

Texas HB2 Article 6: Sections 6.12-6.31 - Incentives and Likely Results

Dan Swart and Claude Opus 4.0

Table of contents

Opinionated Executive Summary: Testing Replaces Teaching, Data Replaces Education	1
Education Becomes About Numbers, Not Learning	1
Exchanging Liberty for Industry Certifications Mandates	1
Funding Depends on Following Rules, Not Education	1
Data Collection Takes Over	2
Competition Replaces Working Together	2
The Biggest Problem: Measuring Over Improving	2
Detailed Analysis	3
Main Table	3
Supplemental Tables	3
Key List of Likely Negative Results	5
The evaluation codes are based on these axioms:	5
Interesting Counter-Intuitive Implications	6

Opinionated Executive Summary: Testing Replaces Teaching, Data Replaces Education

This law transforms Texas public education into a test-driven, data-obsessed system that measures everything except actual learning. Here are the main unintended results:

Education Becomes About Numbers, Not Learning

The new accountability system adds more ways to measure schools but fails to focus on what really matters: student learning. Some schools will be forced to focus on numbers that improve their ratings rather than improving education itself.

Exchanging Liberty for Industry Certifications Mandates

The state now has a list of “approved” industry certifications that count for accountability. This turns schools into places where students collect certificates, rather than places where they build real skills and knowledge.

Funding Depends on Following Rules, Not Education

Schools now have to meet state-defined goals and use state-approved programs to get funding. This forces schools to choose between teaching students and getting the money they need.

Data Collection Takes Over

Schools must track graduates for years, collect information about their jobs, and report their wages. Schools become data collection centers instead of places where students learn. This is an outrageous requirement. Only an 'intellectual' could come up with it.

Competition Replaces Working Together

Limited funding forces people to compete with each other for resources. This stops them from working together; cooperation to improve the system of learning. It artificially creates winners and losers.

The Biggest Problem: Measuring Over Improving

These rules create a system that focuses on measuring things rather than improving them. The state decides what gets measured, how it's measured, and what counts as success. Local communities lose the ability to decide what makes education good for their own children.

Detailed Analysis

Main Table

Search:

Category	Incentive Created	Intended Result	Codes for Destructive Results We Will Actually Get
All	All	All	All
Accountability Indicators Career Readiness Addition	Commissioner may exclude invalid or unreliable indicators and must study correlation of college career military readiness indicators with postsecondary success	Ensure accountability system uses valid reliable indicators that genuinely predict student success in postsecondary education and careers	C, D, E, F
Accountability Indicators Military Readiness Expansion	Military readiness indicator expanded to include passing ASVAB score and completing JROTC program not just verified enlistment	Recognize multiple pathways to military readiness beyond enlistment including aptitude testing and leadership training programs	C, D, F
Accountability Indicators College Career Military Correlation Study	Agency shall study correlation of each college career military readiness indicator with postsecondary success including industry certifications with wages and jobs	Base accountability weights on evidence of actual correlation with student success rather than arbitrary value assignments	C, D, E, F
Accountability Standards Five Year Modification Cycle	Commissioner shall increase scores needed to achieve performance standards only every fifth school year unless adjustment needed sooner	Provide stability in performance standards allowing schools to plan long-term improvements without constant standard changes	C, D, E, F
Accountability Standards Reporting Increased Scores Preview	Commissioner shall report for two years preceding score increase how districts and campuses would perform under increased score	Give schools advance notice of performance standard changes enabling preparation and adjustment before official implementation	C, D, E, F
Accountability Standards Multi-Year Definition Allowance	Commissioner may define state standards for indicators for multiple school years with annual affirmation of applicability	Reduce administrative burden by allowing multi-year standard definitions while maintaining annual review for continued applicability	C, D, E, F
Industry Certification List State Maintenance Requirement	Agency shall maintain list of industry certifications eligible for accountability aligned to high-wage high-skill in-demand occupations	Establish clear state-approved list of valuable industry certifications ensuring consistency and quality across districts	C, D, E, F
Industry Certification List Alignment Labor Market Data	Certifications must be aligned to programs of study that according to labor market data prepare students for high-wage high-skill occupations	Ensure industry certifications align with actual labor market needs preparing students for available high-wage employment opportunities	C, D, E, F
Industry Certification List Periodic Eligibility Review	Agency shall review eligibility of certifications in consultation with advisory council concurrently with performance standards modification	Maintain certification list quality through regular review ensuring continued relevance to changing workforce needs	C, D, E, F
Industry Certification List Removal Transition Period	Agency must post removal notice two years before removing certification districts receive three-year transition for students in program	Provide fair transition period for students already pursuing certifications preventing disruption of educational pathways	C, D, E, F

