

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

This document compiles questions submitted by instrument vendors through the Question Submission Form for the Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments (RFLNI). Questions included reflect submissions received by March 13, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. Central Time.

Questions are organized by topic to support clarity and consistency. Where multiple questions address the same or similar issues, a single response may be provided. Responses are intended to clarify RFLNI requirements and expectations and should be read in conjunction with the RFLNI informational packet and applicable statutory requirements.

For further details about the call, including links to the informational packet and application, visit our [Call for K–3 Literacy and Numeracy Instruments](#) webpage.

## PSYCHOMETRICS AND ASSESSMENT DESIGN

### TEXAS-SPECIFIC VALIDATION EVIDENCE AND NORMS

#### **Are national validation studies sufficient, or must vendors provide Texas-specific validation evidence?**

Validation studies using a Texas-specific sample are not required. As stated in the RFLNI, norming samples should be representative of the demographics of the student population in Texas at the grade levels assessed.

This requirement reflects the wide variety of Texas students and is intended to ensure that the psychometric evidence submitted supports reliable and valid interpretation of results for Texas populations. National validation studies and nationally representative norming samples may be acceptable, provided applicants clearly demonstrate how the sample includes or reflects the demographic characteristics of Texas students and supports appropriate use of the instrument in Texas schools.

#### **Will TEA require Texas-specific validation studies or is national validation acceptable?**

See the response to *“Are national validation studies and norms acceptable, or must vendors provide Texas-specific validation evidence?”*

#### **Are nationally representative norms that include the Texas student population acceptable?**

See the response to *“Are national validation studies and norms acceptable, or must vendors provide Texas-specific validation evidence?”*

#### **Does TEA expect the normative sample to be representative of Texas demographics specifically, or is a nationally representative sample sufficient?**

See the response to *“Are national validation studies and norms acceptable, or must vendors provide Texas-specific validation evidence?”*

### STANDARDIZATION AND ASSESSMENT DESIGN

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

**On pg. 10 under General Requirements, it states, “All submissions must be standardized assessments, meaning the instrument uses consistent questions, tasks, materials, and scoring protocols across administrations.” Can you clarify what “consistent” means in this context?**

In this context, “consistent” means that the assessment follows a uniform design, administration process, and scoring framework across administrations so that results are comparable and interpretable across students and over time. Consistency does not require identical items for every student, but it does require a consistent blueprint, standardized procedures, and scoring rules.

**Does the state require that each assessment contain the same questions (e.g. linear fixed form), or is the intent simply that the assessment follows a uniform design and scoring framework across administrations that provides comparable scores across students?**

TEA does not require that each assessment contain the same questions or be administered as a fixed-form instrument, but it does require a consistent underlying test blueprint. The intent is that the assessment follows a standardized design and scoring framework that produces comparable scores across students, regardless of whether the instrument uses fixed-form, adaptive, or other item-selection approaches.

**Could you please define “standardized assessment”?**

A standardized assessment is one that uses a consistent test blueprint, questions or tasks, materials, administration procedures, and scoring protocols across administrations to produce comparable and interpretable results for students.

**Will adaptive digital assessments that present individualized item sequences but maintain standardized scoring and administration protocols be considered standardized assessments?**

Yes. Adaptive digital assessments may be considered standardized assessments, provided they maintain standardized administration, test blueprints, procedures, and scoring protocols and produce results that are comparable across students, even when individualized item sequences are used.

## BIAS, FAIRNESS, GROWTH, AND EQUIVALENCY EVIDENCE

**What specific analyses does TEA expect for bias evaluation (e.g., Differential Item Functioning, subgroup reliability analyses, fairness reviews)?**

As stated in the RFLNI, examples of acceptable analyses may include, but are not limited to, Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses and factor analyses. Bias analyses should be conducted for different subgroups of students, including gender, race and ethnicity, emergent bilingual status, economic status, and special education status at a minimum. Applicants may use additional appropriate, methodologically sound approaches to demonstrate bias evaluation and mitigation, provided the evidence supports evaluation against the RFLNI requirements and rubric criteria.

