

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2014 1:16:15 PM

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

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2014 12:22 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Wednesday, June 18, 2014 - 12:21

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Beasley

Title:

Organization you are affiliated with:

City: Corrigan

State: Texas

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

I would like to express my support for ceasing to have Medical Radiologic Technologist certification in Texas.

I and a Registered Technologist in the field of Radiology, CT and Cardiovascular - Interventional Technology. I also hold the MRT or the Medical Radiologic Technologist certification here in Texas.

After having read the Sunset information, I must agree that having the MRT program in Texas is a duplicate and therefore wasteful program. Being registered on a national level technologist must submit 24 continuing education hours of education bi-annually. The only difference is that to maintain the Texas certification three of the CE hours must be instructor lead. Generally finding instructor led CE hours is more expensive because of the distances that must be traveled for classes and seminars and fees incurred with the education.

Education regarding, radiation safety, patient care and new technologies are accepted by both entities and therefore valuable yet redundant. The current MRT fee paid by the caregiver is \$66.

Having recently worked in Tennessee and Alabama I found that neither state required additional certification. The technologists performing patient care maintained their National Registries and adhered to educational requirements. Removing the burden of sending CE reports to two organizations and reducing the need for the technologist to pay an annual fee would be very welcome to the front line technologists that perform patient care.

The American Registry of Radiologic Technologist (ARRT) is the most widely accepted National registry. It is focused on issues such as education and radiation exposure reduction. It is closely aligned with the American Society of Registered Technologists commonly known as ASRT, which has the Image Gently and Image Wisely

programs that specifically address ways to lower radiation dose to the public.

I have served in the field of radiology for 24 years. In that time the majority has been in Texas. Although I recently moved back to Texas from working in Tennessee and Alabama. Technologist in those states were professional and educated, yet they didn't have the additional burden of submitting duplication information and paying duplicate fees to a state agency.

Some may say that doing away with MRT will change the job market for technologists. I beg to differ. Since the requirements are so closely aligned the same people that get the ARRT can also obtain the MRT. As a positive gain, hospitals and other organizations can recruit across state lines and mine great talent with one less obstacle.

In the end the MRT program is a duplication of a nation wide system that is redundant. There is no value added by the extra steps and the front line staff are expected to pay the additional fees. Removing this program is a worthy endeavor.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: An alternative to the current model can be for employers within the State of Texas to require persons using ionizing radiation to be Registered with the ARRT. Thus eliminating the need for the MRT program.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree