

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	2. Date October 3, 2017
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Chapter PI 25, Children at Risk Plan and Program	
4. Subject Children at Risk Plans	
5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0	
10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule As a result of the Assembly Education Committee's Red Tape Review of administrative rules held on May 18, 2017, the Department proposes to amend PI 25, relating to Children at Risk Plan and Program. The proposed technical change requested by the Committee adds the email address, in addition to his or her name and telephone number, of a person that a parent or pupil can contact regarding the school district's program for at-risk pupils whenever a pupil has been identified as a child at risk.	
12. Summary of the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations Representing Business, Local Governmental Units, and Individuals that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacted for Comments. None	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None	
14. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred) State: No fiscal effect. Local: No fiscal effect.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Chapter PI 25 defines children who are at risk of not graduating from high school, establishes criteria for school boards to consider when developing children at risk plans and sets forth the requirements for receipt of additional state aid in those districts. The rule, which has not been amended since 1994, provides that each pupil and his or her parent must be notified in writing whenever the pupil has been identified as a child at risk and that a notice must include the name and telephone number of the staff person designated by the school board for developing the school district's program for children at risk. The Assembly Education Committee requested that an email address be added, in addition to the	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

person's name and phone number, to this provision in the rule. Without a rule change, the Department will continue to administer the rule as it exists in PI 25.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The rule, as well as agency and school district practice, will be consistent.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

N/A

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

N/A

19. Contact Name

Carl Bryan

20. Contact Phone Number

608-267-9127

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for each Small Business Sector, Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

3. Did the agency consider the following methods to reduce the impact of the Rule on Small Businesses?

- Less Stringent Compliance or Reporting Requirements
- Less Stringent Schedules or Deadlines for Compliance or Reporting
- Consolidation or Simplification of Reporting Requirements
- Establishment of performance standards in lieu of Design or Operational Standards
- Exemption of Small Businesses from some or all requirements
- Other, describe:

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

- Yes No
-