

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Monday, April 25, 2016 8:12:22 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2016 4:52 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Agency: TEXAS BOARD PHYSICAL THERAPY EXAMINERS

First Name: Cynthia

Last Name: Fisher

Title: Physical Therapist

Organization you are affiliated with: self

Email:

City: horizon city

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

I am submitting my comments regarding issues presented in the Sunset Commission Report regarding the Texas State Board of Physical Therapy Examiners. I have been licensed in Texas since 1979 and am currently practicing. First of all the opening statement of the report to me implies a very negative connotation regarding the agency "flying under the radar" as if the agency had any control over the two times their review was postponed not by them but in fact by the Sunset Commission.

As a previous board member, my job was to ensure that physical therapists and physical therapist assistants practiced in accordance to the PT Practice Act and Rules so that consumers of physical therapy in Texas were protected.

Issue 1

I am strongly opposed to the recommendation. As you mentioned at the time this rule was enacted, it was because there were a proliferation of clinics with non PTs representing themselves to patients as PTs which posed a threat to the consumer. The intent was to register facilities that were not overseen by other regulatory agencies (IE, JACOH).. This rule ensured that a licensed PT was in fact practicing at that facility. I feel that if this is done away with, the same problem may again occur. I do agree that the penalties for a PT or PTA practicing needs to be reduced or reconsidered when they in fact are not responsible for registering the facility.

Issue 2

I speak in favor of this recommendation as it will allow mobility for therapists to work in other states

Issue 3

I am opposed to this recommendation. prior to the current system of CCU approval which is designed to have each course reviewed by 3 content experts in that area to ensure that each course meets the requirements for CCU approval in the practice act and rules, a staff person in the agency essentially rubber stamped each course as they were not a PT and were not able to assess whether the content of the course was based on evidence and current practice. I feel if this recommendation is followed unless the agency hires PTs to administer this program the public will not be protected as there will be no assurance that the course content meets current standards of practice. This

will also come with and increased cost to the agency.

Issue 4

I speak in favor of this recommendation as I feel that this will continue to protect the consumer of PT

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: none at this time

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree