ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis ☑ Original □ Updated □ Corrected		
2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number $DE5$		
3. Subject Unprofessional Conduct		
4. Fund Sources Affected 5. Chapter 2 □ GPR □ FED ☑ PRO □ PRS □ SEG □ SEG-S 20.165(1)(20, Stats. Appropriations Affected	
6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □<	sorb Within Agency's Budget	
7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) State's Economy Specific Businesses/Sectors Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)		
8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?		
9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The Board completed a comprehensive review of DE 5 Standards of Conduct to ensure the chapters are statutorily compliant and are current with professional standards and practices.		
 10. 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. This rule was posted for economic comments and none were received. 		
11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA. None		
12. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economyas a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)		
This rule will not have an economic or fiscal impact.		
13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit to implementing the rule is a code which has not been updated since 1999 will reflect current professional standards and practices.		
14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implication is the unprofessional conduct provisions reflect current professional practice.		
15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None		
16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) Illinois' unprofessional conduct provisions include irregularities in billing for services rendered to a patient. It does not include surrendering a license while under investigation. It also does not address failure to treat a person due to color, sex or gender. Iowa's unprofessional conduct provisions include: various billing violations; and refusing to accept patients or deny dental service to patients because of the patient's race, creed, sex or national origin. It does not mention a person		

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

surrendering a license while under investigation.

The provisions addressed in this proposed rule are not included in Michigan or Minnesota's unprofessional conduct provisions.

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Sharon Henes	(608) 261-2377

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