

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	2. Date 5/20/25								
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) DCF 56									
4. Subject Foster home licensing									
5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected								
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <table style="width: 100%;"><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues</td><td colspan="2"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</td></tr></table>		<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget							
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <table style="width: 100%;"><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)</td></tr></table>		<input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers	<input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)			
<input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors								
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers								
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)									
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$indeterminate									
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									
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The current foster care rule has overly restrictive standards that cause an unnecessary administrative burden for licensing agencies and inappropriate barriers to licensure of foster parents, especially relatives.									
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. The department solicited comments from the Wisconsin County Human Services Association, county social and human services agencies, Wisconsin Association of Family & Children's Agencies, licensed child-placing agencies, tribes, Indian child welfare directors, and the Wisconsin Child Welfare Professional Development System.									
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. No local governmental units responded to the comment solicitation.									
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) The rule reduces the administrative burden for public and private licensing agencies. The rule also creates a separate licensing track for relatives and like-kin. To the extent that the separate licensing standards increase placements with relatives and like-kin rather than nonrelatives, the separate standards have no fiscal impact. To the extent that the relative and like-kin licensing standards allow foster care placements with relatives and like-kin who would have otherwise been receiving court-ordered kinship care payments, the separate standards shift costs from state-reimbursed kinship care (TANF) to foster care funded through the local child welfare agency, which may utilize funding from the Children and Families allocation, DMCPs funding, or other local child welfare funding.									
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The rule allows licensing agencies to focus on standards that are necessary for safe caregiving. Increasing relative placements is expected to reduce the number of months, placements, and traumatic experiences that children experience in the foster care system.									
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule									

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The rule complies with the Title IV-E requirements specified in the rule analysis.

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

Michigan has separate relative licensing standards with rate parity and Illinois and Minnesota are developing separate relative standards. Comparison on other issues is in the rule analysis.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Elaine Pridgen, Rules Coordinator	608-422-7077

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)

NA

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

NA

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:

NA

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

NA

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

NA

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

☐ Yes ☒ No
