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| **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE** The bill author has informed the committee that recent lawsuits and feedback from educational leaders underscore a growing need for reforms to the public school accountability system and the state testing program. C.S.H.B. 4 seeks to reconstruct both the state testing program and the metrics by which the success of public schools is evaluated to better enable both stakeholder involvement and responsiveness by, among other provisions, implementing an instructionally supportive state testing program, revising the manner in which indicators of achievement and public school performance ratings under the public school accountability system are modified and implemented, establishing a grant program for school district local accountability plans, and providing for actions challenging Texas Education Agency decisions related to public school accountability to be settled in a timely manner. |
| **CRIMINAL JUSTICE IMPACT**It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly create a criminal offense, increase the punishment for an existing criminal offense or category of offenses, or change the eligibility of a person for community supervision, parole, or mandatory supervision. |
| **RULEMAKING AUTHORITY** It is the committee's opinion that rulemaking authority is expressly granted to the State Board of Education in SECTIONS 2 and 3 of this bill and to the commissioner of education in SECTIONS 8 and 12 of this bill. |
| **ANALYSIS** C.S.H.B. 4 amends the Education Code to revise provisions relating to public school accountability, including the implementation of an instructionally supportive assessment program and the adoption and administration of tests in public schools, indicators of achievement and public school performance ratings under the public school accountability system, a grant program for school district local accountability plans, and actions challenging Texas Education Agency (TEA) decisions related to public school accountability.**Academic Skills Assessments**Statewide Assessment ProgramC.S.H.B. 4 changes the knowledge- and skills-based assessment program the State Board of Education (SBOE) is required by rule to create and implement by specifying that it is an instructionally supportive statewide assessment program and by requiring the program, in addition to being knowledge- and skills-based, to provide for progress monitoring, and be balanced, innovative, and streamlined. The bill establishes that the primary objective of the instructionally supportive assessment program is to benefit Texas students. Additionally, the bill changes specified state policy with respect to the design of the assessment program, from being designed to provide tests that are as short as practicable and to minimize the disruption to the educational program to being designed to do the following:* provide information regarding student academic achievement and learning progress to the following:
	+ public schools for the purpose of improving student instruction;
	+ students, parents, and teachers for the purpose of guiding learning objectives;
	+ education researchers for the purpose of comparing student academic achievement and learning progress data at the national and statewide levels; and
	+ the public for the purpose of allowing the public to assess the costs and benefits of using public money for the assessment program;
* evaluate the achievement level and learning progress of each assessed student in reading, mathematics, and science;
* provide information to the TEA for the purpose of making decisions regarding public school accountability, campus recognition, and the improvement of public school operations and management;
* identify the educational strengths and needs of individual students and the readiness of those students to be promoted to the next grade level or to graduate from high school;
* assess whether educational goals and curricular standards are being met at the campus, district, state, and national levels;
* provide information to help evaluate and develop educational programs and policies; and
* provide instructional staff with immediate, actionable, and useful information regarding student achievement of standards and benchmarks that may be used to improve the staff's delivery of student instruction.

Procedures for the Adoption and Administration of Certain Tests C.S.H.B. 4 replaces the requirement for TEA to adopt or develop statewide standardized tests with a requirement for TEA, in creating and implementing the instructionally supportive assessment program, to instead adopt nationally norm-referenced tests that are capable of being administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. The bill requires the state assessment program to obtain nationally comparative results for the subject areas and grade levels for which norm-referenced tests are adopted. The bill removes the requirements that an applicable test be designed to assess state curriculum standards in social studies and that all students, with certain exceptions, be assessed in social studies in grade eight. However, the bill retains the requirements that an applicable test be designed to assess state curriculum standards in reading, mathematics, science and that all students, subject to the same exceptions, be assessed as follows:* annually in mathematics and reading in grades three through eight;
* in science in grades five and eight; and
* in any other subject and grade required by federal law.

 C.S.H.B. 4 replaces the requirement for TEA to develop the applicable tests in a manner that allows, to the extent practicable, the score a student receives to provide reliable information relating to a student's satisfactory performance for each performance standard under state law and an appropriate range of performances to serve as a valid indication of growth in student achievement with a requirement for the applicable tests adopted by TEA to provide for the assessment of students in a manner that:* ensures the score a student receives provides such reliable information;
* allows for such an appropriate range of performances:
* focuses primarily on supporting excellent instruction, while also providing essential summative information that fulfills applicable federal requirements;
* consists only of questions written at the appropriate reading level for the applicable grade level, as determined by Lexile measures or another research-based readability metric approved by TEA in coordination with the technical and educator advisory committees established under state law;
* does not require a student to complete a separate, standalone essay or extended constructed response component;
* for a reading assessment, assesses writing skills through questions integrated within the context of the overall assessment;
* is adaptive to each student-appropriate measurement of individual student performance and growth;
* provides, not later than 24 hours after the date the test is administered, detailed diagnostic reports of individual student results that include recommendations based on a student's performance on the test for teachers and parents regarding practical and useful instructional strategies to better meet the individual needs of the student;
* for a beginning-of-year or middle-of-year test, includes instructional growth projections for individual students based on each student's results; and
* for an end-of-year assessment:
	+ measures student performance in relation to state curriculum and performance standards, with results aggregated by grade level and student population category and at the campus, district, and state levels;
	+ measures a student's annual through-year instructional growth;
	+ fulfills the state's public school accountability plan for purposes of satisfying federal public school accountability requirements;
	+ provides valid, reliable, and useful results; and
	+ complies with applicable peer review requirements under federal law.

