ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis	2. Date
Original Updated Corrected	
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghout	use Number if applicable)
PI 34, Educator Licenses	
4. Subject	
Expanding the assessment of pedagogical knowledge in e	ducator preparation programs
5. Fund Sources Affected	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
□ GPR □ FED □ PRO □ PRS □ SEG □ SEG-S	
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule	·
□ No Fiscal Effect □ Increase Existing Revenues	□ Increase Costs □ Decrease Costs
Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues	Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)	
	cific Businesses/Sectors
	lic Utility Rate Payers
	all Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)
	cal Governmental Units and Individuals, per s.227.137 (3) (b) 1., Stats
\$0	
 Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, L Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137 (3) (b) 2., Stats.? 	ocal Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more
🗆 Yes 🛛 No	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule	
Chapter PI 34 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code cont	
licensure of school personnel, including rules around the	
condition for an applicant receiving educator licensure. U	
conceptual framework shall contain a system to assess the	
the educator standards in subch. II of PI 34. The assessme	
knowledge of the teaching profession, whereby the assess	
performance assessment approved by the State Superinten	ideni.
Since the miles were memolected in Average 2018 the De	northeast has identified fourth on flavibility for student
Since the rules were promulgated in August 2018, the De	he assessment of pedagogical knowledge. Additionally, the
	h have been created through recent changes to statute and
	A rule is therefore needed to address differences between
rule and statute and to provide flexibility in the assessment	
 Summary of the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations R that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacte 	epresenting Business, Local Governmental Units, and Individuals d for Comments

The Department held a preliminary public hearing and comment period on the scope statement for the proposed rule. The comments received were also considered in the development of this economic impact analysis. No specific businesses or local governments were contacted.

- 13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA None.
- 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 flexibility and reduce the regulatory burden on educator preparation programs by no creating options for programs in assessing a student teacher's predagogical knowledge as a condition for

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

attaining licensure. Additionally, the rule may result in a savings for student teachers which may be assessed on their knowledge of pedagogy by other means relative to the status quo. However, the flexibilities offered to educator preparation programs and student teachers 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.

State: None.

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

The Department has identified further flexibility for license applicants by creating options for educator preparation programs in the assessment of pedagogical knowledge, as well as addressing differences between rule and statute. Absent a rule change, the Department would be required to implement PI 34 as the rules currently exist, thus limiting assessment options for institutions of higher education seeking to endorse qualified candidates for licensure.

16. Long-Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The proposed rule will make the licensing process for student teachers more flexible as well as address differences between rule and statute.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government $N\!/\!A$

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

• Illinois: Pursuant to 105 ILCS 5/21B-30, Illinois requires all new teachers to pass the education Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) for their applicable grade level, based on its standards. The edTPA can only be waived for out-of-state applicants who have 1 year of teaching experience. Out-of-state teachers, teaching on a provisional license must pass the edTPA during the one-year validity of the provisional license in order to be fully licensed.

• Iowa: Pursuant to 281 Iowa Administrative Code section 79.15, Iowa requires all new teachers to pass the applicable grade level pedagogy test in order to attain licensure. Candidates have three options: the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching series, the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT), or the appropriate education Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA).

• Michigan: Michigan does not require an assessment of pedagogical knowledge.

• Minnesota: Pursuant to Minnesota Administrative Rules Chapter 8710, Minnesota requires all teachers to pass the applicable grade level pedagogy test under the Minnesota Teacher Licensure Examinations (MTLE) in order to attain licensure.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Carl Bryan, Administrative Rules Coordinator	(608) 266-3275
Department of Public Instruction	

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