**What forms of evidence are acceptable to demonstrate equivalency between English and Spanish instruments (e.g., construct alignment, parallel test development, item calibration studies)?**

The RFLNI does not prescribe specific methods for demonstrating equivalency between English and Spanish instruments. Applicants may submit appropriate evidence demonstrating equivalency across language

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

versions, provided the evidence supports evaluation of alignment, comparability, and psychometric quality as required by the RFLNI. Evidence will be reviewed based on its relevance, rigor, and alignment to the rubric criteria.

## **What types of analyses does TEA consider strong evidence of sensitivity to growth (e.g., repeated measures studies, longitudinal growth modeling, or pre/post analyses)?**

As stated in the RFLNI, psychometric examination of growth may take many different forms, and no single type of psychometric approach is preferred over another.

Instruments are evaluated based on whether the submitted evidence demonstrates that the instrument is sensitive to change or improvement over time using valid psychometric approaches. Examples may include, but are not limited to, ROC curve analyses, repeated measures analyses with student or group factors, t-tests of change scores, or correlational analyses.

## **PREDICTIVE VALIDITY AND CLASSIFICATION OUTCOMES**

### **Will predictive validity evidence tied to outcomes within the instrument (e.g., MOY/EOY performance) satisfy the predictive validity criterion, or must evidence relate specifically to STAAR Grade 3 outcomes?**

For K–3 Foundational Literacy and Numeracy Instruments, predictive validity evidence must address both:

- Relationships across administrations within the instrument (e.g., BOY to MOY, MOY to EOY), and
- Relationships to performance on the Grade 3 state summative academic achievement assessment.

These expectations align with statutory requirements under Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.0063, which require instruments to:

- be capable of administration at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year (TEC, §28.0063(b)(2)),
- be capable of monitoring student progress (TEC, §28.0063(b)(4)), and
- assess whether a student’s skills identified as in need of targeted instruction indicate that the student is at risk of not achieving satisfactory performance on the Grade 3 reading language arts or mathematics assessment (TEC, §28.0063(b)(5)).

Predictive validity evidence tied only to outcomes within the instrument (such as MOY or EOY performance) is necessary but not sufficient on its own. Instruments must also provide evidence linking performance to Grade 3 state assessment outcomes to meet statutory requirements.

### **In the predictive validity section (page 11), can you provide additional clarity regarding the “(if applicable) Evidence that performance on the end of year portion of the instrument (minimally) is related to future performance on the Texas STAAR reading assessment.” When is this applicable specifically?**

As stated in the RFLNI, predictive validity evidence is required for K–3 Foundational Literacy and Numeracy Instruments submitted under TEC, §28.0063. For these instruments, evidence that performance on the end-of-year administration is related to future performance on the Grade 3 state summative academic achievement assessment is applicable.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

For Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instruments submitted under TEC, §28.006, predictive validity evidence is optional, but submission of such evidence may strengthen an application.

## **What classification outcome should classification accuracy be based on for kindergarten readiness instruments (e.g., risk for reading difficulty, dyslexia risk indicators, benchmark categories)?**

For Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instruments, classification accuracy should be based on outcomes that allow the commissioner to determine the level of performance that indicates kindergarten reading readiness, consistent with the requirement outlined in TEC, §28.006(c-3). Instruments must support classification outcomes that enable this determination and provide sufficient evidence to evaluate the accuracy and consistency of those classifications.

Instruments may include additional classifications for informational purposes; however, classification outcomes must minimally support the statutory requirement related to determining kindergarten reading readiness.

## **INDEPENDENT RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS**

### **Could you please clarify what is meant by “independent”? Does this refer to 3rd party research?**

In the RFLNI, “independent” refers to research, analyses, or reviews that are conducted outside of the instrument developer’s internal development process. Independent research may include studies or reviews conducted by third parties that are not directly involved in the design, development, or scoring of the instrument.

The RFLNI does not prescribe a single definition of “independent” or require a specific type of independent study; rather, the intent is to ensure that evidence supporting reliability and validity is not based solely on internal analyses conducted by the instrument developer.

### **Does an independent review, completed and/or underway, of a vendor’s literacy and numeracy instruments by a third party, e.g., NCII, meet the independent research requirements for reliability and validity?**

Independent third-party reviews or studies may be submitted as evidence to support reliability and validity, provided they are relevant to the instrument being submitted and address the required psychometric properties. The presence of an independent review does not, on its own, guarantee that requirements are met; submitted evidence will be evaluated based on its completeness, relevance, and alignment to the RFLNI requirements.

