**DATE**: March 18, 1999

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION INNOVATION ANALYSIS

**BILL #**: HB 1667

**RELATING TO**: High School Grading System

SPONSOR(S): Representative Ryan COMPANION BILL(S): SB 1602 (I)

# ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

(1) EDUCATION INNOVATION

(2) EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

(3) (4)

(5)

# I. SUMMARY:

HB 1667 amends s. 232.2463 to add the grades of "B+", "C+" and "D+" to the high school grading scale and defines the value for each letter grade and redefines the grades of "B", "C", and "D". The following chart shows the grading scale proposed by the bill.

High School Grading System As Proposed by HB 1667					
Grade	Percentage/G.P.A. Value	Definition			
А	94-100% 4.0	Outstanding Progress			
B+	90-93% 3.5	None listed			
В	81-84% 2.5 None listed  77-80% 2.0 Average Progress  73-76% 1.5 None listed	Above Average Progress  None listed			
C+					
С		Average Progress			
D+		None listed  Lowest Acceptable Progress			
D					
F	0-69% 0.0	Failure			

The bill has an effective date of July 1, 1999, and states that this grading scale is to be implemented in the 1999-2000 school year.

School districts will have to update their system of recording grades to accommodate the new scale. The cost is indeterminate at this time and will depend on the type of system used by the district to record grades and produce report cards.

**DATE**: March 18, 1999

PAGE 2

# II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

# A. PRESENT SITUATION:

Section, 232.2463, F.S, sets up the standards for the grading system and interpretation of letter grades in public high schools. The chart below shows the current high school grading scale pursuant to s. 232.2463, F.S

High School Grading Scale				
Grade	Percent/G.P.A. Value	Definition		
Α	94-100% 4.0	Outstanding Progress		
В	85-93% 3.0	Above Average Progress		
С	77-84% 2.0	Average Progress		
D	65-74% 1.0	Lowest Acceptable Progress		
F	0-64% 0.0	Failure		

#### B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

HB 1667 amends s. 232.2463 to add the grades of "B+", "C+" and "D+" to the high school grading scale and defines the value for each letter grade. The letter grade percentages and definitions for "B", "C", and "D" are also redefined. The following chart shows the grading scale proposed by HB 1667.

High School Grading System As Proposed by HB 1667					
Grade	Percentage/G.P.A. Value	Definition			
Α	94-100% 4.0	Outstanding Progress			
B+	90-93% 3.5	None listed			
В	85-89% 3.0	Above Average Progress  None listed			
C+	81-84% 2.5				
С	77-80% 2.0	Average Progress			
D+	73-76% 1.5	None listed  Lowest Acceptable Progress			
D	70-72% 1.0				
F	0-69% 0.0	Failure			

The bill has an effective date of July 1, 1999 and states that this grading scale is to be implemented in the 1999-2000 school year.

STORAGE NAME: h1667.ei DATE: March 18, 1999 PAGE 3 C. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES: Less Government: Does the bill create, increase or reduce, either directly or indirectly: (1) any authority to make rules or adjudicate disputes? No. (2) any new responsibilities, obligations or work for other governmental or private organizations or individuals? No. (3) any entitlement to a government service or benefit? No. b. If an agency or program is eliminated or reduced: (1) what responsibilities, costs and powers are passed on to another program, agency, level of government, or private entity? N/A (2) what is the cost of such responsibility at the new level/agency? N/A (3) how is the new agency accountable to the people governed? N/A Lower Taxes: Does the bill increase anyone's taxes? a. No. b. Does the bill require or authorize an increase in any fees?

No.

c. Does the bill reduce total taxes, both rates and revenues?

No.

d. Does the bill reduce total fees, both rates and revenues?

No.

e. Does the bill authorize any fee or tax increase by any local government?

No.

**DATE**: March 18, 1999

PAGE 4

# 3. Personal Responsibility:

a. Does the bill reduce or eliminate an entitlement to government services or subsidy?

No.

b. Do the beneficiaries of the legislation directly pay any portion of the cost of implementation and operation?

No.

## 4. Individual Freedom:

a. Does the bill increase the allowable options of individuals or private organizations/associations to conduct their own affairs?

No.

b. Does the bill prohibit, or create new government interference with, any presently lawful activity?

No.

## 5. Family Empowerment:

- a. If the bill purports to provide services to families or children:
  - (1) Who evaluates the family's needs?

N/A

(2) Who makes the decisions?

N/A

(3) Are private alternatives permitted?

N/A

(4) Are families required to participate in a program?

N/A

(5) Are families penalized for not participating in a program?

N/A

Does the bill directly affect the legal rights and obligations between family members?

No.

c. If the bill creates or changes a program providing services to families or children, in which of the following does the bill vest control of the program, either through direct participation or appointment authority:

**DATE**: March 18, 1999

PAGE 5

(1) parents and guardians?

No.

(2) service providers?

The school district would be responsible for implementing the new grading scale.

(3) government employees/agencies?

The school district would be responsible for implementing the new grading scale.

D. STATUTE(S) AFFECTED:

Amends s. 232.2463, F.S.

- E. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:
  - **Section 1** Amends s. 232.2463, F.S., providing a revised high school grading scale to include grades of B+, C+ and D+; defining percentage requirement and grade point average values.
  - **Section 2** Provides an effective date of July 1, 1999.

## III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

- A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE AGENCIES/STATE FUNDS:
  - 1. Non-recurring Effects:

None.

2. Recurring Effects:

None.

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

None.

4. Total Revenues and Expenditures:

None.

- B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS A WHOLE:
  - 1. Non-recurring Effects:

School districts will have to update their system of recording grades to accommodate the new scale. The cost is indeterminate at this time and will depend on the type of system used by the district to record grades and produce report cards.

2. Recurring Effects:

None.

E: E 6	March 18, 1999			
	3.	Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Grow	<u>th</u> :	
		None.		
C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IN		RECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SE	CTOR:	
	1.	Direct Private Sector Costs:		
		None.		
	2.	Direct Private Sector Benefits:		
		N/A		
	3.	Effects on Competition, Private Enterprise a	and Employment Markets:	
		None.		
D. FISCAL COMMENTS:				
	N/A	A		
CO	NSE	EQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 C	F THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:	
A.	AP	PLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISI	ON:	
	The	e bill does not require counties or municipaliti	es to expend funds.	
B.	RE	DUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHOR	JTY:	
	The	e bill does not reduce the authority of counties	s or municipalities to raise revenue.	
C.		REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:		
	The	e bill does not reduce the percentage of state	tax shared with counties and municipalities.	
СО	MME	ENTS:		
Gra the	ade d indi	calculations for scholarship and college entrar vidual scholarship or universities criteria henc	nce purposes are typically recalculated according to be, the bill will have little effect in this area.	
<u>AM</u>	IEND	DMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CH	ANGES:	
N/A	A			
SIG	SNAT	TURES:		
			Staff Director:	
	P	amela M. Allen	Ouida J. Ashworth	
	E 6  C.  C.  C.  C.  C.  C.  C.  C.  C.  C	CONSE A. AP The B. RE The COMMI Grade of the indi  AMENE N/A  SIGNATION Prep	3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Grown None.  C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SE  1. Direct Private Sector Costs:     None.  2. Direct Private Sector Benefits:     N/A  3. Effects on Competition, Private Enterprise a None.  D. FISCAL COMMENTS:     N/A  CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE	