PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS PROPOSAL

National Professional Standards for Dog Trainers and Behavior Consultants in the United States

A blueprint for voluntary self-regulation, competency assessment, ethics, public accountability, and consumer protection.

AUTHORED BY

Will Bangura

M.S., CAB-ICB, CBCC-KA, CPDT-KA, FDM, FFCP

Certified and Accredited Canine Behaviorist

2026

> Dog training and canine behavior consulting in the United States have developed without unified national professional standards. The blueprint below describes a serious, voluntary, science-informed framework for changing that, built on competency assessment, ethics, public accountability, veterinary collaboration, and consumer protection.

Why a National Standards Structure Is Needed

Dog training and canine behavior consulting in the United States have developed without a unified national standards framework. Several established credentialing organizations have done meaningful work over the past several decades to advance education, ethics, and professional practice in this field, and many qualified professionals hold credentials that reflect serious study and verified skill. What does not yet exist is a coordinated national structure that ties education, examination, registry, and accountability together under shared, publicly recognizable standards. Without that coordination, the public, veterinarians, shelters, insurers, and policy stakeholders have no consistent reference point for evaluating providers, and the profession has no shared identity it can present to the broader healthcare and public safety landscape.

This is consequential because the work itself often is. Trainers and behavior consultants routinely engage with cases involving aggression, severe fear and anxiety, reactivity, bite history, child safety, and complex behavior pathology. These cases carry welfare implications for the dog and safety implications for the household and the public. Pet parents searching for help in these situations face a marketplace in which credentials, training methods, scope of practice, and accountability mechanisms vary widely from provider to provider, and in which the meaning of any particular title is not always transparent to the people who most need that clarity.

The proposal that follows describes a credible response to that gap. It is not a campaign against the existing profession, and it does not claim that current credentialing organizations lack value. It is a blueprint for unified professional self-regulation, the same model that supports many other recognized professions in the United States. Self-regulation tends to set standards before law does, and when it is built well, it produces standards that are more technically sound than legislation written without the profession's input. The goals are professional identity, public trust, consumer protection, humane practice, validated competency, public safety, and durable working relationships with veterinarians, applied animal behaviorists, and other allied professionals.

Licensure is discussed in this proposal only as a long-term possibility, focused on narrow categories of high-risk behavior work, and only after the underlying voluntary standards have been established and adopted. The first step is to build something the profession can join because it is credible, not because it is required.

Core Mission

The mission of the proposed organization is to advance dog training and canine behavior consulting through nationally recognized standards of education, ethics, humane practice, competency assessment, public accountability, and consumer protection. The intent is to raise the floor of professional practice through voluntary participation, to make competence verifiable for those who seek that verification, and to give the public, veterinarians, and other stakeholders a trustworthy reference point when evaluating providers. The work is built on collaboration with the existing field, not on replacing it.

Organizational Model

The proposed structure has three coordinated components. They are designed so that educational, examination, and registry functions remain operationally independent. This separation matters because conflicts of interest are difficult to manage when the same body trains, tests, and lists professionals. The model below reflects practices used in established credentialing fields where independence between education and assessment is treated as a baseline integrity requirement.

American College of Dog Training and Behavior (ACDTB)

The parent organization sets professional standards, accredits educational programs, governs the code of ethics, advances research literacy, advocates for humane practice, and represents the profession to the public, to government, and to allied fields. The College is the standards body. It does not certify individuals, and it does not run the registry. Its authority rests on the rigor of the standards it produces and the credibility of the people who develop them.

American Board of Dog Training and Behavior (ABDTB)

The Board is the credentialing and examination authority. It develops examinations, oversees practical skills assessment, validates competency, recognizes diplomates, and manages continuing education requirements at the credentialing level. To preserve the integrity of credentialing, the Board operates independently from the College's educational accreditation arm, so that examination development is not driven by the schools that prepare candidates. This separation is standard practice in legitimate credentialing systems and is a precondition for public confidence.