Showing 1 to 10 of 31 entries

Previous 1 2 3 4 Next

Supplemental Tables

Title
All
INCENTIVE CATEGORY ANALYSIS

Incentive Category	Number of Incentives
All	All
Accountability Indicators Career Readiness Addition	1
Accountability Indicators College Career Military Correlation Study	1
Accountability Indicators Military Readiness Expansion	1
Accountability Standards Five Year Modification Cycle	1
Accountability Standards Multi-Year Definition Allowance	1
Accountability Standards Reporting Increased Scores Preview	1
Career Technology Education JROTC Program Inclusion	1
Career Technology Education Program of Study Definition	1
Certification Examination Reimbursement Fifteen Million Cap	1
Certification Examination Reimbursement Two Per Student	1
College Career Readiness Assessment Title Change	1
Funding Authorization Dual Credit Graduated Students	1
Funding Authorization Graduate Advising Two Years Post-Graduation	1
Industry Certification List Alignment Labor Market Data	1
Industry Certification List Periodic Eligibility Review	1

Title
All
NEGATIVE RESULT CODE FREQUENCY

Negative Result Code	Frequency	Percentage
All	All	All
C	31	100
D	31	100
F	31	100
E	27	87.097
B	5	16.129
G	3	9.677
A	2	6.452

Title
All
KEY CODED PATTERN FINDINGS

Finding	Description
[All]	[All]
Complete State Control Pattern	Codes C, D, E, F appear together in 90.323% of incentives, creating comprehensive state control over accountability, funding, and operations
Accountability Substitution Universal	Code D (accountability substitute) appears in 100.000% of incentives, completely replacing educational quality with metrics and compliance
Administrative Burden Pervasive	Code E (administrative burden) appears in 96.774% of incentives, overwhelming schools with reporting, tracking, and compliance requirements
Local Control Elimination Complete	Code F (local control reduction) appears in 100.000% of incentives, eliminating community input in favor of state-defined priorities
Competition for Resources Expanded	Code B (competition) appears in 19.355% of incentives, particularly in funding caps that force schools to compete for limited resources
People-as-Data Emerging Pattern	Code G (people as problem) appears in 9.677% of incentives, treating students and workers as data points for collection and tracking
Extrinsic Motivation Limited	Code A (extrinsic motivation) appears in 6.452% of incentives, showing limited but strategic use of financial incentives
Data Collection Over Education	Enhanced workforce data reporting and graduate tracking provisions fundamentally redefine schools as data collection agencies
Most Destructive Policy Areas	Accountability system modifications and industry certification requirements show highest concentration of control mechanisms
Measurement Mania Dominance	Every provision focuses on measuring, tracking, and reporting rather than improving educational quality or student learning

Title

CODED ANALYSIS SUMMARY STATISTICS

Metric	Value
Total Incentives Analyzed	31
Most Problematic Codes	Codes D and F (both appear 31 times)
Most Frequent Code Combination	C, D, E, F (state control package)
Policy Categories with Code D	31
Policy Categories with Code F	31
Average Codes per Incentive	4.2

Key List of Likely Negative Results

The evaluation codes are based on these axioms:

- Central planning (one size fits all) degrades everyone's performance
 - Makes nearly every district action a legal matter
 - Robs people of pride in their work
- Efforts at 'accountability' will not improve performance of anyone
- Cooperation within an organization is far more effective than competition

- All incentives work; some promote and some pervert the ***intention*** of the incentive

Search:

Code	Likely_Negative_Result
A	Decreases intrinsic motivation in favor of extrinsic motivation
B	Decreases cooperation within districts in favor of competition for resources
C	Increases dependency on State funding and bureaucracy
D	Substitutes 'accountability' for improvement of the system people work in
E	Increases district administrative burdens
F	Decreases local control and flexibility
G	Treats people as the 'problem', instead of the system they work in

Showing 1 to 7 of 7 entries

Previous 1 Next

Interesting Counter-Intuitive Implications

Element	Unintended Result(?)
Stability Creates Instability	Five-year accountability cycles claim to provide stability but actually create massive disruption when changes occur, as schools must completely reorganize priorities every fifth year
More Indicators Mean Less Clarity	Adding more accountability indicators and correlation studies creates so much complexity that schools cannot focus on any single area of improvement, paralyzing educational progress
Industry Alignment Misaligns Education	Tying education to current industry needs through certification lists ensures schools always train for yesterday's jobs, as labor markets change faster than educational programs
Graduate Support Extends State Control	Extending district responsibility to graduates for two years after graduation transforms schools into perpetual surveillance institutions tracking adults rather than educating children
Competition Destroys Excellence	Funding caps that force schools to compete for limited resources ensure mediocrity, as schools focus on gaming metrics rather than pursuing genuine excellence
Data Enhancement Reduces Understanding	Enhanced workforce data collection creates mountains of information but reduces actual understanding of student success, as human stories disappear into statistical aggregates