C.S.H.B. 4 requires TEA to annually review and validate the readability of each item on an adopted nationally norm-referenced test to confirm alignment of the item with grade-level expectations and ensure that the item accurately measures student mastery of state curriculum standards without introducing undue complexity that is not related to the assessed standard. The bill requires an adopted test to be administered as closely as possible to the following schedule:* for a beginning-of-year test, between October 1 and October 31;
* for a middle-of-year test, between January 13 and February 21; and
* for an end-of-year test, between May 15 and May 30.

The bill subjects a test adopted under the bill to provisions providing for design requirements applicable to a criterion-referenced test replaced by the bill but differs as follows: * removes the prohibition against such a test having more than three parts;
* clarifies that the tests must be designed to minimize the impact on student instructional time; and
* replaces the requirement for the tests to be designed so that if administered to students in grades three and four, 85 percent of students will be able to complete the applicable part within 60 minutes and if administered to students in grades five through eight, 85 percent of students will be able to complete the applicable part within 75 minutes, with a requirement for such tests to be designed so that:
	+ for a beginning-of-year or middle-of-year test administered to students in grades three and four, 85 percent of students are expected to complete the test within 60 minutes;
	+ for a beginning-of-year or middle-of-year test administered to students in grades five through eight, 85 percent of students are expected to complete the test within 75 minutes; and
	+ for an end-of-year test administered to students in grades three through eight, 85 percent of students are expected to complete the test within 90 minutes.

The bill reduces from eight hours to six hours the maximum amount of time allowed for administering an applicable test. C.S.H.B. 4 replaces the requirement for TEA to adopt end-of-course tests for secondary-level courses in Algebra I, biology, English I, English II, and U.S. history with a requirement for TEA to adopt end-of-course tests for secondary-level courses in reading, mathematics, and science for the purpose of complying with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act to be administered only as necessary to meet the minimum requirements of that act. The bill reflects this change in provisions relating to secondary-level performance requirements and relating to supplemental instruction. The bill provides the following: * if changes are made to federal law or regulations, including the federal Every Student Succeeds Act, to reduce the number or frequency of tests required to be administered to students:
	+ the SBOE must adopt rules reducing the number or frequency of tests administered to students under state law; and
	+ the TEA must ensure that students are not required to be assessed in subject areas or in grade levels that are no longer required to meet the minimum requirements of that act; and
* if there is a conflict between provisions relating to the adoption and administration of tests and a federal law or regulation, including the federal Every Student Succeeds Act, TEA must seek a waiver from the application of the conflicting federal law or regulation.

C.S.H.B. 4 replaces the prohibition against more than 75 percent of the available points on an applicable test being attributable to questions presented in a multiple choice format with a prohibition against more than 25 percent of the available points on an applicable test being attributable to questions presented as technology-enhanced or constructed-response items. C.S.H.B. 4 adds a temporary provision, set to expire September 1, 2027, that requires TEA, under rules adopted by the SBOE for the 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 school years, to release the questions and answer keys to applicable end-of-year or end-of-course tests, excluding any test administered to a student for the purpose of retaking the test, after the last time the test is administered for the applicable school year. The bill makes applicable beginning with the 2027-2028 school year provisions requiring TEA to release such questions and answers every third year, establishing that TEA is not required to release a question being field-tested and not used to compute a student's test score, and requiring TEA to release such questions that are no longer being field-tested and that were not used to compute a student's score. The bill removes the specification that the release of questions no longer being field-tested and that were not used to compute a student's score be done under SBOE rule.C.S.H.B. 4 requires TEA to adopt an optional test in social studies for students in grade eight and an optional end-of-course U.S. history test that a public school district or open-enrollment charter school may elect to administer. The bill revises the requirement for TEA to notify districts and campuses of the results of certain tests as follows:* clarifies that the tests subject to the requirement are end-of-year and end-of-course tests;
* additionally requires TEA to notify districts and campuses of preliminary academic accountability ratings assigned to the district and campus by TEA based on those results; and
* changes the deadline by which TEA must provide such notifications from not later than the 21st day after the applicable test is administered to not later than the 14th day after that date.

Prohibited Consideration of Tests Administered to Certain Grade LevelsC.S.H.B. 4 includes first and second grade among the grade levels for which performance on a test administered to students in that grade level is prohibited from being considered for any purpose under the public school accountability system or statutory provisions relating to accountability interventions and sanctions.  Repealed ProvisionC.S.H.B. 4 repeals provisions that set out content requirements for the U.S. history end-of-course test, require TEA to ensure that the test's questions align with applicable state curriculum standards, and require TEA to annually issue a report relating to those questions.**Accreditation, Evaluation, and Local Accountability Plans**Assignment of Performance Ratings for 2025-2026 School YearC.S.H.B. 4 adds a temporary provision, set to expire August 1, 2026, establishing that a reference in statutory provisions relating to public education to the overall performance rating assigned to a district or campus for academic accountability or to a domain performance rating assigned to a district or campus for the 2025-2026 school year means the higher of the overall performance rating or the applicable domain performance rating the district or campus received for the 2024-2025 school year or the overall performance rating or the applicable domain performance rating the district or campus received for the 2025-2026 school year.Review of and Adjustments to Performance Indicators Regarding Student Achievement C.S.H.B. 4 revises the duties of the commissioner of education with respect to the adoption of certain performance indicators under the public school accountability system as follows:* replaces the requirement for the commissioner to adopt a set of indicators of the quality of learning and achievement, including performance indicators in the three domains of student achievement, with a requirement for the commissioner to adopt rules as necessary to implement provisions relating to performance indicators regarding student achievement; and
* replaces the requirement for the commissioner to periodically review the indicators for the consideration of appropriate revisions with an authorization for the commissioner to modify the domains or performance indicators adopted for purposes of accreditation only with the express approval of the legislature.

C.S.H.B. 4 further revises the performance indicators for evaluating districts and campuses in the three domains of student achievement under the public school accountability system as follows:* in the student achievement domain, changes one of the indicators for evaluating high school campuses and districts that include high school campuses from an indicator that accounts for students who enlist in the U.S. armed forces or the Texas National Guard to an indicator that accounts for students who demonstrate military readiness through verified enlistment in the U.S. armed forces or the Texas National Guard, by achieving a passing score as determined by the commissioner on the armed services vocational aptitude battery test, or by successfully completing a JROTC program;
* in the school progress domain, changes one of the indicators for effectiveness in promoting learning from an indicator for tests on the percentage of students who met the standard for improvement, as determined by the commissioner, to an indicator for tests on the percentage of students who met the standard for annual through-year instructional growth or improvement in reading, mathematics, and science, as determined by the commissioner; and
* in the closing the gaps domain, removes the use of disaggregated data to demonstrate the differentials among the following students:
	+ students formerly receiving special education services;
	+ students continuously enrolled; and
	+ students who are mobile.

C.S.H.B. 4 authorizes a district, in addition to performance indicators in the three domains of student achievement and not later than the July 1 immediately preceding the school year for which the district requests consideration of an indicator, to submit a request to TEA to consider in the student achievement domain or the school progress domain, one or more of the following student engagement and workforce development indicators for use in evaluating the performance of campuses that serve students in prekindergarten through eighth grade:* an indicator that accounts for the percentage of students participating in school-sponsored extracurricular or cocurricular student activities;
* for campuses that serve students in prekindergarten, an indicator that accounts for student participation in full-day prekindergarten programs;
* for campuses that serve students in kindergarten through fifth grade, an indicator that accounts for teacher completion rates of the literacy achievement academies and mathematics achievement academies;
* an indicator that accounts for students in grades six, seven, and eight who successfully complete a career and technology course approved for purposes of the career and technology education allotment; and
* an indicator that accounts for students who successfully complete and receive credit for a course designated for a grade higher than the grade in which the student is enrolled.

The bill requires the commissioner to notify a district submitting a request for consideration of such an indicator, not later than September 1 following the date the district submits the request, regarding the commissioner's decision to approve or deny the request.C.S.H.B. 4 revises provisions relating to the state standards the commissioner is required to define for certain achievement indicators as follows:* clarifies that the state standards that the commissioner is required to define for each achievement indicator are the state standards for each achievement indicator adopted for purposes of accreditation;
* requires the commissioner to adopt those standards in addition to the requirement in current law to define those standards;
* changes the time frame in which the commissioner must define and adopt those standards from annually to not later than July 15 of each year; and
* replaces the requirement for the commissioner to establish and modify the standards in consultation with educators, parents, and business and industry representatives, as necessary, with a requirement for the commissioner to define and adopt the standards for the current school year in consultation with such individuals, as necessary.

The bill requires the commissioner to increase the rigor by which the commissioner determines the overall performance ratings for academic accountability to continuously improve student performance and establishes the 15th anniversary after the date the commissioner modifies the performance standards as provided by the bill as the deadline by which the following goals must be achieved: * eliminating achievement gaps based on race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status; and
* ensuring Texas is a national leader in preparing students for postsecondary success.

The bill specifies that such success is measured by Texas ranking nationally in the top five states in preparing students for postsecondary success in comparison to states with similar student demographics and public education enrollment rates.C.S.H.B. 4 authorizes the commissioner to increase the scores needed to achieve performance standards on achievement indicators adopted for purposes of accreditation only every fifth school year and requires the commissioner to notify each district of such an increase in score not later than two school years before the school year in which TEA intends to evaluate the performance of districts and campuses under that increased score. Methods and Standards for Evaluating PerformanceC.S.H.B. 4 revises provisions relating to the calculation used in assigning a district or campus an overall performance rating for academic accountability and a separate domain performance rating for each of the three domains of student achievement, as follows:* requires the commissioner, for campuses that serve students in prekindergarten through eighth grade, to attribute not less than 10 percent of the performance rating under the student achievement domain or the school progress domain, whichever performance rating is higher, to the student engagement and workforce development indicators requested for consideration by a district and approved by the commissioner under the bill's provisions;
* decreases the amount of the performance rating attributable to the closing the gaps domain from not less than 30 percent of the performance rating to not more than five percent of the performance rating;
* requires the commissioner, for campuses that serve grades three through eight, to attribute not less than 50 percent of the domain performance rating for the student achievement domain to the indicators for evaluating the performance of districts and campuses generally; and
* requires the commissioner, for campuses that serve grades 9 through 12 with respect to the student achievement domain, to attribute not more than 40 percent of the domain performance rating to the indicators for evaluating the performance of districts and campuses generally, 40 percent of the domain performance rating to the college, career, and military readiness indicators, and 20 percent of the domain performance rating to graduation rates.

C.S.H.B. 4, for purposes of assigning a district or campus an overall performance rating for academic accountability and a separate domain rating for each of the three domains of student achievement, requires the commissioner to ensure the following:* if TEA adds or removes a test on which student performance is evaluated for the purpose of assigning district and campus performance ratings or makes significant revisions to the state's assessment program, that TEA reviews, adjusts, and recalculates the cut scores and standards used in evaluating district and campus performance to ensure fairness and consistency in the assignment of district and campus performance ratings;
* that each campus domain performance rating has minimal or no statistical correlation to the percentage of educationally disadvantaged students enrolled at the campus in order to identify effective campuses regardless of student family income;
* that any changes made to the college, career, or military readiness indicators or to the methodology that relies on data from those indicators for the preceding school year take effect beginning with students entering ninth grade in the school year immediately following the change, regardless of whether the change was made statutorily or by commissioner rule; and
* that a campus that is in the first year of operation, that is assigned a new campus identification number, or that is significantly impacted by demographic shifts due to rezoning, closure, or consolidation is not evaluated in the closing the gaps domain for the first year following the applicable event.