National Registry of Dog Trainers and Behavior Consultants (NRDTBC)

The Registry is the public-facing accountability layer. It maintains a searchable database of credentialed professionals, verifies credentials in real time, tracks continuing education compliance, records disciplinary actions, and recognizes specialty designations. Pet parents, veterinarians, shelters, insurers, and municipalities who choose to consult the Registry can verify a professional's standing in seconds. Without a public registry, the rest of the structure is not visible to the people it is intended to serve.

Credential Ladder

A credible profession benefits from a clear ladder, with defined entry, advancement, and specialty tiers. Three levels are proposed.

Registered Dog Trainer (RDT)

The entry-level professional credential. Requirements include completion of an accredited educational program (or a rigorous approved legacy pathway), a written examination covering learning theory, canine ethology, body language, welfare science, ethics, and consultation skills, an observed practical skills assessment, signed agreement to the code of ethics, basic background standards, and ongoing continuing education. The RDT is intended to signal competence in foundational training work with companion dogs and the ability to recognize cases that should be referred to a more advanced practitioner or to veterinary care.

Registered Dog Behavior Consultant (RDBC)

The advanced credential for professionals working with behavior pathology, fear, anxiety, reactivity, aggression, and complex behavior modification. Requirements build on the RDT and include advanced coursework in applied behavior analysis, affective neuroscience as it applies to companion animals, behavior modification planning, and aggression safety, supervised case experience under qualified mentorship, documented case logs reviewed by peers, an advanced practical assessment, and an ethics review. The RDBC is intended to be a credential a veterinarian can refer to with confidence when a case extends beyond basic training needs.

Diplomate, American Board of Dog Training and Behavior (DABDTB)

The specialty tier for senior professionals who have demonstrated sustained excellence in the field. Requirements include years of documented professional practice, substantial advanced case logs, peer review, an advanced specialty examination, a record of contribution to the field through

teaching, mentorship, writing, or research dissemination, ongoing continuing education, and ethics standing. The Diplomate designation is intentionally selective. It is intended to function as a public marker of expertise at the highest tier of voluntary professional credentialing.

Foundational Standards of Practice

Standards of practice define what competent, humane, and ethical work looks like in this field. The proposed standards are evidence-informed, welfare-centered, and consistent with the broader scientific literature on learning, emotion, and stress in companion animals.

Practitioners are expected to use the least intrusive, minimally aversive effective intervention appropriate to the case, to consider the dog's emotional wellbeing alongside behavior change, to choose methods consistent with current animal behavior science, to operate within their scope of practice, to refer when a case exceeds their competence or shows possible medical contributors, to communicate clearly with pet parents about goals, methods, risks, and realistic outcomes, to maintain safety for the dog, the household, the public, and the practitioner, and to follow defined protocols when behavior risk escalates.

These standards are intended to function as the operational baseline for credentialing, accreditation, and ethics review, not as aspirational language.

Scope of Practice

The boundaries of the profession are best stated explicitly. Dog trainers and behavior consultants do not diagnose medical conditions, do not prescribe medication, and do not replace veterinarians or veterinary behaviorists. They are expected to recognize behavioral presentations that may have a medical contributor, including sudden behavior change, possible pain-related reactivity, cognitive decline in older dogs, signs that may suggest neurological involvement, and patterns that warrant veterinary evaluation. Referral to a veterinarian, and where appropriate to a board-certified veterinary behaviorist, is a professional obligation rather than a courtesy.

This clarity protects the public, protects the dog, and protects the profession. A field that drifts into territory that belongs to veterinary medicine loses credibility with the medical community. A field that fails to refer when referral is indicated loses the trust of the people it serves. The standard works in both directions.

