

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

PI Chapter 47: Educator Effectiveness Equivalency Process

3. Subject

Educator Effectiveness Equivalency Process

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

20.255(1)(hg)

6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule

No Fiscal Effect Increase Existing Revenues Increase Costs
 Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
 Decrease Cost

7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State's Economy Specific Businesses/Sectors
 Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers
 Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)

8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

This rule recognizes the state's model for evaluating educator practice within the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System might not suit every district's unique needs. As such, this rule allows a school district, consortium of districts, or charter school established under s. 118.40(2r), Stats., to submit a new model for evaluating educator practice for review to the department. The equivalency process applies only to the educator practice component within the state system; the student outcomes component is not subject to equivalency.

10. 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.

School districts and the organization developing their equivalent model were asked about any possible compliance or implementation costs. For this economic impact analysis, the department contacted those school districts and organizations that notified the department of their intention to apply for an equivalent model for the 2013-14 school year.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

School districts that notified the department of their intention to apply for an equivalent model for the 2013-14 school year were asked to notify the department of any possible compliance or implementation costs.

12. 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)

This rule provides school districts, consortia of districts, or charter schools established under s. 118.40(2r), Stats., with the opportunity to develop and submit a new model for evaluating educator practice. The application for approval of an equivalency model takes time to complete. Thus, the rule will require some staff time from the applicants during the application process.

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

Benefits of implementing this rule include giving districts more local control in selecting the model for evaluating educator practice that best meets their unique needs. Alternatives include having every district across the state implement the state's model for evaluating educator practice set forth within the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Economic Impact Analysis

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Recognizing each district has unique needs, this rule would allow districts the flexibility to develop or choose an alternative model for evaluating educator practice which best meets those needs.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

NA

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

Illinois has established a similar educator effectiveness system, the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) to address the needs of effective educator evaluations. Teachers and principals may be evaluated by any person who successfully completes training and a pre-qualification. Unlike Wisconsin's state model, Illinois is requiring all districts to design and implement systems to measure teacher and principal performance. Districts then have two options for adopting a new system that incorporates student growth measures into teacher evaluations. A school district can develop its own system that meets minimum standards mandated by state rules; or it can choose to use all or portions of a state-designed optional model. A special advisory group, the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (PEAC) will provide input on rules for districts wanting to develop their own teacher and principal evaluation systems; and recommendations for a statewide model for principal evaluation and a default/optional model for teacher evaluation.

Iowa allows districts to design educator evaluation systems as long as they align with the state teaching standards. School districts are required to determine what policies, procedures and processes are needed to support Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. A teacher evaluation system should be built around a range of sources of data and information that will encourage and support the demonstration of teacher mastery of the Iowa Teaching Standards.

Michigan is currently in the process of developing an educator evaluation system. The Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE) will develop a fair, transparent, and feasible evaluation system for teachers and school administrators. The system will be based on rigorous standards of professional practice and of measurement. The goal of this system is to contribute to enhanced instruction, improve student achievement, and support ongoing professional learning. Currently Michigan is in the process of piloting over 800 different systems designed by school districts.

Minnesota has a voluntary program, Quality Compensation, or Q Comp, that allows local districts and exclusive representatives of the teachers to design and collectively bargain for a plan incorporating career ladder/advancement options, job-embedded professional development, teacher evaluation, performance pay, and an alternative salary schedule.

17. Contact Name

Sheila Briggs

18. Contact Phone Number

(608) 266-3361

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