



SMALL BUSINESS AND
ECONOMIC OPPURTUNITY
COMMITTEE

Witness Form

Today's Date 5/21/21

Name: Natasha McGraw

Address: 6978 Blacksnake Hill Rd NE
Dover OH 44622

Telephone: 330-447-5805

Organization Representing: OCCTA

Testifying on Bill Number: 133

Testimony: Verbal Written Both

Testifying As: Proponent Opponent Interested Party

Are you a Registered Lobbyist? Yes No

Special Requests: _____

Natasha McGraw
Vice President of the OCCTA
(Ohio Career-Technical Cosmetology Teachers Association)
Cosmetology Instructor
Buckeye Career Center
545 University Dr NE
New Philadelphia OH 44663

05/20/2021

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Natasha McGraw, I am a Career Technical cosmetology instructor with 17 years of industry experience, and I hold a Master's Degree in Workforce Education and Development. I personally am in favor of SB 133 because of the following reasons;

Passing Senate Bill 133 would empower cosmetology educators and students by placing the emphasis on education and merit rather than hours and minutes. It will guarantee that no student will be left behind by allowing for differentiated instruction that is competency based. Advanced students will have the opportunity to test early and be placed into a job where they will continue their learning via work based instruction. While the advanced students are continuing their education outside of the classroom setting, the students who are facing challenges will learn to master the basic skills that they need in the school's lab setting.

I feel that Senate Bill 133 unites both the public and private sectors because both the high school and adult education students will finally be following the same curriculum as it pertains to hours. Currently there has been a long term division that revolves around Career Technical high schools being able to count the students' academic hours towards the 1500-hour program. I can testify that my high school students are receiving 354 hours towards their 1500-hour program for passing their academic classes and they are receiving an additional 119 theory hours for passing their cosmetology anatomy class. The total amount of hours that they receive in an academic classroom setting is 473 hours. Therefore, out of the entire 1500-hour program only 1027 hours are obtained within the lab and theory coursework that I teach as a cosmetology instructor.

Reducing the cosmetology program from 1500 to 1000 I feel will not reduce the quality of education in the High School Career technical setting. It will simply allow the students to work in the industry prior to graduation where they will obtain a more advanced learning experience. The majority of local salons already have a new stylist training program in place, therefore I do not feel as though this would be a burden to the salons. I myself went through a 9-month long internship program after obtaining my license. Training new stylists has become an industry standard for a long time. It does not matter if they receive 2000, 1500 or 1000 hours, all new stylists are somewhat nervous working in the salon their first year. I believe that 1000 hours is the perfect amount to teach students basic skills, as well as salon safety and sanitation. The salon is where they will and always have received more in depth training.

Lastly, I feel that allowing the theory exam to be taken at testing centers throughout the state will provide students with one less barrier and expense. As an example I would like to compare the testing requirements for a registered nurse with a cosmetologist. I believe that in both professions; being a nurse and a cosmetologist there are similar risk and safety measures that need to be taken. Obviously there is more risk to an exposure incident in the field of nursing, yet the testing requirements are currently more rigorous as it pertains to the cosmetology profession.

Nurses can take their nursing exam at Pearson testing locations throughout the state. Nursing students are also evaluated for competency by their instructor, they do not go to a testing site to test out of a "clinical exam," they simply have to pass the state exam at a testing center upon graduating from an approved state accredited nursing program. A nursing student's clinical exams are completed with their instructor, if they fail their clinical exam they are not eligible to graduate from the program. I feel as though the same process should be implemented for cosmetology students.

I understand that placing the competency based clinical exam in the hands of the cosmetology instructors may seem risky to some, however, if the Ohio State Board of Cosmetology holds instructors to a high standard and keeps them accountable like they always have, then there should be little to no concerns. The Ohio State Board of Cosmetology should design a concise system of accountability and consistency to be in place for all licensed schools as well as specific guidelines as it pertains to competency based clinical testing.

In conclusion I believe that passing senate bill 133 will be beneficial by closing the gap between the public and private sector. It allows for more differentiated instruction with a focus on work based learning. Lastly, revising the procedure for testing will prove that the cosmetology industry is evolving to meet the ever changing needs of our community by lessening the barriers to licensure and entrusting that hard working cosmetology instructors are competent to proctor our own students' clinical abilities.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing my personal testimony on Senate Bill 133.

Respectfully,



Natasha McGraw

Cosmetology Instructor

Buckeye Career Center

p:330-339-2288 x 1409

e:nmcgraw@buckeyecareercenter.org

a:545 University Drive NE, New Philadelphia OH, 44663