

SB 5054- Scope of Practice Analysis for Substance Use Disorder Professionals (SUDP)

Scope of practice for SUDPs in Washington is defined in 18.205.020 RCW as the provision of "substance use disorder counseling," which means "employing the core competencies of substance use disorder counseling to assist or attempt to assist individuals with substance use disorder in their recovery." The core competencies of substance use disorder counseling are defined as "competency in the nationally recognized knowledge, skills, and attitudes of professional practice, including assessment and diagnosis of substance use disorders, substance use disorder treatment planning and referral, patient and family education in the disease of substance use disorders, individual and group counseling, relapse prevention counseling, and case management, all oriented to assist individuals with substance use disorder in their recovery."

The completed analysis revealed 42 states are deemed to have an equivalent and/or greater scope of practice to Washington. The following eight states' scopes of practice were deemed not to be substantially equivalent to Washington:

1. Utah
2. Delaware
3. Kentucky
4. Maryland
5. Mississippi
6. New Jersey
7. North Dakota
8. Vermont

The analysis of scopes of practice is based strictly on statutory and rules language of each state. Differing states may refer to substance use practitioners by various titles; however, the assessment is based on the practice of substance use and/or chemical dependency counseling as defined in statute and rule for each state.

State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary
Alabama	<u>YES</u>	The language of Alabama's scope of practice is based on National Association for Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors (NAADAC) standards, and certification is voluntary. However, the language is well-defined and exceeds Washington's standards.

State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary
Alaska	YES - Refer to Alaska Core Competencies	The scope of practice language for Alaska is well-defined and is assessed as greater in equivalence to Washington's. The language within the scope suggest the use of tools to address Alaskan natives and other cultural needs along with referral and service coordination protocols.
Arizona	YES - ARC 32-3251	<p>Licensed associate substance abuse counselor (LSAC) and licensed independent substance abuse counselor.</p> <p>Arizona's scope of practice is similar to Washington's and we consider it substantially equivalent.</p> <p>The language references the use of general counseling theories, based on research, to treat clients with substance abuse and chemical dependency issues.</p>
Arkansas	YES	Arkansas's scope of practice is focused on substance use protocols and considered substantially equivalent to Washington's.
California	YES - Refer to California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals Application with core competencies	<p>California's scope of practice is considered equivalent to Washington's.</p> <p>The language references Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's (SAMHSA) Technical Assistance Publication 21 (TAP 21) competency requirements and consultation with other professionals as required.</p>
Colorado	YES - Refer to Colorado Office of Behavioral Health	<p>Certified addictions counselor (CAC II), certified addictions counselor (CAC III), licensed addiction counselor (LAD)</p> <p>Colorado's scope of practice is well-defined and exceeds that of Washington.</p> <p>The scope language includes references to service planning, on-going continuity of care, advocacy, referral, crisis intervention, recovery management, and culturally specific protocols. The scope language also allows counseling to involve family members as part of the treatment plan.</p>

State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary
Connecticut	YES	Connecticut's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Delaware	NO	The language of Delaware's scope of practice does not specifically indicate the independent practice of assessing, diagnosing, and treating people with substance use disorders.
District of Columbia	YES	The District of Columbia's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Florida	Yes	The language of Florida's scope of practice is based on International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium (IC&RC) standards, and is substantially equivalent to Washington's standards.
Georgia	YES	The language of Georgia's scope of practice is based on National Association for Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors (NAADAC) standards, and certification is voluntary. However, the language is well-defined and exceeds Washington's standards.
Hawaii	YES	Hawaii's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Idaho	YES - Refer to Idaho's Board of Alcohol/Drug Counselor Certification	Idaho's scope of practice language is well-defined and greater than equivalent to Washington's. The scope includes ability to diagnose, treat, and provide case management for individuals with substance use disorder along from their families; it also includes protocols for referrals, community education, trauma informed care, and continuity of care, including discharge planning and relapse prevention.
Illinois	YES	Illinois' scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Indiana	YES	The language of Indiana's scope of practice is well-defined and exceeds Washington's standards.
Iowa	YES	The language of Iowa's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary

