

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 to rules governing degrees required for admission to licensure.

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 provide notice that the board is

redefining the meaning of a degree that can be deemed "equivalent" to a doctoral degree in psychology or school psychology (and providing a 3-year phase out of case-by-case transcript and dissertation reviews); and, to clarify board rules relative to degrees from: 1) Non-U.S. institutions and 2) 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 expressly for the purpose of training professional psychologists; and, that degrees shall be earned from bona fide regionally accredited institutions of higher education (not from the unacceptably 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 and historical availability of case-by-case review of a doctoral degree based on longstanding coursework requirements in various sections of this rule.

By statute (4732.10), for admission to examination for the psychologist license, the board recognizes doctoral degrees in psychology, school psychology, and doctoral degrees in other fields "deemed equivalent" to doctorates in psychology or school psychology. The proposed change to this rule (first paragraph) and in a proposed new rule continues to recognize the "equivalent" degree route as allowed in statute, but redefines it by requiring that the academic PROGRAM itself have specific accreditation as a professional psychology training program (as opposed to the current rule which allows and requires case-by-case review of the applicant's education). This rule, if amended, would be valid for 3 years and could be rescinded after that time once all existing case-by-case equivalent reviews are completed in the office.

Please note that the lengthy and varied coursework lists in this rule are currently used for the case-by-case reviews and will remain in effect for 3 years. Within the 3-year phase-out, applicants can continue to request an equivalent degree 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 and whether "equivalence" is sought in comparison to a degree in psychology or a degree in school psychology).

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 course hours for courses taken after July 15, 2000 (not degree completed). Striking this is important because there is no truth to the implication that there is any requirement that any degrees needed to be completed before July 15, 2000.

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

More noteworthy in section (C) are the 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 doctoral degree in psychology from a regionally accredited institution; and, 2) degrees from institutions from non-U.S. institutions. The first added text is pasted in from later in the rule from (C) (1), so that this section of the rule can be devoted to the "candidate for accreditation" issue. The proposed addition in (C) also sets a 3-year phase-out for review of degrees earned from non-accredited institutions ("candidate for accreditation"). Currently and for the next 3 years if amended, this rule entitles a person with a doctoral degree from an institution with "candidate for accreditation" status the right to an equivalence degree review (to a doctoral degree in psychology). After the 3-year phase out, all degrees will have to be earned from fully regionally accredited institutions. The board agrees with the widely accepted belief that "regional accreditation" of the institution is a very low threshold (even full accreditation). Therefore, this proposed change is consistent with the concept and intention to require all degrees (after 3 years) to be bona fide psychology training degrees and to be from fully accredited academic 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 filed with this package, so it can be granted more overt attention. It is currently buried and confusing. The processes related to non-U.S. degrees need to be more clearly advertised and by striking language here and placing in its own rule this issue seems to be better addressed.

The proposed changes to section (F) are intended to clarify (and place 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 ("candidate") institution's degrees to be deemed equivalent to a doctoral degree in SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY [equivalence to psychology doctorates 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: **7/26/2009**

(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**