

October 16, 2023

Daniel Rosenthal, PE (Chair) Hearing Care Professionals Technical Review Committee Nebraska Department of Health & amp; Human Services Attn: Ron Briel, Credentialing Review PO Box 94986 Lincoln, NE 68509-4986 Sent via e-mail

Dear Mr. Rosenthal,

I am communicating with you as a licensed clinical Doctor of Audiology in relation to an urgent matter. As a practicing Audiologist in Durango, Colorado, I strongly oppose the scope of practice expansion proposal offered by certain hearing instrument specialists (HIS), affiliated trade organizations, hearing aid manufacturers, distributors, and franchisees, all of whom stand to gain financially from its implementation. This matter can have a negative impact on neighboring states, including Colorado. Oftentimes, we share patients with nearby providers for the convenience of our patients.

This poorly conceived proposal, should it pass, would shortsightedly authorize HIS to perform Audiologic diagnostic testing, interpretation, and treatment services, without the appropriate training, qualifications, and supervision, putting Nebraskans of all ages at significant risk of financial and physical harm. Skills and scope of practice expansion being proposed take years of training, supervision, and experience to develop with intention, yet this proposal would be allowing HIS to perform far outside of what their training prepares them for.

As an Audiologist in a neighboring state, I am opposed to this proposal with valid objections. The surrounding states do not allow hearing aid specialists/dispensers to perform services beyond those designed to advance the sale of hearing aids (share their scope). And, they are specifically NOT allowed to perform diagnostic testing, cerumen management, tinnitus management, or aural rehabilitation under their license, because they are wholly unqualified to do so (just as they are in Nebraska).

I am concerned that patients from my state who live in border communities may seek care in Nebraska and unknowingly be harmed by untrained and underqualified individuals. It is equally likely that consumers in Nebraska will no longer have confidence in the care that they receive there and will seek treatment in surrounding states, increasing wait times for Colorado citizens or any of the neighboring states.

We urge the Committee to uphold Nebraska's statute with those of surrounding states to ensure safe, superior Audiologic care for citizens throughout the region.

Audiologic services, including diagnostic services, cerumen management, tinnitus evaluation and treatment, and aural rehabilitation are complex procedures that require extensive clinical training. Yet, the HIS proposal includes a list of proposed educational requirements for licensure that



'grandfather' existing HIS' with no increase in training or improved qualifications and feign enhanced requirements for new HIS, that, upon careful inspection, simply maintain the status quo (must be 21 years of age and have a high school education). Further, the proposal allows the educational requirements to be changed arbitrarily at the discretion of the Board. The requested scope expansion in the HIS proposal is completely out of step with evidence-based practices in the delivery of Audiologic care, particularly when evaluated against the licensing and training requirements for similar and related professions. For example, a clinical doctorate (Au.D.) degree is required for audiologists to enter clinical practice in Nebraska and all 50 U.S. states and territories. Physicians and advanced practice providers including nurse practitioners, physician assistants, psychologists, and speech language pathologists are other professionals who are authorized under their licensure to perform these services.

The HIS proposal is absolutely incongruent with existing scope of practice and educational requirements for Audiology Assistants in Nebraska. Even though Nebraska requires postsecondary education for registered Audiology Assistants, they are still not authorized to perform any of the Audiologic diagnostic and treatment services described in the HIS proposal.

Occupational licensure laws are designed to protect consumers—not to unfairly protect and advantage industry players seeking only to profit. I urge the Hearing Care Technical Review Committee to reject the HIS scope expansion proposal in its entirety. Thank you for your consideration with this matter and having a sound mind when assessing your stance.

Sincerely,

landace kep Uli

Chandace Jeep, Au.D. CCC-A, FAAA Doctor of Audology & Practice Owner Animas Valley Audiology Associates, LLC 799 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite #1 Durango, CO 81301 (970) 375-2369 cjeep@animasvalleyaudiology.com

Chandace Jeep, Au.D. • Doctor of Audiology & Owner