

SENATE AMENDMENTS

2nd Printing

By: Gooden

H.B. No. 2263

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT

relating to continued monitoring of certain public school campuses that have been assigned a campus intervention team.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Section 39.106(e), Education Code, is amended to read as follows:

(e) For each year a campus is assigned an unacceptable performance rating, a campus intervention team shall:

~~(1) [continue to work with a campus until:~~

~~[(A) the campus satisfies all performance standards under Section 39.054(e) for a two-year period; or~~

~~[(B) the campus satisfies all performance standards under Section 39.054(e) for a one-year period and the commissioner determines that the campus is operating and will continue to operate in a manner that improves student achievement;~~

~~[(2)]~~ assist in updating the targeted improvement plan to identify and analyze areas of growth and areas that require improvement; and

(2) ~~[(3)]~~ submit each updated plan described by Subdivision (1) ~~[(2)]~~ to the board of trustees of the school district.

SECTION 2. This Act takes effect September 1, 2017.

ADOPTED

MAY 24 2017

Katay Spaw
Secretary of the Senate

By: *Roger W. N.*

H.B. No. 2263

Substitute the following for H.B. No. 2263:

By: *José Lucio, Jr.*

C.S. H.B. No. 2263

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT

relating to the public school accountability system.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Section 39.053, Education Code, is amended by amending Subsection (c) and adding Subsections (c-4) and (g-3) to read as follows:

(c) School districts and campuses must be evaluated based on five domains of indicators of achievement adopted under this section that include:

(1) in the first domain, the results of:

(A) assessment instruments required under Sections 39.023(a), (c), and (l), including the results of assessment instruments required for graduation retaken by a student, aggregated across grade levels by subject area, including:

(i) for the performance standard determined by the commissioner under Section 39.0241(a), the percentage of students who performed satisfactorily on the assessment instruments, aggregated across grade levels by subject area; and

(ii) for the college readiness performance standard as determined under Section 39.0241, the percentage of students who performed satisfactorily on the assessment instruments, aggregated across grade levels by subject area; and

(B) assessment instruments required under Section 39.023(b), aggregated across grade levels by subject area,

1 including the percentage of students who performed satisfactorily
2 on the assessment instruments, as determined by the performance
3 standard adopted by the agency, aggregated across grade levels by
4 subject area;

5 (2) in the second domain:

6 (A) for assessment instruments under Subdivision
7 (1)(A):

8 (i) for the performance standard determined
9 by the commissioner under Section 39.0241(a), the percentage of
10 students who met the standard for annual improvement on the
11 assessment instruments, as determined by the commissioner by rule
12 or by the method for measuring annual improvement under Section
13 39.034, aggregated across grade levels by subject area; and

14 (ii) for the college readiness performance
15 standard as determined under Section 39.0241, the percentage of
16 students who met the standard for annual improvement on the
17 assessment instruments, as determined by the commissioner by rule
18 or by the method for measuring annual improvement under Section
19 39.034, aggregated across grade levels by subject area; and

20 (B) for assessment instruments under Subdivision
21 (1)(B), the percentage of students who met the standard for annual
22 improvement on the assessment instruments, as determined by the
23 commissioner by rule or by the method for measuring annual
24 improvement under Section 39.034, aggregated across grade levels by
25 subject area;

26 (3) in the third domain, the student academic
27 achievement differentials among students from different racial and

1 ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds;

2 (4) in the fourth domain:

3 (A) for evaluating the performance of high school
4 campuses and districts that include high school campuses:

5 (i) dropout rates, including dropout rates
6 and district completion rates for grade levels 9 through 12,
7 computed in accordance with standards and definitions adopted by
8 the National Center for Education Statistics of the United States
9 Department of Education;

10 (ii) high school graduation rates, computed
11 in accordance with standards and definitions adopted in compliance
12 with the Every Student Succeeds Act [~~No Child Left Behind Act of~~
13 ~~2001~~] (20 U.S.C. Section 6301 et seq.);

14 (iii) the percentage of students who
15 successfully completed the curriculum requirements for the
16 distinguished level of achievement under the foundation high school
17 program;