TEA does not require that independent evidence come from a specific organization or clearinghouse, nor does it require a particular research format.

### **In the reliability and validity sections (page 11), there is mention of demonstration of independent research. Can you provide additional clarity on this requirement?**

The requirement for independent research is intended to ensure that evidence supporting reliability and validity is not based solely on internal analyses conducted by the instrument developer. Applicants should submit independent evidence, where available, that supports the reliability and validity of the instrument.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

See the response to *“Could you please clarify what is meant by “independent”? Does this refer to 3rd party research?”* for further details.

## TIMING AND AVAILABILITY OF PSYCHOMETRIC EVIDENCE

**For our instrument, analyses for an ongoing validation study (2025-26 SY) are in progress and are expected to be completed in Summer 2026 for several language and literacy measures. As a result, updated psychometric properties will not be available at the time of this submission. We will describe the planned updates to the measure, but these descriptions will not include new quantitative estimates or results until analyses are complete. Would there be an opportunity to provide updated psychometrics during the review process?**

TEA will review and evaluate instruments based on the materials and evidence submitted at the time of application. The review process is expected to be completed by the end of Summer 2026, and updated psychometric evidence that is not available at the time of submission may not be considered as part of the initial evaluation. Applicants should submit the most complete and current evidence available at the time of application.

**For vendors still gather evidence that will not be available by Spring 2026, may we collect data during the pilot time frame in 26/27?**

The evaluation of instruments for approval will be based on evidence submitted with the application. While a pilot year is included as part of the overall process, applicants should not assume that psychometric evidence collected after application submission will be incorporated into the initial review. Instruments should demonstrate sufficient readiness and supporting evidence at the time of application to be considered for approval.

## ADMINISTRATION, SCORING, AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

### INDIVIDUAL ADMINISTRATION

**Does “individually administered” include technology-based assessments where students interact independently with a digital system and may complete the assessment simultaneously with other students?**

Yes. “Individually administered” means that each student independently interacts with and completes the assessment. This may include technology-based assessments in which students work independently within a digital system, including settings where multiple students complete the assessment at the same time.

**“All instrument components must be individually administered.” Does this mandate a 1:1 ratio (one assessor per student), or does the computer-adaptive nature of a platform satisfy the requirement for individualized administration?**

Computer-adaptive or technology-based platforms may satisfy this requirement when the assessment is designed for independent student interaction.

**How does TEA interpret “individually administered” components for computer-adaptive tests?**

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

For computer-adaptive tests, “individually administered” means that each student independently interacts with and completes the assessment. This includes computer-adaptive assessments, provided that the assessment experience and responses are individualized to the student and completed without shared interaction.

## SCORING AND REPORTING FEASIBILITY

**Will digital administration platforms that automate scoring and reporting be considered strong evidence of feasibility for teachers and administrators?**

Digital administration platforms that automate scoring and reporting are considered acceptable. The strength of evidence for feasibility will be evaluated during the academic review and will be determined based on the extent to which the platform supports practical administration, scoring, and reporting for teachers and administrators.

## ASSESSMENT FREQUENCY

**May instruments provide additional interim progress monitoring beyond BOY/MOY/EOY administrations without affecting compliance with the three-administration requirement?**

Yes. The BOY/MOY/EOY administration requirement represents the minimum required administration schedule. Instruments may include additional interim progress monitoring beyond BOY, MOY, and EOY without affecting compliance with this requirement. As noted in Section 3.5, TEA Preferences for Foundational Literacy and Numeracy Instruments (page 17) of the RFLNI, instruments may receive additional consideration if they support ongoing progress checks between BOY, MOY, and EOY administrations, such as interim checks, skill-specific probes, or tools aligned to response-to-intervention practices. *This feature is a preference and is not a required component.*

## INSTRUMENT CATEGORIES

### SUBMISSION CATEGORIES

**Are you looking for vendors who can provide ELA and math? Or can we submit for only ELA?**

Interested applicants may submit instruments for one or more categories, including Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instruments, K–3 Foundational Literacy Instruments, and/or K–3 Foundational Numeracy Instruments. Applicants are not required to submit instruments for both literacy and numeracy and may apply for only one category if desired.

