

**Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis (Part A)****State Board of Psychology**

Agency Name

Division

**Ronald R Ross**

Contact

**77 South High St Suite 1830 Columbus OH  
43215-6108**

Agency Mailing Address (Plus Zip)

**614-466-1085**

Phone

**614-728-7081**

Fax

**4732-9-01**

Rule Number

**AMENDMENT**

TYPE of rule filing

Rule Title/Tag Line

**Requirements for admission to the examination for a  
psychologist license.****RULE SUMMARY**

1. Is the rule being filed consistent with the requirements of the RC 119.032 review? **No**

2. Are you proposing this rule as a result of recent legislation? **No**

3. Statute prescribing the procedure in accordance with the agency is required to adopt the rule: **119.03**

4. Statute(s) authorizing agency to adopt the rule: **4732.06**

5. Statute(s) the rule, as filed, amplifies or implements: **4732.06, 4732.10, 4732.15**

6. State the reason(s) for proposing (i.e., why are you filing,) this rule:

Proposed amendments.

7. If the rule is an AMENDMENT, then summarize the changes and the content of the proposed rule; If the rule type is RESCISSION, NEW or NO CHANGE, then summarize the content of the rule:

The primary proposed changes to this rule intend to serve as notice that the Board is redefining the meaning of a degree deemed "equivalent" to a doctoral degree in

psychology or school psychology (and providing a 3-year phase out of case-by-case transcript reviews); and, to clarify Board rules relative to degrees from: 1) non-U.S. institutions and 2) degrees from U.S. institutions with "candidate for accreditation" status.

The Board has judged that, within its authority to promulgate rules relative to minimally sufficient academic training required for licensure as a psychologist, all candidates for the psychologist license shall have an earned doctoral degree from a program that exists for the express purpose of training professional psychologists; and, that degrees be earned from a bona fide regionally accredited institution of higher education (not the low threshold of "candidate" for accreditation). The 3-year phase-out is afforded as a reasonable period for candidates who are already enrolled in a doctoral program based on the anticipated case-by-case review of the final transcript.

By statute (4732.10), for admission to examination for the psychologist license, the Board recognizes doctoral degrees in psychology, school psychology, or a doctoral degree deemed "equivalent." The proposed change in this rule (first paragraph) and in a proposed new rule (OAC 4732-9-01.01) continues to recognize the "equivalent" degree route in statute, but redefines it by requiring that the doctoral program itself have certain accreditation as a professional psychology training program--as opposed to the current rule, which leads to a case-by-case review of the transcript and dissertation. This rule, if amended, would be valid for three more years and can be rescinded after that time once all existing equivalent reviews are completed in the office.

Please note that the course lists in this rule are currently used for such case-by-case reviews and will remain effective for the 3 years while the rule is still functioning. Within the 3-year phase out, applicants can continue to request an individual "equivalence" review of a doctoral degree in a field other than psychology or school psychology according to the relevant section of the rule (depending on when the degree was granted).

The deletion in (A) of this rule is proposed because it is confusing and inaccurate. Use of this date (July 15, 2000) was related to a previous rule update in section (A)(2)(b) of this rule requiring additional hours for courses taken after July 15, 2002 (not degree completed). Striking this is important because there is no reality to the implication that there is a requirement that any degrees needed to be completed before July 15, 2002.

A minor proposed change to section (C) of this rule serves to correct a typo in the second line.

More noteworthy in this section (C) are the next insertion and deletion. This rule currently deals with: 1) doctoral degrees from U.S. institutions with "candidate for accreditation" status to be deemed "equivalent" to a degree in psychology; and also

with 2) degrees from non-U.S. institutions. The first added text is pasted from later in the rule [from (C) (1)] so that this rule can be reserved only for the "candidate for accreditation" issue. The proposed addition in 9C) also sets a 3-year timeline for review of degrees earned from institutions with "candidate for accreditation" status. Currently (and for the next 3 years if amended) this rule entitles a person with a degree from an institution with "candidate for accreditation" status the right to an equivalence review (to a degree in psychology). After the 3-year phase-out, all degrees will have to be earned from regionally accredited institutions. The Board has pronounced (and it is widely accepted) what a low threshold "regional accreditation" is (even full regional accreditation)--as opposed to the even lower threshold "candidate for accreditation." Therefore, this change is consistent with the concept of requiring all degrees (after 3 years) to be bona fide psychology training degrees from regionally accredited institutions.

Please note that the proposed deletion of text in (C) (relative to non-U.S. degrees) is deleted here but is pasted into a new rule (OAC 4732-9-01.02) so it can be granted more overt attention instead of being relatively buried in the current rule. The processes related to non-U.S. degrees need to be more clearly advertized and by striking language here and placing those requirements in a new rule this issue is more appropriately addressed.

The proposed change to section (F) are intended to clarify (and separate into separate rules) the U.S. "candidate for accreditation" institutions and the non-U.S. degree issue again but in the context of non-accredited institution degrees to be deemed equivalent to a doctorate in school psychology [equivalence to psychology degrees are dealt with in (C)]. The proposed addition of language is intended to phase out (over 3 years) case-by-case equivalence reviews of degrees for equivalence to school psychology doctorates from institutions with "candidate for accreditation" status.

8. If the rule incorporates a text or other material by reference and the agency claims the incorporation by reference is exempt from compliance with sections 121.71 to 121.74 of the Revised Code because the text or other material is **generally available** to persons who reasonably can be expected to be affected by the rule, provide an explanation of how the text or other material is generally available to those persons:

*This response left blank because filer specified online that the rule does not incorporate a text or other material by reference.*

9. If the rule incorporates a text or other material by reference, and it was **infeasible** for the agency to file the text or other material electronically, provide an explanation of why filing the text or other material electronically was infeasible:

*This response left blank because filer specified online that the rule does not incorporate a text or other material by reference.*

10. If the rule is being **rescinded** and incorporates a text or other material by reference, and it was **infeasible** for the agency to file the text or other material, provide an explanation of why filing the text or other material was infeasible:

*Not Applicable.*

11. If **revising** or **refiling** this rule, identify changes made from the previously filed version of this rule; if none, please state so:

*Not Applicable.*

12. 119.032 Rule Review Date: **11/24/2006**

(If the rule is not exempt and you answered NO to question No. 1, provide the scheduled review date. If you answered YES to No. 1, the review date for this rule is the filing date.)

NOTE: If the rule is not exempt at the time of final filing, two dates are required: the current review date plus a date not to exceed 5 years from the effective date for Amended rules or a date not to exceed 5 years from the review date for No Change rules.

### **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

13. Estimate the total amount by which *this proposed rule* would **increase / decrease** either **revenues / expenditures** for the agency during the current biennium (in dollars): Explain the net impact of the proposed changes to the budget of your agency/department.

This will have no impact on revenues or expenditures.

0

Not applicable

14. Identify the appropriation (by line item etc.) that authorizes each expenditure necessitated by the proposed rule:

Not applicable

15. Provide a summary of the estimated cost of compliance with the rule to all directly affected persons. When appropriate, please include the source for your information/estimated costs, e.g. industry, CFR, internal/agency:

Not applicable

16. Does this rule have a fiscal effect on school districts, counties, townships, or municipal corporations? **No**

17. Does this rule deal with environmental protection or contain a component dealing with environmental protection as defined in R. C. 121.39? **No**