

Chairman Roegner, Vice Chairman McColley, Ranking Member Craig and members of the Senate government oversight and reform committee

My name is Wezlynn Davis and I am providing testimony in opposition to the amendment added to House Bill 542. I am an Advanced Licensed Esthetician, Founder of The Beauty Lab, a small spa that has been thriving in Downtown Delaware for 11 years. I have been a consultant to some of Ohio's largest family-owned accredited institutions, I have served and volunteered to multiple industry associations and one of Ohio's states engaged beauty and barber industry advocates. I began this policy journey in 2015.

Because this committee has not seen this language before in committee, please allow me to provide some history. In 2016 Kasich signed SB 133 into law in September of 2016. It was a reform bill and came with tremendous opposition. It was the 131st general assembly when industry workers and associations struck a compromise with (then) Senator Kris Jordan, Tavares, and State Rep. Roegner and Reese. The negotiations were long, no one was entirely happy, yet the bill passed in the spirit of compromise. The very language we are opposing today directly impact the people who are the backbone of this industry. These folks have successfully stopped this harmful legislation for four GA's- it is the very language that was negotiated out of the bill which embodied our compromise.

Currently, you will find the language we are opposing today, in another bill that has stalled in Senator Michael Rulli's committee. If you were to ask him what he bill has not moved, he would tell you it did not have the votes.

What is the intent and history of the House Bill 542, before the senate amendment? It is a cleanup bill and fills in the gaps from SB133 with additional language that removes unnecessary barriers for barbers. Rep. Roemer and Rep. Sobelcki will tell you this bill was never meant to be controversial.

Today this legislation has been starred for a possible vote. It is my experience a star next to a bill means the bill has the votes. If you are feeling inclined to pass this bill through committee, I would ask that you take a moment to consider these next points and do a gut check:

In the name of what appears to be deregulation are you willing to pass this legislation if it means the following?

- Your constituents have not been provided the time or opportunity to schedule meetings with you or give you tours of their salons, spas, barber shops, and schools or speak with students in your district to discuss the impact the legislation would directly have on them?
- Do you understand how the elimination of clinic floors in schools (*as proposed by Tony Fiori when asked what would be cut from the curriculum to reduce hours*) impacts the federal

mandate on accredited educational institutions pertaining to the 90/10 rule and how this puts them at risk for losing their ability to provide federal financial aid?

- A 1500-hour cosmetology license is a bundled license that includes three full licenses:
 1. 1200-hour Hair Designer (hair only) License
 2. 600 Esthetics License
 3. 200 Nail Technology license
2000 hours of education done in 1500 hours
- What becomes of the education for esthetics and nail technology if we drop the hours from 1500 to 1000 hours?
 - Does it degrade and/or is it appropriate that a 1000-hour cosmetologist will be licensed to perform every service a licensed esthetician and licensed nail technologist can, with nothing more than a few paragraphs of text book education and no hands-on / clinic floor training?
- New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, California and Texas provide 1000-hour cosmetology training, yet education in 1000-hour states on average are equal to and some cases more expensive than Ohio at 1500 hours. To achieve tuition reductions a school will have to determine where in the budget finances can be cut. Naturally, costs such as rent cannot be cut and supplies and teaching materials cannot be cut from a budget, this leaves staff.
 - Have you had time to consider your vote would mean forcing Ohio schools to eliminate jobs and reduce salaries?
 - Have you had time to consider whether you are willing to put schools at risk of violating state mandated teacher per student ratios?
- Your vote would mean significantly reducing access to Pell grant money. How does this legislation reduce student loan debt and not actually increase the out-of-pocket costs for your most disadvantaged constituents? Have the proponents of this bill walked you through this very real problem that will become the biggest barrier to entry into the industry?
- For a school to maintain its federal accreditation, their students need to pass and become licensed. They must meet a percentage as prescribed by the federal government.
 - Allowing students to test out early will significantly increase the failures of which their accreditation is graded on; have you had time to consider that a yes vote means putting your family owned, individually owned schools at risk for losing federal accreditation?

- A yes vote to this legislation strips all future students from reciprocity eligibility to all contiguous states and every state in the country except for five. Are you ok with signing off on this?
- Have you had time to consider the impacts this legislation will have to all Ohio schools on bordering lines when considering students want reciprocity with contiguous states and full Pell grant eligibility?
 - Do you feel there is a potential risk for putting your bordering schools out of business by passing this legislation because it is easier for students to get their benefits in other states? Ohio's schools on the boarder deserve your ear and thoughtful consideration before a vote.
- Have you had the opportunity to be presented with alternatives to allowing others to enter Ohio by reviewing language from 4713-7-09 out-of-state license holder applications for Ohio licenses, and reciprocity for barbers found in section 4709.0 eights, in addition to speaking to the state agency about how to adjust administrative rules?
 - If opening Ohio for business is the concern, why would we eliminate all the benefits from your future licensees, namely Pell Grant and reciprocity, and all skilled professionals from the market when we have a more straightforward option by addressing the language found in these rules?

It is an honor to stand before you and provide testimony. It is important that you know we asked for meeting over the past year to come together again and together design legislation, in the spirit of compromise. The small business does not want to continue to battle these corporate, wealthier entities. However, the call has not yet be returned, the meeting has not been accepted. We have many items to share that will reflect true deregulation and support the one in two out rule. Although the amendment adopted feels like deregulation, it is the inverse to the one in two out rule. Let us help. My motto is we do not rally in the street, we take our seat at the table. Your invitation to the table would be well received and we would be dedicated to partnership, a true and reasonable discussion around deregulation to negotiate and compromise for the mutual goal of what is best for Ohio.

Thank you and I welcome any questions.

Sincerely,
Wezlynn Davis