**Is the reviewing committee going to be considering numeracy and literacy submissions/products completely separately and not combined? Considered on their own merit?**

Yes. Each instrument category is reviewed independently. Literacy, numeracy, and kindergarten reading readiness instruments are evaluated separately and judged on their own merit using the scoring rubric specific to the category for which the instrument is submitted.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

**Are both K–3 Foundational Literacy Instruments and K–3 Foundational Numeracy Instruments required from a vendor, or is the state open to selecting the best in each of the subject areas? For example, will states consider only vendors that provide a combined Foundational Literacy and Numeracy in both English and Spanish?**

Interested applicants are not required to submit both foundational literacy and foundational numeracy instruments. TEA will review and select instruments in each subject area independently.

Applicants are not required to provide instruments in both foundational literacy and foundational numeracy or in both English and Spanish. As noted in Section 3.5, TEA Preferences for Foundational Literacy and Numeracy Instruments, offering foundational literacy and foundational numeracy instruments in both English and Spanish is a preference and not a requirement. Foundational literacy and numeracy instruments may be offered in one language or multiple languages.

*Please note: For Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instruments only, instruments must be offered in both English and Spanish to be considered for selection as one of the three commissioner-approved kindergarten reading readiness instruments.*

## SELECTION IF APPLYING TO MULTIPLE CATEGORIES

**If a vendor submits for the kindergarten readiness category but is not selected as the primary or alternate, can the instrument still be considered for the K–3 literacy list?**

Yes. Each instrument category is reviewed and selected independently. An instrument submitted for the Kindergarten Reading Readiness category that is not selected as a primary or alternate may still be considered for approval as a K–3 Foundational Literacy Instrument, provided it meets the requirements and is submitted for that category.

## RFLNI RESPONSE FORM AND SUBMISSION LOGISTICS

### INSTRUMENT ACCESS AND CONTENT SUBMISSION

**It says "submit full test content". Please clarify what this means.**

For evaluation purposes, reviewers must be able to access a current version of an instrument in its entirety to fully understand the assessment experience a student and educator will encounter. This includes sufficient access to review all components, item types, scoring, and reporting features necessary to evaluate the instrument against RFLNI requirements.

**For access to the instruments, if the instrument is a computer-adaptive test, the items are selected based on student responses and thus the entire assessment is not available for preview through a teacher demo account. May we provide a student-level demo account for reviewers to access the assessment and experience the assessment accordingly?**

Yes. Student-level demo accounts are acceptable, provided they allow reviewers to access a current version of the instrument in a way that reflects the full student assessment experience for evaluation purposes.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

## FORM FORMAT AND USABILITY

**The application form is a PDF, but does not seem to be a fillable format. Will you be posting a different version for vendors to complete?**

No. Due to accessibility requirements, TEA can not post a fillable or alternative version of the RFLNI Response Form.

**Is it possible for the Agency to provide an offline copy of all the forms we must submit through Qualtrics?**

No. There is no offline copy of the Qualtrics submission form. The only form that must be completed by applicants is the RFLNI Response Form. The Qualtrics submission portal includes a small number of required fields at the beginning to collect basic identifying information, which are also included in the RFLNI Response Form. All remaining fields in the Qualtrics submission portal are used solely to upload evidence supporting responses provided in the RFLNI Response Form.

**We are unable to populate responses within the RFLNI Response Form link provided. Was the form meant to be a workable/fillable document?**

The RFLNI Response Form is not a fillable or interactive document. Applicants are expected to complete the form outside of the PDF viewer, such as by exporting the document into another system (e.g., a word processing application), and then upload the completed form as part of the submission.

**The submission form is a PDF. The instructions say that vendors are to complete the required fields, drop-downs, and response boxes and upload the document. However, the required form is a PDF without fillable fields. Additionally, where a text response is required, the form will not allow for more than a couple lines of text. Will TEA provide this document in word format or another format that allows vendors to input our responses?**

No. TEA will not provide the RFLNI Response Form in Word or another fillable format. Applicants may export the PDF into another system, such as a word processing application, to complete their responses before uploading the completed form. Applicants are not limited by the visible space in the PDF and may format responses as needed to ensure completeness.

