Ohio House State and Local Government Committee Opponent Testimony Occupational License Review Report HB 238 November 28, 2023

Chairwoman John, Vice Chair Dean, Ranking Member Brennan and members of the Ohio House State and Local Government Committee, I am Sue Carter Moore, Licensed Cosmetology Instructor since 1966, President Emeritus of the Salon Schools Group, and President of the Ohio Association of Cosmetology Schools.

HB189 and SB129 in the 132nd General Assembly, SB 245 in the 133rd General Assembly, SB 133 and HB 277 in the 134th General Assembly, all attempted to reduce Cosmetology education hours. None successfully passed from Committee to a House or Senate floor vote.

As recently as June in this current General Assembly, an amendment was added to HB 33 to once again reduce Cosmetology education, but was rejected in favor of reducing the Hair Designer license to 1000 clock hours.

Currently in the Senate, an amendment was added to Senator Roegner's SB 89 Cosmetology Compact Bill to once again reduce Cosmetology education. The bill has had 6 hearings, and is still in Committee. I would like to point out that I was very much in favor of the Cosmetology Compact bill until the amendment was added. In concert with the 1000 clock hour Hair Designer course created this past June with HB 33, SB 89 seemed to be the final solution to the years long pleas of chain salons for a faster cosmetology course and license mobility.

The Cosmetology license encompasses three fields of study: cosmetology, esthetics (skin care) and manicuring. Who determined that 1260 clock hours is the optimum number of hours to adequately teach cosmetology, esthetics and nail technology? That's only 10 more hours of Cosmetology education than I obtained in 1966. A lot has happened in beauty education since 1966.

Should cosmetology, esthetics, and manicuring education reduction be included in HB 238, I feel certain you will see a LOT of statewide opposition, both among cosmetology schools as well as salon owners.

Each time a working cosmetologist makes a trip to the Statehouse to testify, they lose income. As you might expect, this is the very busiest time of the year for salons. My presence here today is to hopefully intercede and stop the cosmetology, esthetics, and manicuring education reductions included in this bill. Should that not happen, I am confident you will meet many more of my fellow professionals.

There is no other "beauty license" in Ohio that has the potential for permanent harm to clients' skin than the esthetics license. Products with active ingredients that exfoliate skin, machines that perform microdermabrasion, and scalpel usage in dermaplaning, all have the capability of permanently disfiguring skin. In my opinion, the number of hours for esthetics education needs to be increased, rather than decreased. I'm curious if licensed professionals were consulted re: education reduction?

I would like to point out, according to Federal Financial Aid Regulations, a clock hour course must be a minimum of 600 hours to receive FFA. Reducing Esthetics license education to 500 clock hours may have unintended consequences.

I believe much the same about manicuring: the course length needs to be increased, largely due to the plethora of nail extension products that have the capability to destroy or disfigure nail beds, not to mention various diseases and disorders that must be recognized, treated, or passed on to a medical professional.

Elimination of all advanced beauty licenses eliminates individuals' lifetime career choices. The beauty industry workforce is overwhelmingly female and minorities, seeking to become small business owners. Shouldn't you be enhancing their ability to succeed, rather than reducing it by eliminating education?

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I welcome providing additional information about the industry that has changed the lives of many, and in which I have participated for the last 57 years.

Respectfully, Sue Carter Moore 614 736 4247 smoore@salonschools.com