



Proponent Testimony on HB 189
Before the
House Government Accountability and Oversight Committee
By
Kerry Sawyer
On
June 21, 2017

Chairman Blessing, Vice Chair Reineke, Ranking Member Clyde and members of the House Government Accountability and Oversight Committee thank you for the opportunity to provide proponent testimony on the cosmetology reforms contained in HB 189, jointly sponsored by Rep. Kristina Roegner (R-Hudson) and Rep. Alicia Reece (D-Cincinnati). My name is Kerry Sawyer, and I am the franchisee/owner along with my husband Anthony Sawyer of 32 Sport Clips Haircuts with 9 of the locations being in Ohio with **over 95** employees/licenseses throughout Ohio. Our stores in Ohio are located in and around the Columbus area as well as one location in Springfield, OH. We are in the process of building a new store near Dublin and are looking at building another one next year in Ohio.

HB 189 picks up where we left off in the 131st General Assembly with the passage of **SB 213**. Ohio Salon Association, along with many lawmakers, wanted to tackle several other issues, but we wanted to take the time to research what model occupational licensing reform legislation should look like for the cosmetology industry in all 50 states. For more than four years a group now called the Future of the Beauty Industry Coalition (FBIC) has been developing research from all 50 states to use as the basis for this legislation. The FBIC is made up of cosmetologists, students, salon owners, manufacturers, distributors, and cosmetology schools. This group came together to provide reasonable reforms to state cosmetology law rather simply deregulating the industry.

As a small business owner in the salon business I face a significant challenge in staffing our stores and I believe that HB 189 will directly benefit my stores, my stylists and my clients. We are fortunate to have more clients who would like to patronize our stores than we can support. Yes, our sales are constrained due to a limitation in the number of service providers (licensed cosmetologists) we can hire. If the unnecessary burden of 1,500 hours was reduced to 1,000 hours we anticipate that we can employ at least 2 more people per location. These are good jobs that are going unfilled with most positions earning from \$18-\$36/hour. We know from our stylists and from research that the commitment needed by a student to pay for and attend school for 1,500 hours is excessive and prohibits many people from entering the cosmetologist profession. Lightening that requirement to 1,000 hours will ease that burden and encourage people to enter into a great profession.

Similarly, we have people whom would like to work in Ohio for us, but without an Ohio license due to a relocation; then subsequently finding out that their license from another state is not valid in Ohio and that Ohio requires additional testing and potentially additional hours. License reciprocity between

states would make what it should be - a non-issue. While many relocated stylists do go through the process of getting their Ohio license, I have never seen a stylist change any of their cutting skills, client skills, or any behavior, in any way due to this additional process. Cutting hair is a 'universal' skill that should easily transfer from state to state. Why shouldn't a stylist be able to find employment in Ohio in order to do the exact same thing she does in any other state with licensure?

We have developed a team within our 32 stores organization called the Artistic Brand Ambassador team. They are a team that travels from state to state to help train, open new stores, market and develop culture inside the stores. Our Indiana, Maryland and Virginia employees struggled getting licensed in Ohio due to Ohio regulations. These cosmetologist have been cutting hair for over 10 + years however, Ohio has such strict restrictions they were unsuccessful on receiving a license without additional schooling. How is this fair? The other states they had to provide proof of license and pay the state fee and in 2 weeks they were licensed in multiple states.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to provide proponent testimony on **HB 189** to the committee. I hope this testimony has provided the members with some common-sense changes and reasonable reforms for your consideration. The schools and the small business salon owners that provide employment to the graduates from Ohio schools of cosmetology are *not* seeking to deregulate the beauty industry, but to make sure state government does not necessarily interfere with the ability to start a business, grow a business or unnecessarily create hurdles for individuals entering the workforce to pursue a profession. Together, we will build a stronger future for our industry and continue to support accountability and licensing of our professionals.

I cannot stress the importance of enacting these cosmetology reforms prior to the summer recess. Adjustments need to be made to cosmetology training programs this year so the future class of beauty industry professionals graduating from programs are ready to enter the workforce about this time next year. All eyes are on Texas and Ohio to lead the charge with these legislative changes.

You can find more information on the FBIC by going to www.futurebeautyindustrycoalition.com or the OSA website: www.ohiosalonassociation.com.

Kerry Sawyer
Team Leader-Sport Clips Franchisee,
Cell Phone: 317-650-4067
Email: kerrysawyer@sawyerbg.com