Competency Standards

A written examination, taken alone, cannot fully validate competence in a field that requires real-time judgment under live conditions with a sentient learner. The competency standard therefore evaluates knowledge and applied skill together. The proposed scope of competency assessment includes:

- Learning theory at a working professional level, including operant and respondent conditioning, stimulus control, and the functional analysis of behavior
- Canine ethology and body language, including stress signaling, conflict behavior, and affective state recognition
- Aggression safety, risk assessment, and bite history evaluation
- Coaching and adult education skills, since most training work is delivered through people
- Humane handling and equipment selection
- Behavior modification planning, including antecedent arrangement, reinforcement strategy, and progression criteria
- Client communication, informed consent, and case documentation
- Welfare assessment across training and behavior modification work
- Risk management and emergency protocols

This is intended as the floor for a registered professional, not the ceiling.

Practical Skills Assessment

A meaningful credential benefits from observed performance. Practical assessment evaluates handling skills, leash mechanics, reinforcement timing, body language interpretation in real time, training mechanics with a live dog, coaching of a pet parent through a defined exercise, humane interactions throughout the session, and the ability to construct and explain a basic behavior modification plan. Practical assessment distinguishes a working credential from a paper test. It is also the element that gives veterinarians, insurers, and the public a substantive reason to treat the credential as more than self-described expertise.

Educational Accreditation

The College should accredit the educational programs that prepare candidates for credentialing. Accreditation should apply to schools, academies, university certificate programs, structured mentorship programs, and supervised internships. Accredited curricula should cover behavior science, ethology, learning theory, welfare science, canine cognition, humane handling, aggression safety, ethics, business professionalism, and consultation skills, with substantial supervised practical experience built into the program rather than added on the side.

Accreditation should not become a pay-to-play system. Standards must be applied consistently regardless of an applicant program's size, brand, or financial contribution to the College, and accreditation decisions should be made by qualified reviewers with documented conflict-of-interest disclosures. The credibility of accreditation depends entirely on the perception, and the reality, that it cannot be purchased.

Legacy and Grandfathering Pathway

Many experienced professionals built their careers before the proposed structure existed. A credible national framework needs to recognize that experience while still maintaining rigor. The legacy pathway is designed to be respectful of established professionals and substantive enough to preserve the integrity of the credential.

The pathway considers documented years of professional practice, case logs reviewed by qualified peers, evidence of continuing education, professional references, observed practical assessment, ethics review, and a transition examination calibrated to the relevant credential tier. Existing credentials from established organizations are considered as part of the record. The pathway is not a token gesture, and it is not automatic. It is a serious bridge for serious professionals, and it is essential to the political and practical viability of the model. A framework perceived as exclusionary will not gain the broad participation it needs to succeed.

Ethics and Conduct

The code of ethics covers humane treatment of dogs, informed consent, transparency about methods and expected outcomes, honesty in advertising and credentials, management of conflicts of interest, client confidentiality, referral obligations to veterinary and veterinary behavior care, public safety obligations, professional boundaries with clients, and the responsible use of social media and

public-facing content. Ethics in this field is operational rather than abstract. It governs daily decisions about welfare, safety, and the trust that pet parents place in professionals during emotionally difficult moments.

Complaint and Discipline System

Standards are most credible when they are accompanied by fair, transparent enforcement. A complaint and discipline system gives the public a meaningful avenue for redress and gives credentialed professionals a clear, predictable process when concerns are raised.

The system includes a defined complaint intake process, a fact-finding investigation phase, a peer ethics review panel with documented procedures, a graduated range of outcomes (which may include private reprimand, required remediation, supervised practice, suspension, or revocation when warranted), and a formal appeals process. Due process protections for the accused are essential. So is appropriate transparency for the public on outcomes that affect credentialing status. A profession that asks for public trust accepts public accountability as part of the same agreement.

Veterinary Collaboration Model

The relationship between trainers, behavior consultants, and the veterinary profession is foundational to this proposal. The proposed model includes a veterinary advisory council within the College, formal referral standards that work in both directions, collaborative care guidelines for cases that benefit from joint management, and clearly defined protocols for behavioral presentations that may warrant medical evaluation.

The framing is collaborative rather than competitive. Dog trainers and behavior consultants complement veterinary medicine. They do not replace it. Veterinary behaviorists, applied animal behaviorists, and credentialed trainers and consultants each occupy distinct, defensible roles in the continuum of care. A national standards organization that takes that continuum seriously will be in a strong position to earn veterinary engagement over time. The proposal does not assume any existing endorsement from veterinary organizations. Building those relationships is part of the work.