The bill retains the requirement under current law for the commissioner to ensure that the method used to evaluate performance is implemented in a manner that provides the mathematical possibility that all districts and campuses receive an A rating.C.S.H.B. 4 requires the commissioner, if the provisions of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act regarding public school accountability and assessment requirements are repealed or otherwise no longer have effect, to reallocate any percentage of the overall performance ratings attributable to the indicators adopted in the three domains of student achievement to the student engagement and workforce development indicators, if applicable. If TEA fails to assign a performance rating to a district or campus before the annual August 15 deadline under current state law, the bill requires the district or campus to be automatically reissued the performance rating assigned to the district or campus for the preceding school year. Such an assigned performance rating remains in effect for all official purposes, including any interventions or sanctions under state law, until TEA assigns the district or campus a new rating.Procedures Relating to the Adoption of Standards and the Provision of Explanatory Materials for the Accountability Rating SystemC.S.H.B. 4 replaces the authorization for the commissioner to adopt indicators and standards for purposes of accreditation at any time during a school year before the evaluation of a district or campus with a requirement for the commissioner to adopt performance standards relating to academic skills assessments and achievement indicators adopted for purposes of accreditation not later than the July 15 immediately preceding the school year for which the commissioner intends to assign district and campus performance ratings based on those standards. The bill authorizes the commissioner to modify the standards, methods, measures, or procedures used to evaluate districts and campuses and assign performance ratings on or after July 15 only with the express approval of the legislature. Accordingly, the bill specifies not later than July 15 of each year as the date by which the commissioner is required to provide each district a document in a simple, accessible format that explains certain accountability performance measures, methods, and procedures that will be applied for that school year in assigning the performance rating. The bill includes the performance standards adopted for the following school year among the required contents of the document.Distinction DesignationsC.S.H.B. 4, with respect to the award of a distinction designation for a district's or campus' outstanding performance in academic achievement in certain academic subjects, changes the applicable subjects from English language arts, mathematics, or science, or social studies, to reading, mathematics, or science. Grant Program for District Local Accountability PlansC.S.H.B. 4 requires TEA to establish a grant program, from money appropriated or otherwise available for that purpose, to assist at least one district in each education service center region in developing a local accountability plan that complies with the requirements under provisions relating to the assignment of campus performance ratings under the local accountability system. The bill authorizes the commissioner to adopt rules as necessary to implement those provisions, including rules applying to a district applying for such a grant. The bill authorizes a district, if the commissioner awards a grant to the district and has not adopted rules applying to the district, to select and collaborate with a third-party organization with expertise in assessment and accountability to develop a local accountability plan.**Actions Challenging TEA Decisions Related to the Public School Accountability System**C.S.H.B. 4 authorizes a school district or open-enrollment charter school to bring an action challenging a TEA decision that is made under the public school accountability system and that is based on the lawful exercise of discretion granted to TEA by the legislature only if the district's or school's petition alleges the TEA's decision is unconstitutional, arbitrary, capricious, or without lawful authority. The bill requires the trial court in such an action to expedite the action and render a final order or judgment not later than the 60th day after the date each defendant has filed an answer or other pleading responsive to the petition. If the final order or judgment is appealed, the bill requires the appellate court to expedite the appeal and render a final order or judgment not later than the 60th day after the date the appeal is filed. The bill authorizes the trial court or the appellate court, as applicable, to extend the time period within which the court must render the final order or judgment by not more than 30 additional days for good cause. The bill authorizes the trial court to set deadlines for discovery, briefing, trial, and all other proceedings necessary to render a final order or judgment and the appellate court to set deadlines for briefing, oral argument, and all other proceedings necessary to render a final order or judgment.The provisions of C.S.H.B. 4 relating to actions challenging TEA decisions applies to an action filed on or after September 1, 2025. An action filed before September 1, 2025, is governed by the law in effect on the date the action was filed, and the former law is continued in effect for that purpose.**Applicability** Except as otherwise provided, C.S.H.B. 4 applies beginning with the 2025-2026 school year.**Repealed Provision**C.S.H.B. 4 repeals Section 39.023(c-9), Education Code. |
| **EFFECTIVE DATE** On passage, or, if the bill does not receive the necessary vote, September 1, 2025. |
| **COMPARISON OF INTRODUCED AND SUBSTITUTE**While C.S.H.B. 4 may differ from the introduced in minor or nonsubstantive ways, the following summarizes the substantial differences between the introduced and committee substitute versions of the bill.Statewide Assessment ProgramWith respect to the statewide assessment program, the introduced included the following provisions absent from the substitute:* a provision that replaced the requirement that the SBOE by rule create and implement a statewide assessment program with the requirement that TEA create and implement a balanced and streamlined statewide assessment program for tests administered to assess academic skills to ensure school accountability for student achievement that is aligned with the state curriculum standards adopted by the SBOE, achieves certain public education academic goals, and supports classroom instruction;
* a provision that replaced the requirement that the SBOE consider the importance of maintaining stability in the statewide assessment program when adopting subsequent modification of the rules with the requirement that TEA do so when modifying the program; and
* a provision that required the assessment program to include certain tests and technical assistance and guidance to district and charter schools for implementing the program.

