

Texas HB2 Article 2: Educator Preparation and Teacher Rights

Dan Swart and Claude Sonnet 4.0

Table of contents

Executive Summary: Good Intentions Will Not Produce Desired Results	1
Districts Trade ‘Innovation’ for Less Control and More State Power	1
Teacher Shortage ‘Fix’ That Makes Things Worse	1
Advanced Certification: More Money, Less Real Improvement	2
Partnership Programs Can Waste Resources	2
Mentorship: Turning Help Into Competition	2
The Quality of Preparation and Accountability Problem	2
Local Talent Equals More State Control Over Teachers	2
Achievement Academy Turns Learning Into a Checklist	2
Conclusion	3
Detailed Analysis	3
Main Table	3
Supplemental Tables	3
Key List of Likely Negative Results (Revised 7-Code Framework)	5
The evaluation codes are based on these axioms:	5

Executive Summary: Good Intentions Will Not Produce Desired Results

The policies in HB2 Article 2, which focus on teacher preparation and certification, might seem like good ideas, but they can actually hurt teaching. These policies are called “innovative” and “supportive,” but they are likely to cause more problems.

Districts Trade ‘Innovation’ for Less Control and More State Power

Innovation districts are meant to give local schools more freedom by allowing them to skip some teacher certification rules. But in reality, these policies will take away local control (Code F in 48% of cases) and make schools more dependent on the state (Code C in 67% of cases). Schools shouldn’t need permission from the state to make real changes.

Teacher Shortage ‘Fix’ That Makes Things Worse

Policies that let schools hire uncertified teachers and offer \$1,000 payments may seem like a fix for teacher shortages. But they treat teachers as the problem, instead of fixing the real issue: the strict rules the state imposes that create false shortages (Code G in 43% of cases). The state causes

shortages by making schools follow unnecessary rules and then offers small payments to solve the problem.

Advanced Certification: More Money, Less Real Improvement

Policies that offer more pay (\$3,000-\$6,000 extra) for teachers with advanced certifications promise to improve student achievement. But they encourage teachers to collect certifications for the money, not to fix the system they work in (Code A in 67% of cases). This makes teaching about earning money, instead of helping students.

Partnership Programs Can Waste Resources

Teacher preparation programs give large amounts of money (\$10,000-\$24,000 per candidate) to create partnerships between universities and schools. But these programs waste resources and create problems, like increasing state control (Code C), adding more paperwork (Code E in 71% of cases), and taking away local control (Code F). Instead of improving education, the state spends millions on partnerships that fall apart when the funding ends.

Mentorship: Turning Help Into Competition

Mentorship programs give teachers \$1,000 for helping new teachers, but they create competition for limited resources (Code B in 24% of cases). Instead of encouraging teamwork, these policies turn mentoring into a way to make extra money. There are already systems that encourage teachers to work together.

The Quality of Preparation and Accountability Problem

Policies that require “research-based instructional materials” and “evidence-based strategies” for teacher preparation sound good, but they mostly focus on making schools follow rules instead of improving education (Code D in 52% of cases). These policies replace real change with “accountability theater.” Words like “research-based” and “evidence-based” sound important, but they don’t really lead to better teaching.

Local Talent Equals More State Control Over Teachers

“Grow Your Own” programs, which help local districts support high school students and employees who want to become teachers, sound good. But they limit local control (Code F) because the state tells districts exactly how to run these programs. Instead of being a community effort, these programs become another example of following state rules.

Achievement Academy Turns Learning Into a Checklist

Achievement academy payments (\$500-\$1,000) are meant to support professional development, but they turn teaching into a system of rewards (Code A). Eventually, teachers will attend workshops for money, not because they want to learn. These programs feel more like getting credit hours than real opportunities for growth.

Conclusion

These policies hurt the development of dedicated teachers. Instead of building on teachers' passion for teaching, they create a system where teachers focus on collecting certifications and earning rewards. They weaken teamwork between teachers and harm local communities.

In the end, these policies don't help students. They create a costly system that trains teachers to work within a broken system, rather than encouraging creative thinking and real teaching. The only people who benefit are the trainers and consultants.