Public Registry

The Registry is the most visible part of the framework for the public. Through a single search, a pet parent can verify whether a provider holds a current credential, what tier that credential occupies, whether continuing education is in good standing, whether any disciplinary actions are on record,

and which specialty designations apply. Veterinarians can use the same tool to identify referral partners. Shelters and rescues can use it to evaluate program providers. Municipalities can use it to identify qualified evaluators in dangerous dog cases. The Registry is what turns the rest of the structure into something the public can actually use.

Insurance and Risk Partnerships

Liability insurers, homeowner insurers, shelters, rescues, municipalities, veterinary groups, and humane organizations all carry risk that is connected to the quality of training and behavior services available in their communities. Each is a potential long-term partner. Insurer preference programs, in which credentialed professionals could receive favorable treatment in coverage or rates, are presented here as a future possibility worth pursuing rather than as an existing benefit. The proposal does not assume any current insurer recognition of the proposed credentials, and any future claims of insurer involvement should be supported by verified agreements before they appear in public materials.

Legislative Strategy

Legislation is treated in this proposal as a downstream possibility rather than a starting point. Beginning with broad licensure tends to generate resistance from the very stakeholders the model needs to engage, and produces statutes that are not anchored in mature professional standards. The proposed phasing reflects a more realistic path.

Phase 1 establishes voluntary national standards and credentials, builds the educational accreditation pipeline, and seeks adoption through credibility rather than compulsion. Phase 2 launches the national registry and works toward consumer-facing recognition of the registered titles, including engagement with media, veterinary associations, and consumer protection bodies. Phase 3 explores title protection at the state level, so that titles such as Registered Dog Trainer, Registered Dog Behavior Consultant, and the Diplomate designations could carry legal meaning in jurisdictions that adopt them. The proposal does not assume that any of these titles are currently legally protected. Phase 4, where appropriate and where evidence supports it, considers specialty licensure or formal state recognition for high-risk behavior work, including aggression, dangerous dog cases, severe behavior pathology, and public-safety-relevant practice.

Each phase is contingent on the phase before it. Legislation built on top of established voluntary standards has a meaningfully better chance of succeeding than legislation that tries to define a profession from scratch.

Public Messaging

The public posture of the organization is intended to be professional, collaborative, public-safety oriented, consumer-protection oriented, humane, and science-informed. The message is not that the existing profession is unqualified, and it is not that current certifications lack value. The message is that the profession is maturing, that unified national standards are being built, that pet parents now have a clear way to verify credentials and accountability status, and that credentialed professionals are accountable to the public they serve. A consistently professional tone is part of the strategy, not a stylistic choice.

Governance

A governance structure capable of carrying this work includes a Board of Directors with defined fiduciary responsibilities, a Standards Committee responsible for the standards of practice, an Educational Accreditation Committee, an Ethics and Discipline Committee, a Veterinary Advisory Council, a Public Safety Advisory Council, a Scientific Advisory Committee composed of qualified researchers and applied behavior scientists, and a Continuing Education Committee. Each body has a defined charter, defined membership criteria, term limits, and conflict-of-interest disclosures. Strong governance is the precondition for credibility and the foundation for public trust.

Funding

Sustainable funding sources include membership dues, examination fees, accreditation fees for educational programs, continuing education programming, conferences, sponsorships consistent with conflict-of-interest policy, foundation grants, and, in time, partnerships with insurance and adjacent fields. Credibility requires resisting over-commercialization. Sponsorship from product manufacturers in particular must be governed by strict policy so that the standards body cannot reasonably be perceived as captured by industry interests. The financial model serves the mission. It does not shape it.

Five-Year Goal

Within five years, realistic targets are a published national standards framework, a network of accredited educational pathways, a functioning national registry, recognized credential titles in consistent use among participating professionals, established working relationships with veterinary

and welfare organizations, early conversations with insurers, and broad voluntary adoption across the field. Licensure is not on the five-year horizon. The five-year work is to make the standards real, visible, and trusted.