## RESPONSE LENGTH AND COMPLETION RULES

**In the RFLNI Response Form, there are a number of application questions for which a single line or set of underlines is provided as a response field. Does the line or set of underlines indicate and limit the length of the response to the length of the line(s), or may we go beyond to ensure our response is complete - this is particularly relevant for the psychometric items where three lines may be insufficient for some of the descriptions requested? May we delete the underline for ease of readability and respond to those items in the resulting blank space?**

The line or set of underlines shown in the RFLNI Response Form does not limit the length of an applicant's response. Applicants may provide responses that extend beyond the visible space in the form to ensure completeness. Applicants may adjust formatting, including removing underlines, as needed for readability, provided the full response is clearly presented in the submitted document.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

**In the RFLNI Response Form, should we leave blank the responses to whichever “Instruments Only” sections for which we are not providing information since it does not align with the type of instrument for which we are submitting? For example, if we are submitting for the Foundational Literacy Instrument and the Foundational Numeracy Instrument, would we submit one RFLNI Response Form for each instrument type and leave the other instrument type “only” sections blank in each form?**

Applicants should complete only the sections of the RFLNI Response Form that apply to the instrument being submitted. Sections labeled for other instrument types may be left blank when they do not apply.

Applicants may submit one RFLNI Response Form per instrument, even if that instrument is being submitted for multiple categories, provided the instrument is the same and the supporting evidence is consistent across categories.

Separate submissions are required in the following circumstances:

- When submitting different instruments (for example, a foundational literacy instrument and a separate foundational numeracy instrument).
- When submitting different language versions of an instrument (e.g., English and Spanish), as each language version must be submitted separately with its own supporting evidence.
- When an instrument includes distinct components or psychometric evidence that will be evaluated differently by category (for example, literacy versus numeracy). In these cases, separate submissions are recommended to allow each category to be evaluated fully and accurately.

Submitting separate forms in these situations helps ensure that each instrument and category is reviewed using the appropriate rubric and has the best opportunity for a complete and fair evaluation.

**If an instrument would qualify for the Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instrument, K-3 Foundational Literacy Instrument, and K-3 Foundational Numeracy Instrument in English and Spanish, do separate applications need to be submitted (with associated psychometrics, reporting, etc.)?**

See the response to the previous question regarding completion of the RFLNI Response Form, which outlines when a single submission is sufficient and when separate submissions are required or recommended.

## ACCETABLE EVIDENCE FORMATS

**For the RFLNI Response Form, may we include screenshots, vendor-created tables, links, etc., as our evidence within the response fields?**

Links and vendor-created tables may be included as evidence within the response fields of the RFLNI Response Form. Screenshots should be uploaded as supporting evidence through the submission portal rather than embedded in the response fields, to allow reviewers the best ability to view and evaluate the materials.

**For the evidence to support our responses in the RFLNI Response Form, would it be acceptable to provide access (login information) to an online technical report to which we would provide direct links to the relevant report sections as part of our responses? Or is a PDF version required of excerpts or the entirety of the large document? Alternatively, may we link to an external clearinghouse where those evaluations are posted online?**

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

Yes. Providing access to an online technical report (including login information), submitting PDF versions of technical documentation, or linking to an external clearinghouse where evaluations are posted online are generally acceptable. However, internet links break and accesses sometimes expire, which could prevent reviewers from having a full view of the submissions. Applicants should submit whatever evidence is needed to support a complete and accurate evaluation of the instrument in the most easily consumable manner possible for reviewers.

Applicants are additionally encouraged to provide robust, clearly organized evidence. When submitting materials, applicants should clearly identify where supporting evidence for each response can be found (for example, the name of the supporting document and the relevant page range) to assist reviewers in locating the information efficiently.

## FILE UPLOAD REQUIREMENTS

**Are there file size restrictions for uploading files? If so, do they apply to the overall submission or to each individual file?**

There is no file size limit for the overall submission. File size limits apply to each individual file upload associated with a specific section of the RFLNI Response Form. Each uploaded file may be up to **50 MB**.

