

Opponent Testimony re: SB 89  
Before The Government Oversight Committee  
Sue Carter Moore, President Ohio Association of Cosmetology Schools  
September 27, 2023

Chairperson Roegner, Vice Chair Antani, Ranking Member Hicks-Hudson, Members Lang and McColley. As stated, 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.

I was very much in favor of the Cosmetology Compact prior to last week's amendment. In concert with the 1000 clock hour Hair Designer course created just this past June with HB 33, SB 89 seemed to be the final solution to the pleas of chain salons for a faster cosmetology course and license mobility.

Cosmetology education reduction has plagued the Ohio Legislature since the 132<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly in 2017 and 2018, and each successive General Assembly. Finally, a 1000 clock hour course and license mobility. Nirvana!

The amendment added to SB 89 destroys a reasonable solution. We once again find ourselves in opposition to legislation that eliminates educational choices for future cosmetology students.

The 1200 clock hour Hair Designer Course was reduced to 1000 clock hours in HB 33, and includes everything in the 1500 clock hour course with the exceptions of manicuring and esthetics. Perfect for chain salon needs.

I telephoned numerous Great Clips salons and was told repeatedly their focus was hair cutting and styling. The occasional Great Clips does permanent wave services, but none do manicure and facial services. Sport Clips is male focused, and looks like a sports themed barber shop, though they hire mainly cosmetologists. The 1000 clock hour Hair Designer Course meets chain salons needs, along with license mobility created with the Cosmetology Compact.

I do not understand the push to eliminate the 1500 clock hour Cosmetology license that includes 3 disciplines: cosmetology, esthetics and manicuring. Three different career pursuits are available with the 1500 clock hour course. Reducing Cosmetology education by 1/3, when the license incorporates 3 licensure skills is pure folly from the standpoints of client protection as well as client satisfaction with beauty treatments. Not to mention levels of skill students would have. You cannot competently train a student to be a licensed cosmetologist, licensed esthetician and licensed manicurist in 1000 clock hours.

If you haven't done the math by now, I have been licensed for 57 years. For over 50 years I've educated cosmetology, esthetics and manicuring students. A modest calculation shows that number to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 10,000 graduates. Each one of those graduates had the ability to choose the education that best fit their career goals, just like each one of you committee members. ~~Did the state of Ohio ever tell you that it knew best the length of education you should embark on?~~ Each one of you committee members spent years acquiring the education of your choice.

Are you prepared today to deny educational options for future cosmetologists, largely women and minorities, I ask: ~~why is this committee seeking to stifle the education and training of a workforce that is largely looking to become small business owners and entrepreneurs and limit their career opportunities to benefit a small corner of the industry? Individuals licensed as cosmetologists at 1,000 hours would lack the technical skills and expertise to start their own business without significant on the job training forcing them to start at salons where they are often forced to sign noncompetes that hamper their ability to do business in the future or get burned out and exit the industry after working at quick hair cut chains where they are not honing their craft.~~

~~What this comes down to is 500 hours. 12½ weeks of education.~~

5 times this identical cosmetology education reduction legislation attempt has failed.

What problem does cosmetology education reduction solve for citizens of Ohio?

Educational marginalization is defined both as an outcome and a process through which individuals or groups are systemically denied their right to acquire academic or social capabilities through education, that results in their exclusion from social institutions, civic processes and economies.

I welcomed the Cosmetology Compact legislation; regrettably I will not support SB 89 with the amendment.