Ten-Year Goal

Within ten years, the model could support title protection legislation in receptive states, the development of insurer preference programs where insurers find the credentials useful for risk evaluation, preferred-provider relationships with shelter networks and veterinary practices that opt in, broader public recognition of the credential names, and formal state recognition of registry standards in jurisdictions that find the framework useful for their own consumer protection and public safety mandates. Ten years is when a well-built standards body begins to influence policy, rather than waiting on it.

Why This Model Has a Realistic Chance

The proposal has a realistic chance because it begins with professional self-regulation rather than government control. Self-regulation invites participation rather than requiring it. It is collaborative rather than punitive. It gives trainers, behavior consultants, veterinarians, applied animal behaviorists, shelters, rescues, insurers, municipalities, humane organizations, and pet parents a shared structure they can engage with on terms that respect each constituency's interests. None of these groups is asked to give up authority in the early phases. Each is invited to help build something that did not previously exist. That is the kind of coalition that can hold together long enough to produce durable standards.

Closing

A credible profession is built slowly, through standards, accountability, education, and trust. The blueprint described here is a serious response to a real gap in the American dog training and behavior consulting field. It would create a recognized professional identity, a verifiable competency standard, a humane and evidence-informed framework of practice, an accountability structure the public can rely on, and a working partnership with veterinary medicine. It would do this voluntarily at first, and only consider legal recognition once the underlying standards have been established and adopted. The path is long, and the model is ambitious. The first step is the standards themselves, built carefully enough that the rest of the structure can stand on them.

Frequently Asked Questions

Are dog trainers licensed in the United States?

No U.S. state currently requires a license to practice as a dog trainer or behavior consultant. Several states, including Massachusetts, New Jersey, Illinois, California, and New York, have introduced licensure-related bills at various points, but no state-level licensure law has been enacted. Existing credentials in the field are voluntary professional certifications offered by independent organizations.

What is the difference between a dog trainer and a dog behavior consultant?

Dog trainers generally focus on teaching obedience, manners, and skills. Behavior consultants address behavior pathology, including fear, anxiety, reactivity, and aggression, and frequently work alongside veterinary professionals on cases that involve significant emotional and welfare components. The proposed Registered Dog Trainer (RDT) and Registered Dog Behavior Consultant (RDBC) credentials reflect this distinction in scope and competency requirements.

Do dog trainers need certification to practice?

Certification is not legally required in any U.S. state. It is, however, the primary way that pet parents, veterinarians, shelters, and insurers can verify professional training in the absence of licensure. The proposal described in this document would unify and strengthen that verification process at a national level through a public registry and a clear credential ladder.

Would this proposal replace existing dog trainer certifications?

No. The proposal recognizes the work that established credentialing organizations have done over the past several decades and contemplates a legacy and grandfathering pathway that considers existing credentials as part of an applicant's record. The aim is unification under a national framework, not displacement of the existing field.

How does this proposal relate to veterinary medicine?

The proposal is collaborative with veterinary medicine, not competitive. Dog trainers and behavior consultants do not diagnose medical conditions, do not prescribe medication, and do not replace veterinarians or veterinary behaviorists. The framework includes a Veterinary Advisory Council, formal referral standards in both directions, and clearly defined protocols for behavioral presentations that may warrant medical evaluation.

About the Author

WILL BANGURA, M.S., CAB-ICB, CBCC-KA, CPDT-KA, FDM, FFCP

Will Bangura is a Certified and Accredited Canine Behaviorist with more than 35 years of experience specializing in severe aggression, fear, anxiety, reactivity, phobias, and compulsive disorders in dogs. His work is grounded in behavioral psychology, applied behavior analysis, learning theory, affective neuroscience, and evidence-based animal behavior science.

This proposal reflects extensive engagement with the professional landscape of dog training and behavior consulting in the United States and is offered as a starting point for serious dialogue across the field.