For security reasons, executable files (such as those ending in *.exe*) are not permitted. Applicants may upload multiple files for a single upload question by compressing them into a ZIP file prior to upload or by combining materials into a single document. Applicants should clearly label all submitted files to help reviewers efficiently locate and evaluate supporting evidence.

## APPLICATION TIMING

**Will there be another application period? If so, when does TEA anticipate that to be?**

Instruments approved through this RFLNI and staying compliant with all TEA requirements will remain on the Commissioner's Lists through the end of the 2030–2031 school year. TEA anticipates that a future application period would occur prior to the expiration of the current approval period. Additional information about any future application cycles will be communicated by TEA as it becomes available.

## DATA REPORTING AND ED-FI

**What are the required data fields for early numeracy for Ed-Fi?**

TEA will use the Ed-Fi Assessment Domain entities, references and descriptors and will include some TEA specific information in accordance with the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) data standards, specifications, and processes. Additionally, TEA will use additional Ed-Fi Domains as needed for additional information. TEA will publish the final TSDS data standards on or around December 1, 2026. The data standards will include all necessary data elements necessary for the new submissions.

**Is it required that "Student Demographics" be sent via Ed-Fi?**

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

School systems must have the ability to upload student demographic information and student assessment data using campus-level data in accordance with the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) data standards, specifications, and processes to support integration with the state longitudinal data system. TEA will align with the Ed-Fi data standards and will include Texas-specific extensions, which will be published in TEDS.

**What student demographic information, above the Texas Unique ID, is TEA requiring vendors send as a part of their Ed-Fi push?**

TEA will publish the final TSDS data standards on or around December 1, 2026. The data standards will include all necessary data elements necessary for the new submissions.

## SCORING, RUBRICS, AND EVALUATION PROCESS

### EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

**Will each of the content areas be judged/evaluated on their own?**

Yes. Each instrument is evaluated independently. Within an instrument, each skill listed in the applicable tables for that instrument category is also evaluated independently, as reflected in the scoring rubrics for each instrument type.

**Could TEA clarify which requirements will be part of the Preliminary Review?**

During the Preliminary Review, TEA conducts an initial evaluation of submitted instruments to verify completeness and readiness for further review. This preliminary review is intended to identify any critical missing information that would prevent an instrument from participating in the academic review and comparability study.

**Could TEA share which institute(s) of higher education will be conducting the Academic Review and Comparability Study?**

TEA is currently in the process of partnering with an institute of higher education to conduct the academic review and comparability study. This process has not yet been completed. TEA may share additional information once the process has concluded.

### SCORING RUBRICS AND THRESHOLDS

**What is the criteria for scoring “3” (Strongly) for content alignment?**

A score of 3 (Strongly) indicates that the instrument strongly addresses the key aspects of the skill and demonstrates clear alignment with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), as outlined in the content alignment section of the applicable scoring rubric.

**The Scoring Rubric for General Criteria and Reporting Features are Y/N criteria - do instruments need to meet all of these criteria to be considered for evaluation on the other rubric areas, such as Content Alignment, Psychometrics, etc.?**

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

All instruments are evaluated using the entire scoring rubric. Criteria identified as Y/N reflect requirements outlined in the RFLNI, unless they are clearly labeled as part of the rubric section for TEA preferences, must be met.

The full rubric, including Content Alignment, Psychometrics, Administrative Feasibility, and other scored areas, will be considered when making final decisions. Evaluation outcomes are based on the instrument's overall performance across the rubric.

## **Is there a minimum passing score for each rubric, i.e., Content Alignment, Psychometrics, and Administrative Feasibility?**

No. At this time, TEA has not established minimum passing scores for individual rubric areas. TEA intends to review the instruments submitted through this process before making final determinations, in order to avoid prematurely disqualifying instruments prior to full evaluation.

## **What is the minimum passing score for Overall Instruction Score in order to be approved?**

TEA has not established a minimum passing score for the Overall Instruction Score at this time. TEA intends to review the instruments submitted through this process before making final determinations, in order to avoid prematurely disqualifying instruments prior to full evaluation.

