

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<p>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected</p>	<p>2. Date</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Chapter PI 34, Educator Licenses</p>	
<p>4. Subject Changes to licensure for educational interpreters</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</p>	
<p>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)</p>	
<p>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137 (3) (b) 1., Stats. \$0</p>	
<p>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., Stats.? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The proposed rule amends chapter PI 34 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code with respect to creating flexibility for licensing educational interpreters. The proposed rule eliminates the requirement for certain educational interpreters to complete the educational interpreters performance assessment (EIPA) as a condition of their renewal once the licensee passes the EIPA with a score of 3.5 or above.</p>	
<p>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 The proposed rule was developed as a result of consultation with the State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Deaf and Hard of Hearing Programs, which is authorized under s. 115.372, Stats., and whose duties include proposing ways to improve the preparation of teachers and other staff who provide services to pupils who are hearing impaired.</p>	
<p>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA None.</p>	
<p>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) Local: The proposed rule will create additional flexibility and reduce the regulatory burden on educational interpreters by no longer requiring licensees to take the EIPA as a condition for renewing their license once the licensee has passed the EIPA with a score of 3.5 or above. The rule may also create flexibility for school districts because the changes will result in less time and resources directed to staff recruitment compared to the status quo. However, the flexibilities offered to licensees and school districts as a result of this rule change is dependent on individual behavior, and the Department is unable to predict how many applicants would benefit from this change. Therefore, the local impact as a result of this rule is indeterminate.</p>	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

State:

The Department will need to adjust its practices with respect to the exception of renewal requirements for certain educational interpreters in this rule. However, the implementation costs as a result of this rule are minimal and it is assumed that any changes will be absorbed by the Department within existing resources.

15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

Chapter PI 34 governs the licensure of school personnel, including educational interpreters who may be authorized by holding a 5-year renewable license by the Department. Under the current rule, license holders who wish to renew their interpreter license must, in part, pass the EIPA with a renewal score set by the State Superintendent in consultation with the State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Deaf and Hard of Hearing Programs. Currently, the score required for initial and renewed licensure is set by the State Superintendent at 3.3 (this will increase to 3.5 on July 1, 2020). Under the proposed rule, educational interpreters could benefit from no longer having to take the EIPA as a condition of renewing their license once the interpreter has passed the EIPA with a score of 3.5 or higher. As such, the interpreter would only have to renew their license by submitting evidence of continuing educational units. Without a rule change, the Department would be required to enforce the current standards for educational interpreters as they exist in the current rule.

16. Long-Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The proposed rule will make the licensing process for educational interpreters more flexible, thereby helping address staffing needs related to those licensees in school districts.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Section 300.34 (c) (4) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act defines interpreting services as a related service with respect to educating a child who is deaf or hard of hearing. Under the Act, interpreting services are taken to mean oral transliteration services, cued language transliteration services, sign language transliteration and interpreting services, and special interpreting services for children who are deaf-blind. However, because education in the United States is typically governed by each state and local government, the Act does not address how states administer the licensure of educational interpreters as a related service. As such, federal regulations are generally silent with respect to the licensure of educational interpreters.

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

- Illinois: Per Iowa Administrative Code, educational interpreters are issued a license through the State Board of Education and must, in part, pass the EIPA with a score of 3.5 or above to receive certification.
 - Iowa: Per Iowa Administrative Code, educational interpreters are issued a license through the Public Health Department Professional Licensure Division and must, in part, pass the EIPA with a score of 3.5 or above to receive certification.
 - Michigan: Per Michigan Administrative Code, educational interpreters are issued a license through the Michigan Department of Education and must, in part, pass the EIPA with a score of 4.0 or above to receive certification. Educational interpreters who do not have at least a 4.0 but plan to work in an elementary or secondary setting may apply for temporary assignment as an underqualified interpreter.
 - Minnesota: Per Iowa Administrative Code, educational interpreters are issued a license through the Public Health Department of Education and must, in part, pass the EIPA with a score of 4.0 or above to receive certification.
-

19. Contact Name

Carl Bryan, Administrative Rules Coordinator
Department of Public Instruction

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 267-9127

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