18 (iv) the percentage of students who
19 successfully completed the curriculum requirements for an
20 endorsement under Section 28.025(c-1);

21 (v) the percentage of students who
22 completed a coherent sequence of career and technical courses;

23 (vi) the percentage of students who satisfy
24 the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness benchmarks
25 prescribed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under
26 Section 51.3062(f) on an assessment instrument in reading, writing,
27 or mathematics designated by the Texas Higher Education

1 Coordinating Board under Section 51.3062(c);

2 (vii) the percentage of students who earn
3 at least 12 hours of postsecondary credit required for the
4 foundation high school program under Section 28.025 or to earn an
5 endorsement under Section 28.025(c-1);

6 (viii) the percentage of students who have
7 completed an advanced placement or international baccalaureate
8 course;

9 (ix) the percentage of students who enlist
10 in the armed forces of the United States; [~~and~~]

11 (x) the percentage of students who earn an
12 industry certification;

13 (xi) the percentage of students who
14 successfully completed an OnRamps dual enrollment course;

15 (xii) the percentage of students who have
16 received credit by examination;

17 (xiii) the percentage of students who have
18 been promoted to higher grade levels than the grade levels to which
19 the students would ordinarily be assigned;

20 (xiv) the percentage of students who have
21 earned a diploma after not more than three years of high school
22 attendance; and

23 (xv) the percentage of students who earn an
24 associate degree;

25 (B) for evaluating the performance of middle and
26 junior high school and elementary school campuses and districts
27 that include those campuses:

1 (i) student attendance; [~~and~~]
2 (ii) for middle and junior high school
3 campuses:

4 (a) dropout rates, computed in the
5 manner described by Paragraph (A)(i); [~~and~~]

6 (b) the percentage of students in
7 grades seven and eight who receive instruction in preparing for
8 high school, college, and a career that includes information
9 regarding the creation of a high school personal graduation plan
10 under Section 28.02121, the distinguished level of achievement
11 described by Section 28.025(b-15), each endorsement described by
12 Section 28.025(c-1), college readiness standards, and potential
13 career choices and the education needed to enter those careers; and

14 (c) the percentage of students in
15 grades seven and eight who complete a pre-advanced placement course
16 or pre-international baccalaureate course; and

17 (iii) the percentage of students who
18 participate in a University Interscholastic League A+ academic
19 event; and

20 (C) any additional indicators of student
21 achievement not associated with performance on standardized
22 assessment instruments determined appropriate for consideration by
23 the commissioner in consultation with educators, parents, business
24 and industry representatives, and employers; and

25 (5) in the fifth domain, three programs or specific
26 categories of performance related to community and student
27 engagement locally selected and evaluated as provided by Section

1 39.0546.

2 (c-4) For purposes of evaluating the performance of a
3 district or campus under Subsection (c), the commissioner shall
4 determine a method by which the performance of a student is
5 attributed greater weight for each school year a student has been
6 continuously enrolled in the school district or at the campus, as
7 applicable.

8 (g-3) The commissioner shall adopt rules for computing the
9 percentage of students participating in a University
10 Interscholastic League A+ academic event under Subsection
11 (c)(4)(B)(iii).

12 SECTION 2. Section 39.107, Education Code, is amended by
13 adding Subsections (b-10), (b-11), and (b-12) to read as follows:

14 (b-10) Not later than June 15 of each year, the commissioner
15 shall, in writing, either approve or reject any campus turnaround
16 plan prepared and submitted to the commissioner by a district. If
17 the commissioner rejects a campus turnaround plan, the commissioner
18 must also send the district an outline of the specific concerns
19 regarding the turnaround plan that resulted in the rejection.

20 (b-11) If the commissioner rejects a campus turnaround
21 plan, the district must create a modified plan with assistance from
22 agency staff and submit the modified plan to the commissioner for
23 approval not later than August 15. The commissioner shall notify
24 the district in writing of the commissioner's decision regarding
25 the modified plan not later than September 1.