## **COMPARABILITY STUDY**

### **How does the Comparability Study impact an instrument's score and consideration for approval?**

Findings from the comparability study are considered alongside the academic review and the full scoring rubric when making final approval decisions. The study supports the commissioner's determination of alignment and comparability across instruments, including comparability among kindergarten reading readiness instruments and alignment between K–3 instruments, the kindergarten reading readiness instrument, and the grade 3 state assessment administered under Texas Education Code (TEC), §39.023.

### **Could TEA provide more details on how the Comparability Study will be conducted?**

The comparability study is a statutory requirement conducted by an institute of higher education. The study evaluates how instruments perform relative to one another across key technical, content, and reporting dimensions to support comparability across approved instruments.

For Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instruments, TEC, §28.006(c-3) requires that each approved instrument provide for the ability to compare performance indicating kindergarten readiness across instruments adopted or approved under that section.

For K–3 Foundational Literacy and Numeracy Instruments, TEC, §28.0063(e) requires the commissioner to determine comparability between instruments administered under that section and:

- a kindergarten reading readiness instrument administered at the beginning of the school year, and
- the grade 3 state assessment administered at the end of the school year under TEC, §39.023.

This phase helps ensure that instruments placed on the Commissioner's Lists are high-quality, appropriately calibrated, and capable of producing consistent, actionable data for Texas educators and families.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

## PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

**Will the results of the evaluation, e.g., academic review and comparability study, be published for all submitted instruments, both approved and not approved?**

TEC, §28.0063(c)(4) requires the commissioner to make publicly available the criteria used for the evaluation and approval of instruments submitted for review. TEA will comply with statutory requirements regarding transparency and will communicate additional information as appropriate.

## USE OF TEKS-ALIGNED SCORES

**If an instrument provides a score based on the TEKS standard domains that encompass the "Foundational Skills" noted in the RFLNI, will scores for those categories be considered sufficient? For example, the TEKS strand "Number and operations" in kindergarten encompasses cardinality and one-to-one correspondence, number representation/recognition, counting, subitizing, comparing and ordering numbers.**

Instruments may use TEKS-aligned domains or strands to organize assessment content; however, for evaluation purposes, instruments must clearly demonstrate how each required foundational skill identified in the RFLNI is measured.

As stated in the RFLNI, instruments must provide a separate score for each skill they claim to assess. When a broader TEKS domain score is reported, the submission must include sufficient evidence showing how that domain score is derived from, or disaggregates to, the individual foundational skills listed in the RFLNI.

Each foundational skill is evaluated independently as part of the content alignment review. Instruments that report only aggregated domain-level scores without clear, skill-level scoring and documentation may not provide sufficient information for evaluation using the applicable rubric.

## KINDERGARTEN READING READINESS INSTRUMENTS

### INSTRUMENT STRUCTURE

**Does the Kindergarten instrument need to be a standalone assessment, or can it be a configuration of a larger K–3 assessment system?**

A Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instrument may be a standalone assessment or a configuration of a larger K–3 assessment system, provided that the kindergarten component independently meets all applicable requirements outlined in the RFLNI for Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instruments.

### MEASUREMENT REQUIREMENTS

**For kindergarten readiness instruments, does TEA require direct measurement of writing production, or will assessment of encoding/spelling knowledge satisfy the writing skill criterion?**

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

TEA has not specified a required method for measuring writing skills for kindergarten reading readiness instruments. The RFLNI identifies writing skills as an area to be measured but does not require a specific task type. Instruments may assess writing skills using approaches appropriate to the instrument design, provided the requirement to measure writing skills is addressed.

## BENCHMARKS AND CUT POINTS

**Is there an expected benchmark or cut point that the kindergarten reading readiness instrument should be aligned to? For example, the 15th percentile.**

No. At this time, TEA has not established a required benchmark or cut point for kindergarten reading readiness instruments. Instruments may use benchmarks or classification thresholds consistent with their design, provided the approach is supported by appropriate evidence and aligned with the requirements outlined in the RFLNI.

## DYSLEXIA SCREENING

### SCREENER STRUCTURE

**Does TEA require dyslexia screening tasks to be standalone subtests, or may the required constructs be embedded within the broader assessment?**

Dyslexia screening tasks may be administered as standalone subtests or embedded within a broader assessment. Regardless of assessment design, the instrument must support dyslexia risk identification and be able to clearly identify students who are considered at risk for dyslexia in kindergarten and grade 1 so that school systems can meet dyslexia reporting requirements. Dyslexia risk classification must be supported by appropriate evidence.

