

## SB 5054 Scope of Practice Analysis for Psychology

The definition of the practice of psychology in Washington, as stated in RCW 18.83.010 is as follows:

(1) The "practice of psychology" means the observation, evaluation, interpretation, and modification of human behavior by the application of psychological principles, methods, and procedures for the purposes of preventing or eliminating symptomatic or maladaptive behavior and promoting mental and behavioral health. It includes, but is not limited to, providing the following services to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and the public, whether or not payment is received for services rendered:

(a) Psychological measurement, assessment, and evaluation by means of psychological, neuropsychological, and psychoeducational testing;

(b) Diagnosis and treatment of mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders, and psychological aspects of illness, injury, and disability; and

(c) Counseling and guidance, psychotherapeutic techniques, remediation, health promotion, and consultation within the context of established psychological principles and theories.

This definition does not include the teaching of principles of psychology for accredited educational institutions, or the conduct of research in problems of human or animal behavior.

The completed analysis revealed all 50 states were deemed to have an equivalent and or greater scope of practice to Washington.

The analysis of scope of practices is based strictly on statutory and rules language of each state.

State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary
<b>Alabama</b>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	The language of Alabama’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.  However, psychological technicians are also licensed in Alabama with a master’s degree and a separate (not substantially equivalent) scope of practice that requires them to be supervised by a doctoral level licensed psychologist.
<b>Alaska</b>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	The language of Alaska’s scope of practice is as defined as Washington’s, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Arizona</b>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	The language of Arizona’s scope of practice is not as defined as Washington’s, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Arkansas</b>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	The language of Arkansas’ scope of practice is well-defined and exceeds Washington's standards.
<b>California</b>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	The language of California’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.

<b>State</b>	<b>Equivalent Scope of Practice?</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<b>Colorado</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Colorado's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Connecticut</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Connecticut's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Delaware</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Delaware's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>District of Columbia</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Washington, D.C.'s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Florida</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Florida's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Georgia</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Georgia's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Hawaii</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Hawaii's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Idaho</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Idaho's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Illinois</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Illinois' scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Indiana</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Indiana's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Iowa</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Iowa's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Kansas</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Kansas' scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Kentucky</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Kentucky's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Louisiana</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Louisiana's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Maine</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Maine's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Maryland</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Maryland's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Massachusetts</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Massachusetts's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.

<b>State</b>	<b>Equivalent Scope of Practice?</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<b>Michigan</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Michigan's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Minnesota</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Minnesota's scope of practice is better defined and substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Mississippi</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Mississippi's scope of practice is better defined and substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Missouri</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Missouri's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Montana</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Montana's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Nebraska</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Nebraska's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>Nevada</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Nevada's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of New Hampshire's scope of practice is well defined and substantially equivalent to Washington's.
<b>New Jersey</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of New Jersey's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>New Mexico</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of New Mexico's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>New York</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of New York's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>North Carolina</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of North Carolina's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>North Dakota</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of North Dakota's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Ohio</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Ohio's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Oklahoma's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
<b>Oregon</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Oregon's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Pennsylvania's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.

<b>State</b>	<b>Equivalent Scope of Practice?</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<b>Rhode Island</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Rhode Island’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>South Carolina</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of South Carolina’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>South Dakota</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of South Dakota’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Tennessee</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Tennessee’s scope of practice is not as well defined; however, is considered substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Texas</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Texas’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Utah</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Utah’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Vermont</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Vermont’s scope of practice is not well defined; however, is considered substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Virginia</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Virginia’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>West Virginia</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of West Virginia’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Wisconsin</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Wisconsin’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.
<b>Wyoming</b>	<a href="#"><u>Yes</u></a>	The language of Wyoming’s scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington’s.