Detailed Analysis

Main Table

Search:

Category	Incentive Created	Intended Result	Codes for Destructive Results We Will Actually Get
<input type="text" value="All"/>	<input type="text" value="All"/>	<input type="text" value="All"/>	<input type="text" value="All"/>
Innovation District Exemptions	Local innovation plans can exempt districts from uncertified teacher employment restrictions	Innovation districts gain flexibility to address teacher shortages through alternative staffing	C, E, F
Innovation District Exemptions	Districts of innovation receive funding for preparing and retaining educators through partnership programs	Innovation districts receive state support for educator preparation partnerships	A, C, E, F
Uncertified Teacher Employment	\$1,000 one-time payment for districts hiring uncertified teachers who earn certification by 2027	Districts incentivized to hire and support uncertified teachers through certification process	A, C, E, G
Uncertified Teacher Employment	Allow uncertified teachers in foundation curriculum courses with commissioner approval and timeline	Provide pathway for districts struggling with teacher shortages to employ uncertified staff temporarily	C, E, F, G
Uncertified Teacher Employment	Innovation districts can employ uncertified teachers in non-core subjects through 2027	Allow innovation districts to use uncertified teachers in non-core areas while maintaining core standards	C, E, F, G
Teacher Certification Incentive	One-time \$1,000 payment for each teacher who was uncertified in 2025 but earned certification by 2027	Reward districts and teachers for completing certification requirements within timeline	A, C, E
Teacher Certification Types	Create four types of teaching certificates: standard, enhanced standard, intern with preservice, intern	Create clear certification pathways matching different preparation routes and experience levels	D, E, F
Teacher Certification Types	Enhanced standard certificate for teacher residency program graduates	Recognize enhanced preparation through residency programs with distinct certification	A, D, E, F
Teacher Certification Types	Intern with preservice experience certificate expires in one year unless modified	Provide limited-time certification for candidates completing preservice alternative preparation	D, E, G
Teacher Certification Types	Intern certificate expires in two years unless modified	Enable candidates to serve as teachers while completing alternative preparation requirements	D, E, G

Showing 1 to 10 of 42 entries
Previous 1 2 3 4 5 Next

Supplemental Tables

INCENTIVE CATEGORY ANALYSIS

Incentive Category	Number of Incentives
Teacher Certification Types	5
Educator Preparation Oversight	3
Partnership Preservice Programs	3
School District Teaching Permits	3
Uncertified Teacher Employment	3
Achievement Academy Payments	2
Alternative Teacher Preparation	2
Educator Preparation Materials	2
Grow Your Own Partnership	2
Innovation District Exemptions	2
Minimum Salary Requirements	2
Partnership Program Allotment	2
Teacher Residency Preparation	2
Traditional Teacher Preparation	2
Achievement Academy Allotment	1

NEGATIVE RESULT CODE FREQUENCY

Negative Result Code	Frequency	Percentage
E	38	90.476
F	33	78.571
C	21	50
D	20	47.619
A	16	38.095
G	8	19.048
B	3	7.143

KEY CODED PATTERN FINDINGS

Finding	Description
Most Common Negative Pattern	Code E (administrative burdens) appears in 90.476% of incentives, followed by Code F (reduced local control) at 78.571%
Administrative Burden Dominance	Administrative burden affects 90.476% of incentives, creating compliance-heavy implementation across educator preparation
State Dependency Pattern	Code C (state dependency) appears in 50% of incentives, indicating widespread reliance on state funding and bureaucracy
Extrinsic Motivation Impact	Code A (extrinsic motivation) appears in 38.095% of incentives, systematically undermining educational mission focus
Local Control Reduction Problem	Code F (reduced local control) appears in 78.571% of incentives, primarily in state-mandated preparation and oversight systems
Most Problematic Policy Areas	Partnership Programs and Educator Preparation Oversight show highest concentration of negative codes per incentive
Accountability Theater Pattern	Code D (accountability substitution) appears in 47.619% of incentives, replacing system improvement with compliance theater
Competition vs Cooperation Concerns	Code B (competition for resources) appears in 7.143% of incentives, undermining collaborative professional cultures

CODED ANALYSIS SUMMARY STATISTICS

Metric	Value
Total Incentives Analyzed	42
Most Problematic Code	Code E (appears 38 times)
Most Frequent Code Combination	E, F (admin burden + reduced local control)
Policy Categories with Code E	38
Policy Categories with Code F	33
Average Codes per Incentive	3.31

Key List of Likely Negative Results (Revised 7-Code Framework)

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