ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis Image: Strain S	2. Date
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghou PI 30, Special Education Aid	se Number if applicable)
4. Subject Clarifying high cost special education aid	
5. Fund Sources Affected	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected s. 20.255 (2) (bd), Stats.
 7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule No Fiscal Effect Increase Existing Revenues Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues 	□ Increase Costs □ Decrease Costs □ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
🛛 Local Government Units	cific Businesses/Sectors ic Utility Rate Payers Il Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Loc \$0	cal Governmental Units and Individuals, per s.227.137 (3) (b) 1., Stats
 10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, L Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137 (3) (b) 2., Stats.? ☐ Yes ☑ No 	ocal Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more
\$30,000 threshold for special education costs is evaluated	ion aid. The areas clarified by this rule are as follows: 1) education and related services to a child, distinct from nt and other capital costs are considered in the context of s.; 3) clarifying what is meant by "federal medicaid," as ing claims under the program; and 4) determining how the against the other funding sources listed in statute.
12. Summaryof the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations Ret that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacted The Department held a preliminary public hearing and con received. No specific businesses or local governments were	for Comments nment period on the proposed rule and no comments were
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Dev None.	
14. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific E Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (I Incurred) State:	Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local nclude Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be

The proposed rule modifies how the Department administers the program, but that would be absorbed within existing agency resources. Over the long term, a more consistent methodology would reduce administrative burden by reducing the need to review special cases or proposals for costing out low-incidence, high-need programs.

Local:

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

The overall fiscal impact is zero—aid will be paid out up to the appropriation. However, the district-by-district impact is indeterminate. Aid payments depend upon the needs of individual children, the local costs of serving those needs, and whether or not a claim is submitted for any given child.

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

The proposed rules clarify statutory provisions governing the high cost special education aid program for the purposes of eligible agencies applying for and receiving the aid. Without a rule change, the Department will be required to administer PI 30 as it currently exists in rule, and eligible agencies may be faced with ambiguity around administration of the program.

16. Long-Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

This proposed rule will ensure clarity for applicants that are eligible for apply for and receive aid under the high cost special education aid program.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None.

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) There are no comparable rules governing aid for high-cost special education students in adjacent states. However, each states' respective formula for funding special education is as follows:

• Illinois: Under 105 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/18-8.15, the formula for funding special education in Illinois is a resource-allocation and census-based system.

• Iowa: Under Iowa Code Ann. § 256B.9, the formula for funding special education in Iowa is a multiple student weights system in which three different weights are based on the type of classroom where the student is educated.

• Michigan: Under Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 388.1652, the formula for funding special education in Michigan is a partial reimbursement system not to exceed 75% of the total approved costs of operating special education programs.

• Minnesota: Under Minn. Stat. Ann. § 125A.76, the formula for funding special education in Minnesota is a hybrid system incorporating partial reimbursement plus multiple student weights based on students slotted into three categories based on learning disorder.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Carl Bryan, Administrative Rules Coordinator	(608) 267-9127
Department of Public Instruction	

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