the Diplomate, Fellow and Technical Specialists must be made clear to both practitioners and criminal justice stakeholders.

Ultimately, the ABC Board decided that the provision of TS certification appropriately extended professional certification to a category of forensic practitioners for whom certification was desired and appropriate. These practitioners are just as strongly defined as criminalists as are Diplomates and Fellows of the ABC. However, they are different in their demonstrated scope and level of competency with respect to managing multidisciplinary casework.

The differences embodied in the descriptions of Diplomates, Fellows and Technical Specialists do not denigrate the field of criminalistics. Indeed, by rejecting a narrow definition of criminalistics in favor of one that incorporates the realities of today's forensic science laboratories—in which we criminalists work—the ABC believes that the extension of certification to Technical Specialist will ultimately result in a stronger profession. Having more professional criminalists meet the objective, peer-based challenge of certification will absolutely improve the credibility of the entire field.

It is a policy of inclusion and comprehensiveness that has guided ABC to this point. ABC is jointly managed by its member organizations. We recognize our joint responsibility to provide professional certification pathways for as many varieties of criminalists as possible, because we believe that certification is the best objective means to consistently gauge professional competency and foster true professional development among practitioners.

It is my sincere hope that you will continue to contribute your passion for this process by becoming active in Board and Examination Committee governance and subcommittee activities. When future calls for nominees and volunteers are made, your representation of NEAFS or other forensic organizations to which you may belong will help assure the on-going vitality of the ABC and the field of criminalistics.

Carl M. Selavka, Ph.D., D-ABC
 President