Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 2025)

Department	Iowa	Date:	May 20, 2025	Total Rule	35
Name:	Workforce			Count:	
	Development				
	871	Chapter/	63	Iowa Code	260F
IAC #:		SubChapter/		Section	
		Rule(s):		Authorizing	
				Rule:	
Contact	Rebecca	Email:	rebecca.stonawski@iwd.iowa.gov	Phone:	515-
Name:	Stonawski				868-
					1939

					itaic.				
	Contact	Rebecca	Email:	rebecca.stonawski@iwd.iowa.gov	Phone:	515-			
	Name:	Stonawski		5	1	868-			
	ivailie.	Storiawski			1	1939			
						1959			
_		DIFACE	NOTE THE BOY	C RELOW WILL EVRAND AS VOLUTVI	D.F.				
PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE									
What is the intended benefit of the rule?									
This rule fosters the growth and competitiveness of Iowa's workforce and industry.									
Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.									
	Yes. 260F prog	grams have provi	ided community	colleges and businesses with the opp	ortunity to col	laborate			
on training projects that improve lowa's workforce.									
What are the costs incurred by the public to comply with the rule?									
	Community co	lleges may have	administrative c	osts associated with applying and ov	erseeing the 26	0F			
grants.									
			<u> </u>	gency to implement/enforce the ru					
One Iowa Workforce Development administrative staff member administers this program. 260F programs									
occupy approximately 45% of her time.									
			11 12 51						
		tify the benefits		-					
Yes. Community colleges assist our local workforce entities to provide advanced training opportunities									
	which benefit our business communities.								
			•	olish the benefit? 🗌 YES 🗵 NO					
If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if									
applicable. If NO, please explain.									
	260F programs have efficiently run for a number of years. At the present, the legislature has not indicated								
	an alternative option.								

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language? [list chapter/rule number(s) that fall under any of the above categories]

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

871.63.7; 871.63.8; 871.63.24; 871.63.25; 871.63.26; 871.63.27;

RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):

871.63.1-871.63.35

RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):

871.63.1-871.63.6 871.63.9-871.63.23 871.63.28-871.63.35

*For rules being re-promulgated with changes, you may attach a document with suggested changes.

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	6
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	2452
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	98

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?

NA.