

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
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) PI 34, Educator Licenses		
4. Subject Experimental, innovative, or pilot programs		
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget		
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input 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)		
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137 (3) (b) 1., Stats. \$0		
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., Stats.? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule <p>This proposed rule revises the requirements governing experimental, innovative, or pilot educator preparation programs. Under prior rule language, the process for approving and monitoring these programs was less detailed, which resulted in confusion in how experimental programs were approved and overseen. The proposed rule clarifies who may apply, what must be submitted for approval, how long approval may be granted, and how the department monitors program performance during the approval period.</p> <p>The rule clarifies that eligibility for experimental, innovative, or pilot educator preparation programs are for entities that already operate a department-approved program and establishes clearer requirements for approval, including demonstrating a defined innovation purpose and identifying any specific requirements with which the program will not comply. Approval is granted for up to three years and is subject to annual onsite or virtual reviews and required reporting to ensure the program is effectively preparing candidates for licensure. Based on these reviews, the department may allow the program to continue, require a program improvement plan, or deny continued approval. At the end of the approval period, entities must submit a final report summarizing outcomes and evaluation findings. Overall, the rule preserves flexibility for innovation while strengthening oversight, accountability, and consistency in the approval and monitoring of experimental educator preparation programs.</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 <p>The department held a preliminary public hearing and comment period on the scope statement for the proposed rule. As provided in the hearing notice, any comment received during the preliminary public hearing and comment period are also considered for the development of this economic impact analysis. However, no comments were received to be considered in the development of this economic impact analysis.</p>		
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		

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Incurred)

State Fiscal Impact:

The proposed rule is not expected to result in a significant fiscal impact to the state. The activities required under the rule, including review of applications, annual onsite or virtual reviews, and evaluation of required reports, align with existing educator preparation program approval and oversight functions already performed by the department. Any additional workload associated with clarifying and administering experimental, innovative, or pilot program approvals can be absorbed within existing staff responsibilities and resources. No new state funding, staffing, or systems are anticipated or required as a result of implementing the rule.

Local Fiscal Impact:

The proposed rule is not expected to result in a significant fiscal impact to local entities or approved educator preparation providers. Participation in an experimental, innovative, or pilot program is voluntary, and entities may choose whether to apply based on their capacity and resources. Any costs associated with developing proposals, participating in reviews, or submitting required reports would be determined by the entity and can be managed within existing program budgets. The rule does not impose mandatory new requirements on local governments or school districts that do not seek approval under this provision.

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

Implementation of the proposed rule provides clearer and more consistent requirements for the approval and oversight of experimental, innovative, or pilot educator preparation programs. By clarifying eligibility, application requirements, approval timelines, and monitoring expectations, the rule reduces ambiguity for both applicants and the department and establishes a uniform framework for evaluating program effectiveness. The rule supports innovation within educator preparation while maintaining accountability through defined approval periods, periodic reviews, and required reporting. Without the rule change, existing ambiguity in current administrative code would remain, limiting the department's ability to approve, monitor, or maintain the status of experimental or innovative programs and reducing the state's capacity to support new approaches to educator preparation in a structured and accountable manner.

16. Long-Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Implementation of the proposed rule is expected to support a more stable, transparent, and accountable framework for innovation in educator preparation. By establishing clear expectations for approval, monitoring, and evaluation, the rule enables the department to responsibly encourage new preparation models while maintaining licensure quality and public trust. Over time, the structured use of experimental, innovative, or pilot programs may generate evaluative information that informs future policy decisions, program improvements, and potential revisions to educator preparation standards.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Because educator preparation in the United States is typically governed by each state and local government, federal regulations are generally silent with respect to the preparation of teachers. As a result, the requirements for educator preparation programs vary by state.

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

There are no corresponding provisions in neighboring states.

19. Contact Name

Carl Bryan, Legislative Policy Coordinator
Department of Public Instruction

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 266-3275

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