The substitute instead includes provisions absent from the introduced that change the assessment program to an instructionally supportive statewide assessment program that, in addition to being knowledge- and skills-based, provides for progress monitoring and is balanced, innovative, and streamlined and that provides for the program's primary objective and design requirements.Procedures for the Adoption and Administration of Certain Tests; Transfer of Certain Authority and Duties From the SBOE to TEAWith respect to the redesign, adoption and administration of tests, the introduced included the following provisions absent from the substitute:* a temporary provision that required TEA to redesign academic skills tests to incorporate improvements identified in TEA-submitted reports on the integrated formative assessment pilot program and to take certain actions relating to reducing the length of tests and administrating and providing technical and assistance and guidance with regard to the redesigned tests;
* a provision that clarified, for purposes of determining the validity and reliability of statewide standardized tests before the test's administration, that the entities making such a determination include the technical and educator advisory committees appointed by the commissioner and that the independence of another entity authorized to make such a determination from TEA and any other entity that developed the tests is determined by the commissioner;
* a provision that removed the requirement for the SBOE to ensure that certain tests are not administered on the first instruction day of the week unless certain conditions are met and instead required TEA to adopt a testing schedule for each school year, to the extent practicable, provide the schedule to each district and charter school during a certain time frame and include a testing window for the administration of applicable tests;
* a provision that required TEA to the extent practicable to include classroom teachers in the process of scoring questions not presented in a multiple choice format on statewide standardized and end-of-course tests;
* a provision that changed the provisions under which the adoption and administration of tests are subject to modification; and
* a provision that replaced the prohibition against a district or charter school being required to administer an optional interim test with the authorization for a district or charter school to administer such a test to students enrolled at the district or charter school, respectively.

Additionally, the introduced included provisions absent from the substitute that transferred certain authority and duties from the SBOE to TEA, including authority and duties relating to the following:* administering certain end-of-course tests for secondary-level courses and being responsible for rules regarding the administration of such tests;
* adopting rules that require TEA to release certain questions and answer keys;
* adopting one appropriate, nationally recognized, norm-referenced test in reading and mathematics to be administered to a selected sample of students in the spring;
* adopting rules for the administration of statewide standardized tests in Spanish to certain emergent bilingual students;
* adopting rules under which an eligible dyslexic student may use appropriate testing accommodations;
* providing by rule alternate dates for the administration of tests to a student who is a migratory child;
* ensuring the security of instruments and tests in their preparation, administration, and grading;
* adopting rules for the implementation of provisions relating to group-administered achievement test standards and for the maintenance of the security of the contents of all such tests; and
* approving proven psychometric procedures used to update standardization norms for certain test standards.

The substitute instead includes provisions absent from the introduced that do the following:* replace the requirement for TEA to adopt or develop statewide standardized tests with a requirement for TEA to instead adopt nationally norm-referenced tests that are capable of being administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year;
* require the state assessment program to obtain nationally comparative results for the subject areas and grade levels for which norm-referenced tests are adopted;
* remove the requirements that an applicable test be designed to assess state curriculum standards in social studies and that all students, with certain exceptions, be assessed in social studies in grade eight;
* require applicable tests adopted by TEA to provide for the assessment of students in a specified manner;
* require TEA to annually review and validate the readability of each item on an adopted nationally norm-referenced test for certain purposes and require the test to be administered as closely as possible to a specified schedule;
* remove the prohibition against applicable tests having more than three parts and further change requirements for the design of such tests by:
	+ clarifying that the tests must be designed to minimize the impact on student instructional time;
	+ replacing the requirement for the test to be designed so that students will be able to complete the test within applicable time frames with a requirement for the test to be designed so that students are expected to do so for beginning-of-year or middle-of-year tests; and
	+ including a requirement that for an end-of-year test administered to students in grades three through eight, 85 percent of students are expected to complete the assessment instrument within 90 minutes;
* reduce from eight hours to six hours the maximum amount of time allowed for administering an applicable test;
* replace the requirement for TEA to adopt end-of-course tests for secondary-level courses in Algebra I, biology, English I, English II, and U.S. history with a requirement for TEA to adopt end-of-course tests for secondary-level courses in reading, mathematics, and science for the purpose of complying with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act and make related changes regarding the continued application of or waivers from federal law or regulation;
* change the percentage of available points allowed to be attributable to certain questions on an applicable test based on the format of questions presented;
* require TEA to release certain questions and answer keys to applicable end-of-year or end-of-course tests and questions no longer being field-tested and not used to compute a student's score according to a specified schedule;
* revise the requirement for TEA to notify districts and campuses of the results of certain tests and additionally requires TEA to notify districts and campuses of preliminary academic accountability ratings; and
* require TEA to adopt an optional test in social studies for students in grade eight and an optional end-of-course U.S. history test.

Prohibited Consideration of Tests Administered to Certain Grade LevelsThe substitute includes a provision absent from the introduced that prohibits the performance on tests administered to first and second grade students from being considered for any purpose under the public school accountability system or statutory provisions relating to accountability interventions and sanctions.Repealed ProvisionsThe introduced repealed provisions that are not repealed by the substitute that do the following:* require the SBOE by rule to prohibit participation in a University Interscholastic League area, regional, or state competition during certain dates reserved for testing by the commissioner and require the commissioner to adopt rules to provide the league with a periodic calendar of such dates for planning purposes;
* authorize the SBOE by rule to designate sections of a mathematics test for grade levels three through eight that may be completed with the aid of technology and that must be completed without the aid of technology;
* exempt a classroom portfolio method used to assess less than 50 percent of a student's overall assessed performance in writing from the requirement for the SBOE to ensure that tests are not administered on the first instructional day of a week; and
* authorize an entity that operates a dropout recovery education program to administer certain tests on any date selected by the entity that falls within a testing window established for the administration of the test, subject to that SBOE requirement to ensure that tests are not administered on the first instructional day of a week.

