

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 May 16, 2023</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) MPSW 1</p>	
<p>4. Subject Substance Use Disorder practice for APSW and ISW</p>	
<p>5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected s.20.165(1)(g)</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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). \$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)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The objective is to revise chapter MPSW 1 to implement 2021 Wisconsin Act 222. This rule project repeals the subsection in chapter MPSW 1, which requires advanced practice social workers and independent social workers to apply for a substance use disorder specialty. The project also amends who can supervise social workers licensees or social worker certificate holders if they are pursuing a substance use disorder specialty.</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. None</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) DSPS estimates a total of \$1,800 in one-time costs for staffing and an indeterminate one-time IT impact to implement the rule. The estimated one-time staffing need for approximately 40 hours of tasks associated with the implementation of this rule account for staff and board training and website and forms updates. The one-time estimated costs cannot be absorbed in the currently appropriated agency budget.</p>	
<p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule 2021 Wisconsin Act 222 authorizes individuals certified as independent social workers and advanced practice social workers to treat substance use disorder without having to apply for a specialty and satisfy additional educational and supervised training requirements. The alternative to promulgating rules would be to not update the rules. This would leave the rules inconsistent with statutory provisions, which could create confusion with stakeholders.</p>	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implications of implementing the rule is for the MPSW rules will be in compliance with the Statutes.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

None.

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

Illinois:

Illinois does not have requirements for a social worker to obtain specified education or training to specialize in substance use disorder treatment.

Iowa:

Iowa does not have requirements for a social worker to obtain specified education or training to specialize in substance use disorder treatment.

Michigan:

Michigan does not have requirements for a social worker to obtain specified education or training to specialize in substance use disorder treatment.

Minnesota:

Minnesota does not have requirements for a social worker to obtain specified education or training to specialize in substance use disorder treatment.

19. Contact Name

Sofia Anderson

20. Contact Phone Number

608-261-4463

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
-