26 (b-12) If the agency assists or offers assistance to a
27 district in modifying a campus turnaround plan following a

1 rejection under Subsection (b-10), the agency may not recommend or
2 require participation by the district in any of the following:

3 (1) general workshops for the board of trustees of the
4 district;

5 (2) the use of fidelity instruments as part of the
6 campus turnaround plan; or

7 (3) any other initiative that does not directly relate
8 to a concern raised in regard to the rejected campus turnaround plan
9 that was identified by the commissioner under Subsection (b-10).

10 SECTION 3. This Act applies beginning with the 2017-2018
11 school year.

12 SECTION 4. This Act takes effect immediately if it receives
13 a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house, as
14 provided by Section 39, Article III, Texas Constitution. If this
15 Act does not receive the vote necessary for immediate effect, this
16 Act takes effect September 1, 2017.

ADOPTED

MAY 24 2017

Letay Shaw
Secretary of the Senate

BY:

Roger W. N.

FLOOR AMENDMENT NO. 1

1 Amend C.S.H.B. No. 2263 (senate committee printing) by
2 striking all below the enacting clause and substituting the
3 following:

4 SECTION 1. Section 39.106(e), Education Code, is amended
5 to read as follows:

6 (e) For each year a campus is assigned an unacceptable
7 performance rating, a campus intervention team shall:

8 (1) ~~continue to work with a campus until:~~

9 ~~[(A) the campus satisfies all performance~~
10 ~~standards under Section 39.054(e) for a two-year period; or~~

11 ~~[(B) the campus satisfies all performance~~
12 ~~standards under Section 39.054(e) for a one-year period and the~~
13 ~~commissioner determines that the campus is operating and will~~
14 ~~continue to operate in a manner that improves student~~
15 ~~achievement;~~

16 ~~[(2)]~~ assist in updating the targeted improvement
17 plan to identify and analyze areas of growth and areas that
18 require improvement; and

19 (2) ~~[(3)]~~ submit each updated plan described by
20 Subdivision (1) ~~[(2)]~~ to the board of trustees of the school
21 district.

22 SECTION 2. Section 39.107, Education Code, is amended by
23 adding Subsections (b-10) and (b-11) to read as follows:

24 (b-10) Not later than June 15 of each year, the
25 commissioner shall, in writing, either approve or reject any
26 campus turnaround plan prepared and submitted to the
27 commissioner by a district. If the commissioner rejects a campus
28 turnaround plan, the commissioner must also send the district an
29 outline of the specific concerns regarding the turnaround plan

1 that resulted in the rejection.

2 (b-11) If the commissioner rejects a campus turnaround
3 plan, the district must create a modified plan with assistance
4 from agency staff and submit the modified plan to the
5 commissioner for approval not later than the 60th day after the
6 date the commissioner rejects the campus turnaround plan. The
7 commissioner shall notify the district in writing of the
8 commissioner's decision regarding the modified plan not later
9 than the 15th day after the date the commissioner receives the
10 modified plan.

11 SECTION 3. This Act takes effect September 1, 2017.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 85TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

May 25, 2017

TO: Honorable Joe Straus, Speaker of the House, House of Representatives

FROM: Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB2263 by Gooden (Relating to the public school accountability system.), **As Passed 2nd House**

No significant fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.

The bill would remove the requirement that a campus that had previously been assigned an unacceptable performance rating would continue to work with a campus intervention team (CIT). Under current statute, a campus previously assigned "Improvement Required" (IR) continued to work with a CIT to prepare and submit a targeted improvement plan for one or two years.

TEA estimates a reduction in the number of improvement plans submitted annually, and expects a cost savings to result from the bill. However, because these plans are from previously IR campuses, and the agency does not support them as extensively as it does multi-year IR campuses, the cost savings associated with the bill are not expected to be significant.

The commissioner would also be required to either approve or reject any campus turnaround plan in writing no later than June 15th of each year. If the plan is rejected, the commissioner must also send the district an outline of the specific concerns regarding the turnaround plan that resulted in the rejection. A district receiving a rejected plan must create a modified plan with assistance from TEA staff.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2017.

Local Government Impact

The bill would reduce costs to districts with a campus that would no longer be required to contract with a Professional Service Provider in the year after the campus meets standard.

TEA estimates a minimal local impact for districts currently required to take action to address campus improvement plans. This bill would limit or eliminate interventions at some districts.

Source Agencies: 701 Texas Education Agency

LBB Staff: UP, SL, THo, AM

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 85TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

May 18, 2017

TO: Honorable Larry Taylor, Chair, Senate Committee on Education

FROM: Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB2263 by Gooden (Relating to continued monitoring of certain public school campuses that have been assigned a campus intervention team and the approval and modification of a campus turnaround plan submitted by a school district.), **Committee Report 2nd House, Substituted**

<p>No significant fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.</p>
--

The bill would remove the requirement that a campus that had previously been assigned an unacceptable performance rating would continue to work with a campus intervention team (CIT). Under current statute, a campus previously assigned "Improvement Required" (IR) continued to work with a CIT to prepare and submit a targeted improvement plan for one or two years.

TEA estimates a reduction in the number of improvement plans submitted annually, and expects a cost savings to result from the bill. However, because these plans are from previously IR campuses, and the agency does not support them as extensively as it does multi-year IR campuses, the cost savings associated with the bill are not expected to be significant.

The commissioner would also be required to either approve or reject any campus turnaround plan in writing. If the plan is rejected, the commissioner must also send the district an outline of the specific concerns regarding the turnaround plan that resulted in the rejection. A district receiving a rejected plan must create a modified plan with assistance from TEA staff.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2017.

Local Government Impact

The bill would reduce costs to districts with a campus that would no longer be required to contract with a Professional Service Provider in the year after the campus meets standard.

TEA estimates a minimal local impact for districts currently required to take action to address campus improvement plans. This bill would limit or eliminate interventions at some districts.

Source Agencies: 701 Texas Education Agency

LBB Staff: UP, SL, THo, AM

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 85TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

May 12, 2017

TO: Honorable Larry Taylor, Chair, Senate Committee on Education

FROM: Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB2263 by Gooden (Relating to continued monitoring of certain public school campuses that have been assigned a campus intervention team.), **As Engrossed**

No significant fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.

The bill's provisions would remove the requirement that a campus that had previously been assigned an unacceptable performance rating would continue to work with a campus intervention team (CIT). Under current statute, a campus previously assigned "Improvement Required" (IR) continued to work with a CIT to prepare and submit a targeted improvement plan for one or two years.

TEA estimates a reduction in the number of improvement plans submitted annually, and expects a cost savings to result from the bill. However, because these plans are from previously IR campuses, and the agency does not support them as extensively as it does multi-year IR campuses, the cost savings associated with the bill are not expected to be significant.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2017.

Local Government Impact

The bill's provisions would reduce costs to districts with a campus that would no longer be required to contract with a Professional Service Provider in the year after the campus meets standard.

Source Agencies: 701 Texas Education Agency

LBB Staff: UP, THo, AM, SL

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 85TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

March 18, 2017

TO: Honorable Dan Huberty, Chair, House Committee on Public Education

FROM: Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB2263 by Gooden (Relating to continued monitoring of certain public school campuses that have been assigned a campus intervention team.), **As Introduced**

No significant fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.

The bill's provisions would remove the requirement that a campus that had previously been assigned an unacceptable performance rating would continue to work with a campus intervention team (CIT). Under current statute, a campus previously assigned "Improvement Required" (IR) continued to work with a CIT to prepare and submit a targeted improvement plan for one or two years.

TEA estimates a reduction in the number of improvement plans submitted annually, and expects a cost savings to result from the bill. However, because these plans are from previously IR campuses, and the agency does not support them as extensively as it does multi-year IR campuses, the cost savings associated with the bill are not expected to be significant.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2017.

Local Government Impact

The bill's provisions would reduce costs to districts with a campus that would no longer be required to contract with a Professional Service Provider in the year after the campus meets standard.

Source Agencies: 701 Texas Education Agency

LBB Staff: UP, THo, AM, SL