The substitute instead repeals a provision that sets out content requirements for the U.S. history end-of-course test, requires TEA to ensure that the test's questions align with applicable state curriculum standards, and requires TEA to annually issue a report relating to those questions, whereas the introduced did not repeal that provision.Assignment of Performance Ratings for 2025-2026 School YearThe substitute includes a temporary provision absent from the introduced establishing that a reference in statutory provisions relating to public education to the overall performance rating assigned to a district or campus for academic accountability or to a domain performance rating assigned to a district or campus for the 2025-2026 school year means the higher of the overall performance rating or the applicable domain performance rating the district or campus received for the 2024-2025 school year or the overall performance rating or the applicable domain performance rating the district or campus received for the 2025-2026 school year.Review of and Adjustments to Certain Performance Indicators The substitute omits the following provisions that appeared in the introduced:* a provision that authorized the commissioner to exclude certain indicators from the set of adopted indicators upon determining that the indicators are not valid or reliable; and
* a provision that required TEA to study the college, career, and military readiness indicators to determine the correlation of each indicator with postsecondary success and required the value assigned to each such indicator to be based on the strength of the indicator's correlation with successful outcomes.

The substitute includes provisions absent from the introduced that do the following:* requires the commissioner to adopt rules as necessary to implement provisions relating to performance indicators regarding student achievement;
* replaces the requirement for the commissioner to periodically review the indicators for the consideration of appropriate revisions with an authorization for the commissioner to modify the domains or performance indicators adopted for purposes of accreditation only with the express approval of the legislature; and
* authorizes a district to submit a request to TEA to consider in the student achievement domain or the school progress domain certain student engagement and workforce development indicators for use in evaluating the performance of campuses that serve students in prekindergarten through eighth grade and requires TEA to notify the district regarding the decision to approve or deny the request.

Both the introduced and the substitute change one of the indicators in the student achievement domain for evaluating high school campuses and districts that include high school campuses from an indicator that accounts for students who enlist in the U.S. armed forces or the Texas National Guard to an indicator that accounts for students who demonstrate military readiness through verified enlistment in the U.S. armed forces or the Texas National Guard or through another specified qualification. However, the introduced established as the other qualification for demonstrating military readiness both achieving a passing score set by the commissioner on the armed services vocational aptitude battery test and successfully completing a JROTC program, whereas the substitute establishes as the other qualification either achieving such a passing score or successfully completing the JROTC program.Additionally, the substitute includes provisions absent from the introduced revising the school progress domain and the closing the gaps domain.The substitute clarifies the deadline by which certain goals must be achieved after the date the commissioner modifies the performance standards from the 15th year after the date the commissioner modifies such standards, as in the introduced, to the 15th anniversary after that date. Additionally, the introduced specified that the goal of ensuring Texas is a national leader in preparing students for postsecondary success is measured by Texas ranking nationally in the top five states in preparing students for postsecondary success and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress or its successor assessment, whereas the substitute specifies that such success is measured by Texas ranking nationally in the top five states in preparing students for postsecondary success in comparison to states with similar student demographics and public education enrollment rates.While both the substitute and the introduced revise provisions relating to the state standards the commissioner is required to define for certain achievement indicators, the versions differ as follows:* the introduced clarified that the applicable state standards are the state standards for each indicator adopted for purposes of accreditation, whereas the substitute clarifies the applicable state standards are state standards for each achievement indicator adopted for those purposes;
* the substitute requires the commissioner to adopt those standards in addition to the requirement to define those standards, whereas the introduced did not;
* the introduced removed the specification that those standards be defined for the current school year, whereas the substitute does not remove that specification;
* the substitute specifies July 15 of each year as the date by which the commissioner is required to annually define and adopt those standards, whereas the introduced did not specify a date;
* the introduced replaced the requirement for the commissioner to establish and modify the standards in consultation with educators, parents, and business and industry representatives, as necessary, with an authorization for the commissioner to do so, whereas the substitute requires the commissioner to define and adopt the standards for the current school year in consultation with such individuals, as necessary;
* the introduced required the commissioner, beginning with the indicators adopted for the 2027-2028 school year, to increase the scores needed to achieve performance standards on achievement indicators only every fifth school year unless an indicator in the domains of student achievement, school progress, or closing the gaps requires adjustment before that school year to ensure consistency of performance standards, whereas the substitute authorizes the commissioner to increase the scores needed to achieve performance standards on achievement indicators adopted under provisions relating to accreditation only every fifth school year;
* the introduced required the commissioner, beginning with the indicators adopted for the 2027-2028 school year and for each of the two school years preceding a school year the commissioner increases a score, to report the overall performance of districts and campuses under that increased score in a manner that can be reviewed by school administrators, whereas the substitute does not require the commissioner to do so;
* the substitute instead requires the commissioner to notify each district of an increase in score not later than two school years before the school year in which TEA intends to evaluate the performance of districts and campuses under that increased score;
* the introduced required the commissioner, in reporting the performance of districts and campuses on achievement indicators adopted for a school year in which the score needed to achieve performance standards on one or more of those indicators was increased, to include in the report an informational report on the performance of districts and campuses during the preceding school year under the increased score, whereas the substitute does not include such a requirement; and
* the introduced authorized the commissioner to define state standards for an achievement indicator for multiple school years provided that the commissioner annually affirms that those standards are applicable to the current school year, whereas the substitute does not include such an authorization.

