

STORAGE NAME: h1667z.ei
DATE: May 4, 1999

****FINAL ACTION****
****SEE FINAL ACTION STATUS SECTION****

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION INNOVATION
FINAL 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 YEAS 6 NAYS 0
- (2) EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS
- (3)
- (4)
- (5)

I. FINAL ACTION STATUS:

HB 1667 died in the Committee on Education Appropriations on April 30, 1999.

II. 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 |
| A | 94-100% -- 4.0 | Outstanding Progress |
| B+ | 90-93% -- 3.5 | None listed |
| B | 85-89% -- 3.0 | Above Average Progress |
| C+ | 81-84% -- 2.5 | None listed |
| C | 77-80% -- 2.0 | Average Progress |
| D+ | 73-76% -- 1.5 | None listed |
| D | 70-72% -- 1.0 | Lowest Acceptable Progress |
| 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.

Grade calculations for scholarship and college entrance purposes are typically recalculated according to the individual scholarship or universities criteria hence, the bill will have little effect in this area. According to DOE, due to recent changes in GPA calculations, school districts are currently using multiple methodologies for calculating GPA. Methodologies used are dependent upon when a child entered ninth grade and which law was in effect at that time. In addition to state determined grade calculation methods district calculate a district's GPA. The district level method incorporates "weighted" course values and is typically used to determine class ranking.

School districts as well as the state Department of Education 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 and DOE to record grades and produce report cards.

III. 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 |
| A | 94-100% -- 4.0 | Outstanding Progress |
| B | 85-93% -- 3.0 | Above Average Progress |
| C | 77-84% -- 2.0 | Average Progress |
| D | 65-74% -- 1.0 | Lowest Acceptable Progress |
| F | 0-64% -- 0.0 | Failure |

According to DOE, due to recent changes in GPA calculations, school districts are currently using multiple methodologies for calculating GPA. Methodologies used are dependent upon when a child entered ninth grade and which law was in effect at that time. In addition to state determined grade calculation methods, districts calculate a district GPA. The district level method incorporates "weighted" course values and is typically used to determine class ranking.

Other States

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, Arkansas is the only other state to include a grading scale in their state statutes. The majority of the states allow each individual district to determine their grading scale. Arkansas' grading scale is:

- "A" - 90 to 100 percent
- "B" - 80 to 89 percent
- "C" - 70 to 79 percent
- "D" - 60 to 69 percent
- "F" - below 59 percent

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 |
| A | 94-100% -- 4.0 | Outstanding Progress |
| B+ | 90-93% -- 3.5 | None listed |
| B | 85-89% -- 3.0 | Above Average Progress |
| C+ | 81-84% -- 2.5 | None listed |
| C | 77-80% -- 2.0 | Average Progress |
| D+ | 73-76% -- 1.5 | None listed |
| D | 70-72% -- 1.0 | Lowest Acceptable Progress |
| 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 as well as the state Department of Education will have to update their system of recording grades to accommodate the new scale.

C. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES:

1. Less Government:

a. 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?

According to DOE, the required changes in calculating GPAs could create an additional workload for the department, districts and schools. Several methods are currently used depending on the law that was in effect when a child entered the ninth grade.

(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

2. Lower Taxes:

a. Does the bill increase anyone's taxes?

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.

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

b. 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:

(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.

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE AGENCIES/STATE FUNDS:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

School districts and the State Department of Education 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 and DOE to record grades and produce report cards.

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.

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

1. Direct Private Sector Costs:

None.

2. Direct Private Sector Benefits:

N/A

3. Effects on Competition, Private Enterprise and Employment Markets:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

N/A

V. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

The bill does not require counties or municipalities to expend funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not reduce the authority of counties or municipalities to raise revenue.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

The bill does not reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties and municipalities.

VI. COMMENTS:

N/A

VII. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

HB 1667 was considered by the Committee on Education Innovation on March 31, 1999. The bill passed unanimously by a vote of six to zero.

VIII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION INNOVATION:

Prepared by:

Pamela M. Allen

Staff Director:

Ouida J. Ashworth

FINAL ANALYSIS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION INNOVATION:

Prepared by:

Pamela M. Allen

Staff Director:

Ouida J. Ashworth