Kansas	<u>YES</u>	Kansas's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Kentucky	<u>NO</u>	Although the language of Kentucky's scope of practice allows assessment and counseling, it does not specifically indicate the independent practice of diagnosing and the treatment of individuals with substance use disorders.
Louisiana	<u>YES</u>	Louisiana's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Maine	<u>YES</u>	Maine's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Maryland	<u>NO</u>	Although Maryland's scope language allows goal setting and planning of courses of action, it does not indicate the independent practice of diagnosis and treatment of individuals with substance use disorders.
Massachusetts	<u>YES</u>	The language of Massachusetts's scope of practice is based on International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium (IC&RC) standards, and is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Michigan	<u>YES</u>	The language of Michigan's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Minnesota	<u>YES</u>	Minnesota's scope of practice language is substance use disorder focused and is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Mississippi	<u>NO</u>	The language of Mississippi's scope of practice does not specifically indicate the independent practice of assessing, diagnosing, and the treatment of individuals with substance use disorders.
Missouri	<u>YES</u>	Missouri's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Montana	<u>YES - Montana Code 37-35-102</u>	Montana's scope of practice is similar to Washington and is substantially equivalent. The language includes gambling as part of the counseling of addiction.
Nebraska	<u>YES</u>	The language of Nebraska's scope of practice is well defined, substance use disorder focused, and is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary

Nevada	<u>YES</u>	Nevada's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
New Hampshire	<u>YES</u>	The language of New Hampshire's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
New Jersey	<u>NO</u>	The language of New Jersey's scope of practice does not specifically indicate the independent practice of assessing, diagnosing, and the treatment of individuals with substance use disorders.
New Mexico	<u>YES</u>	New Mexico's scope of practice is substantially equivalent to Washington.
New York	<u>YES</u>	New York's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
North Carolina	<u>YES</u>	North Carolina's scope of practice is well defined, substance use disorder focused, and is substantially equivalent to Washington.
North Dakota	<u>NO</u>	North Dakota does not have a scope of practice that is clearly defined in statute or administrative code.
Ohio	<u>YES</u>	Ohio's scope of practice is substance use disorder focused and substantially equivalent to Washington.
Oklahoma	<u>YES</u>	Oklahoma's scope of practice is well defined, substance use disorder focused, and is substantially equivalent to Washington.
Oregon	<u>YES - Refer to Oregon credential Application with full list of core competencies</u>	Oregon's scope of practice is similar to Washington, however could be considered greater than equivalent. The language in the scope of practice includes therapy for families in addition to individuals, and includes safety and risk assessments, documentation requirements, and the coordination of further services that may be needed.
Pennsylvania	<u>YES</u>	The language of Pennsylvania's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's and certification is voluntary. However, the scope is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
Rhode Island	<u>YES</u>	Rhode Island's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
State	Equivalent Scope of Practice?	Summary

South Carolina	<u>YES</u>	South Carolina's scope of practice is well defined, substance use disorder focused, and is substantially equivalent to Washington's.
South Dakota	<u>YES</u>	The language of South Dakota's scope of practice is based on International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium (IC&RC) standards and is not as defined as Washington's scope. However, the scope is substantially equivalent.
Tennessee	<u>YES</u>	The language of Tennessee's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Texas	<u>YES</u>	The language of Texas's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Utah	<u>NO</u>	Utah's scope of practice requires the supervision of a mental health therapist for all (mental health counselor in Washington). Therefore, Utah's scope is not considered equivalent to Washington's.
Vermont	<u>NO</u>	The language of Vermont's scope of practice does not specifically indicate the independent practice of assessing, diagnosing, and the treatment of individuals with substance use disorders.
Virginia	<u>YES</u>	Virginia's scope of practice is well defined, substance use disorder focused, and is substantially equivalent to Washington's. However, certification is voluntary in Virginia.
West Virginia	<u>YES</u>	The language of West Virginia's scope of practice is based on International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium (IC&RC) standards and certification is voluntary. The language not as defined as Washington's but is considered substantially equivalent.
Wisconsin	<u>YES</u>	Wisconsin's scope of practice is not as defined as Washington's, but is considered substantially equivalent.
Wyoming	<u>YES</u>	The language of Wyoming's scope of practice is based on National Association for Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors (NAADAC) standards, and is substantially equivalent to Washington's standards.