Industry Certifications Eligible as a Student Achievement IndicatorThe introduced included provisions absent from the substitute that required TEA to maintain a list of eligible industry certifications for the student achievement indicator that accounts for students who earn industry certifications for purposes of evaluating the performance of high school campuses and districts that include high school campuses and set out provisions relating to the TEA-listed industry certifications, eligibility for such certifications, district benefits for such certifications, and the industry-based certification advisory council under the Labor Code.Methods and Standards for Evaluating PerformanceWith respect to the methods and standards for evaluating performance, the introduced included the following provisions absent from the substitute: * a provision that clarified that the requirements for the commissioner to assign each district and campus an overall performance rating for academic accountability and a separate domain rating for each of the three domains of student achievement apply to each school year;
* provisions relating to sanctions and interventions remaining during the assignment of an overall performance rating of "Not Rated," a prohibition against assigning such an overall performance rating on a statewide basis, and ensuring the mathematical possibility that all districts and campuses receive an "A" rating is only to the extent practicable;
* a provision that required the commissioner to make performance ratings available in years in which the standards for evaluating district and campus performance are modified or recalibrated or in which a new test is offered; and
* a provision that established that failure to meet the August 15 deadline for assigning performance ratings does not invalidate the performance rating assigned to a district or campus or any resulting intervention or sanction.

The substitute instead includes provisions absent from the introduced that do the following:* revise provisions relating to the calculation used in assigning a district or campus an overall performance rating for academic accountability and a separate domain performance rating for each of the three domains of student achievement;
* require the commissioner to ensure certain conditions are met and actions are taken for purposes of assigning an overall performance rating for academic accountability and a separate domain rating for each of the three domains of student achievement with respect to cut scores and standards, certain statistical correlations, changes to the college, career, or military readiness indicators, and an exemption from evaluation for certain districts in the closing the gaps domain after certain qualifying events;
* provide for the reallocation of certain percentages in the event of a repeal or change in effectiveness of the applicable provisions of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act; and
* require a district or campus to be automatically reissued the performance rating assigned to the district or campus for the preceding school year if TEA fails to assign a performance rating by the deadline under state law and establish that such a rating remains in effect for all official purposes.

Procedures Relating to the Adoption of Standards and the Provision of Explanatory Materials for the Accountability Rating SystemWith respect to the procedures relating to the adoption standards and the provision of explanatory materials for the accountability rating system, the introduced included the following provisions that are not present in the substitute:* a provision that changed the period during which the commissioner may adopt indicators and standards to evaluate districts and campuses for accreditation purposes from any time during a school year before the evaluation of the district or campus to any time before issuing such an evaluation;
* a provision that established that the commissioner's failure to provide to each district the document required under state law that explains the accountability performance measures, methods, and procedures that will be applied in assigning each district and campus a performance rating does not prevent that assignment and may not be the basis of a challenge to an assigned performance rating; and
* a provision that removed the specification that such a document be provided each school year.

The substitute instead includes provisions absent from the introduced that do the following:* replaces the authorization for the commissioner to adopt indicators and standards for purposes of accreditation at any time during a school year before the evaluation of a district or campus with a requirement for the commissioner to adopt performance standards relating to academic skills assessments and achievement indicators adopted for purposes of accreditation by a certain date;
* authorizes the commissioner to modify the standards, methods, measures, or procedures used to evaluate districts and campuses and assign performance ratings on or after July 15 only with the express approval of the legislature; and
* revises the required content and the date by which the commissioner must provide each district a document in a simple, accessible format that explains certain accountability performance measures, methods, and procedures that will be applied.

Challenges to Accountability Determinations and Certain Interventions Based on Determinations The substitute omits a provision of the introduced that changed the prohibition against a district or charter school challenging a TEA decision relating to an academic or financial accountability rating in a proceeding other than one conducted pursuant to the process established by the commissioner for that purpose as follows:* specified that the prohibition applies with respect to a challenge on any basis, including a lack of commissioner or TEA authority;
* removed as a condition on the prohibition the district or charter school having an opportunity to challenge the decision under that process established by the commissioner; and
* exempted from the prohibition a district or charter school that has exhausted the district's or school's remedies under that process.

The introduced also repealed a provision giving the commissioner the option to order the use of a board of trustees improvement and evaluation tool developed by the commissioner if a district does not satisfy the accreditation criteria, the academic performance standards, or any financial accountability standard as determined by commissioner rule, or if considered appropriate by the commissioner on the basis of a special accreditation investigation, whereas the substitute does not repeal that provision.Distinction DesignationsWhile both the introduced and the substitute revise provisions relating to distinction designations, the versions differ as follows:* the introduced replaced the provision setting the deadline by which the commissioner is required to award distinction designations for a district's or campus's outstanding performance in academic achievement as not later than August 8 of each year with a provision requiring those designations to be awarded concurrently with the assignment of performance ratings, whereas the substitute does not do so; and
* the substitute changes the academic subjects in which the outstanding performance of academic achievement must be awarded a distinction designation for a qualifying district of campus, whereas the introduced did not make such a change.

Grant Program for District Local Accountability PlansWhile both the substitute and the introduced establish a grant program relating to local accountability plans from money appropriated or otherwise available for that purpose, the versions differ as follows:* the introduced specified that the grant program have the capacity to assist at least one district per education service center region in developing a local accountability system, whereas the substitute instead specifies that the grant program assist at least one district in each education service center region in developing a local accountability system plan;
* the introduced required the commissioner to adopt rules to implement the grant program, whereas the substitute authorizes the commissioner to adopt rules as necessary to implement provisions relating to the assignment of campus performance ratings under the local accountability system, including rules applying to a district applying for the grant; and
* the substitute authorizes a district, if the commissioner awards a grant to a district and has not adopted rules applying to the district, to select and collaborate with a third-party organization with expertise in assessment and accountability to develop a local accountability plan, whereas the introduced did not include such an authorization.

