



RADIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF CONNECTICUT, INC.  
A CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RADIOLOGY

Statement of the  
Radiological Society of Connecticut  
in regard to Senate Bill 406  
Public Health Committee  
February 6, 2009

Sen. Harris, Rep. Ritter and members of the committee:

My name is Linda Kowalski. I am executive director of the Radiological Society of Connecticut, whose members are Medical Doctors specializing in the field of Radiology.

As the physician professionals who are responsible for medical imaging, the people who will be responsible for supervising radiologist's assistants, and the employers of these professionals, RSC is very interested in Senate Bill 406, *An Act Concerning Licensure of Assistant Radiologists*. For the record, we reserve judgment on this legislation and cannot support it at this time. The introduction of such a bill should be done with the close collaboration of radiologists. Serious questions of credentialing and patient safety are involved here, including:

- Education and clinical training requirements for licensure;
- Scope of practice responsibilities;
- Prohibited activities;
- Requirements for medical liability coverage;
- Disclosures under the Medical Professional's Profile law;
- Responsibilities of the supervising Radiologist; and
- Fiscal impact of licensure.

These are not frivolous questions—they go to the heart of what qualifies someone to be a Radiologist's Assistant as well as what they are entitled to do, or not do, as a practitioner. We have seen absolutely no information on this—and we cannot support the bill until we have answers to these important questions. We also believe that the appropriate title for these practitioners should be "Radiologist's Assistant."

If you move forward with a fully drafted bill, we urge you to clarify the ability of another class of highly skilled professionals, Physician Assistants, to engage in the use of Fluoroscopy for diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. You can do so by adding Physician Assistants to the list of practitioners who are currently exempt from licensure requirements in the Radiological Technologists' statute. This will help ensure that Fluoroscopy procedures can be performed in appropriate settings without any confusion or controversy as to who is entitled to assist the Radiologist. If you ultimately decide not to approve the licensure provision in S.B. 406, we would still request that you address this burgeoning controversy by adopting a strike-all amendment as follows:

Section 20-74ee

New subsection (a) 6:

*Nothing in subsection (c) of section 19a-14, sections 20-74aa to 20-74cc, inclusive, and this section shall be construed to require licensure as a radiographer or to limit the activities of a physician assistant, licensed and supervised pursuant to chapter 370, who is engaged in the use of fluoroscopy for guidance of diagnostic and therapeutic procedures.*

As many of you know, an unfortunate clash has erupted between certain members of the Radiological Technologists' profession and Physician Assistants. The former contend that Physician Assistants should not perform Fluoroscopy under the supervision of the Radiologist. To make their point, they have sent letters of complaint to hospital executive staff and to the Department of Public Health.

By statute, a Physician Assistant is entitled to undertake such activities as his or her supervising physician direct so long as the activity is not prohibited in their practice statute. Their practice statute contains no prohibition on assisting with Fluoroscopy. Since the two professions have not been able to resolve this disagreement, we ask that you step in and do so. We need you to mediate and referee this controversy now before it spirals out-of-control.

Please use S.B. 406 as a vehicle to do so. When you hear all of the evidence, RSC believes you will agree that the education, training and clinical experience Physician Assistants bring to the table eminently qualifies them to assist with Fluoroscopy.

Thank you.