**Applicable Actions and Proceedings**Actions Challenging TEA Decisions Related to the Public School Accountability SystemThe substitute includes provisions absent from the introduced that authorize a district or charter school to bring an action challenging a TEA decision that is made under the public school accountability system and that is based on the lawful exercise of discretion granted to TEA by the legislature only if the district's or school's petition alleges TEA's decision is unconstitutional, arbitrary, capricious, or without lawful authority and set out deadlines relating to an applicable trial court or appellate court expediting the action and rendering a final order or judgment.Venue for AppealsThe substitute omits a provision included in the introduced that specified that the authorization for a person aggrieved by a TEA action or commissioner decision to appeal to a district court in Travis County applies to a person appealing on the grounds of being aggrieved by the state's school laws or actions or decisions of any district board of trustees that violate those laws or violate a provision of a written employment contract between a district and a district employee, if a contract violation causes or would cause monetary harm to the employee.Limitation on Attorney Payments for Certain ActionsThe substitute omits the following provisions included in the introduced relating to limitations on attorney payments for certain actions:* a provision that required a district or charter school, if the district or charter school brings an action against TEA, the SBOE, or the State Board for Educator Certification or an agent or officer of those entities that alleges ultra vires conduct by the entity or an entity's agent or officer, to deposit all payments relating to the action made to the district's or charter school's attorney in an escrow account;
* a provision that authorized the district or charter school that prevails in the action to use money deposited in the escrow account to pay their attorney after a final judgment is rendered and all appeals are fully resolved;
* a provision that required the district or charter school to provide the money deposited in the escrow account that may not be paid to the district's or school's attorney after the rendering of a final judgment and the resolution of all appeals to the state for deposit in the foundation school fund; and
* a provision that prohibited such provisions from being interpreted to authorize an action not otherwise authorized by law.

Commissioner Action and Intervention Related to District or Charter School Action or Proceeding Against the StateThe substitute omits the following provisions included in the introduced relating to certain commissioner action and intervention:* a provision that included among the grounds for commissioner action under statutory provisions relating to interventions and sanctions for districts, to the extent the commissioner determines necessary, the initiation or maintenance by a district or charter school of an action or proceeding against the state or an agency or officer of the state; and
* a provision that required the commissioner to appoint a conservator to a district or charter school that is subject to commissioner action based on the initiation or maintenance of such an action or proceeding and set out provisions relating to the duties of the conservator, failure to comply with a conservator order, and certain actions taken or decisions made by the commissioner or conservator being final and not subject to appeal.

Interventions and Sanctions While the Assignment of Performance Ratings Is EnjoinedThe substitute omits the following provisions included in the introduced relating to TEA interventions and sanctions while enjoined from assigning performance ratings:* a provision that required any previously imposed interventions or sanctions to which the district, charter school, or campus is subject continue throughout a period in which TEA is enjoined from assigning performance ratings to a district, charter school, or district or charter school campus;
* a provision that required TEA, as soon as practicable after the dissolution of an injunction enjoining TEA from assigning performance ratings, to assign performance ratings for each school year and to each applicable educational entity for which TEA was so enjoined and, as applicable, to impose any appropriate interventions or sanctions based on the assigned ratings;
* a provision that required TEA to consider the applicable educational entity to have received a "Not Rated" rating for purposes of calculating consecutive years of performance and determining interventions or sanctions for that school year if TEA is permanently enjoined from assigning performance ratings;
* a provision that authorized TEA to modify or waive a deadline or time frame required by law or TEA rule applicable to the assignment of performance ratings for a school year for which TEA was enjoined from assigning performance ratings; and
* a provision that required TEA to impose an applicable intervention or sanction unless the intervention or sanction, as determined by the commissioner, has been superseded by a subsequent intervention or sanction or may be removed based on the subsequent performance of a district, charter school, or campus.

Additionally, the substitute omits the following provisions included in the introduced relating to commissioner action under circumstances in which TEA is enjoined:* a provision that required the commissioner to impose certain interventions on applicable educational entities if that entity would have been subject to commissioner action under applicable state law based on the entity's performance rating for a school year for which TEA was enjoined from assigning performance ratings, regardless of the entity's performance in a subsequent school year; and
* a provision that required the commissioner to revoke a charter holder's charter for an open-enrollment charter school for which the charter holder received a renewal based on the absence of a performance rating for a school year for which TEA was enjoined from assigning a performance rating if, after the assignment of performance ratings for that year, the charter would not have been renewed under state law providing the circumstances under which the commissioner may allow a charter to expire, regardless of the school's performance in a subsequent school year.

Prohibited Use of Funding for Certain Actions or ProceedingsThe substitute omits provisions of the introduced that revised the prohibition against the use of certain public school funds to initiate or maintain any action or proceeding against the state or a state agency or officer as follows:* expanded the funds subject to the prohibition to include federal, state, or local funding, including funding relating to assistance with instructional facilities and payment of existing debt, the foundation school program, and options for local revenue levels in excess of entitlement;
* removed the specification that the type of action or proceeding against the state for which those funds may not be used is an action or proceeding arising out of a decision, order, or determination that is final and unappealable under Education Code provisions;
* clarified that such an action or proceeding against the state or a state agency of officer includes an action or proceeding that includes a claim of ultra vires conduct; and
* removed the exception that allows funds to be used for such an action or proceeding that is specifically authorized by a rule adopted under the Education Code that results in a final and unappealable decision, order, or determination and instead created an exception that allows funds to be used for such an action or proceeding that is specifically authorized under Government Code provisions relating to declaratory judgements.

Eligible Proceedings for a Special Three-Judge District CourtThe substitute omits a provision of the introduced specifying that, for purposes of the attorney general's authority to petition the chief justice of the supreme court to convene a special three-judge district court in a suit filed in a district court in which the state or a state officer or agency is a defendant in a claim that challenges the finances or operations of the state's public school system, such claims include a claim that challenges the implementation of the public school system accountability system. |
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