### USE OF RESULTS

**Are districts required to use the instrument's dyslexia screening output for compliance, or may the instrument simply provide the required measures?**

School systems (school districts and open-enrollment charter schools) are required to report dyslexia risk status for students based on the required dyslexia screening measures. Instruments must be able to identify and flag which students are considered at risk for dyslexia in kindergarten and grade 1 so that school systems can meet statutory reporting and compliance requirements.

**Is separate dyslexia risk classification required, or is reporting of the required constructs sufficient?**

Instruments must support dyslexia risk identification and allow school systems to determine and report dyslexia risk status for students in kindergarten and grade 1. Instruments must provide outputs that enable school systems to identify students who are considered at risk for dyslexia based on the required measures.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

## CLASSIFICATION THRESHOLDS

**Must dyslexia classification thresholds align with TEA guidance, or may vendors use validated classification models?**

Dyslexia classification thresholds must minimally align with TEA guidance to support school system compliance. Instruments may also use additional validated classification models, provided they meet TEA requirements and enable school systems to identify and report students who are considered at risk for dyslexia.

## FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS AND CONTENT ALIGNMENT

### FOUNDATIONAL LITERACY CONTENT

**For K-3, Foundational Literacy, are only the skills in parenthesis required to be measured by the screener?**

Measures listed in parentheses represent required skills and must be included at a minimum to be considered.

Instruments may address some or many of the foundational literacy skills listed in the table. A lack of coverage of one or more non-required skills within an instrument does not automatically disqualify an instrument.

However, instruments should demonstrate meaningful alignment to the TEKS and coverage of foundational literacy competencies.

**In the Foundational Skills table (page 13), Phonics / Decoding is denoted as a required dyslexia skill and the task of Pseudoword Reading is shown in parenthesis. However, in the Dyslexia Handbook, no specific task is mentioned as the means to assess this skill. Can you confirm that other tasks are acceptable for assessment of the Phonics / Decoding skill?**

As stated in the RFLNI, measures listed in parentheses represent required skills, including critical skills **or** dyslexia-related requirements for kindergarten and grade 1. While pseudoword reading is not itself a dyslexia screening requirement, it is identified as a critical skill. Pseudoword reading should be included as part of the Phonics/Decoding skill.

Instruments may include additional tasks to assess Phonics/Decoding skill.

**If an instrument contains a subtest that assesses both phonological and phonemic awareness, can that subtest's score count for both a phonological awareness score and a phonemic awareness score?**

Each skill is evaluated and scored independently, as noted in the rubric, regardless of whether the skills are assessed within the same subtest. As stated in the RFLNI, instruments must provide a separate score for each skill they claim to assess.

When a single subtest is used to assess multiple skills, the instrument must clearly demonstrate how performance on that subtest is disaggregated into separate, skill-level scores. This is necessary to allow educators to identify which specific skill requires targeted instruction, consistent with the intent of the foundational skills requirements and alignment to the student expectations in the TEKS.

# Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments: FAQs

## FOUNDATIONAL NUMERACY CONTENT

### **Can TEA provide a list of specific standards for the foundational skills for early numeracy?**

The TEKS are provided in Appendix B – TEKS and Course Enrollment of the Request for Literacy and Numeracy Instruments. Foundational numeracy standards can be found located under subsection Chapter 111. Mathematics of Appendix B, organized by grade level.

Applicants should reference the relevant TEKS and demonstrate alignment to those standards as part of their submitted evidence, consistent with the content alignment expectations outlined in the RFLNI.

## INSTRUCTIONAL USE

### **Do AI-generated lesson plans, grouping recommendations, and targeted instructional activities qualify as instructional resources aligned to assessment results?**

Yes. AI-generated lesson plans, grouping recommendations, and targeted instructional activities are acceptable as instructional resources aligned to assessment results, provided they are clearly connected to assessment outcomes and support instructional decision-making.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### COST AND ACCESS

#### **For the K-3 literacy and numeracy instruments, is there any requirement or expectation that one or more instruments approved on the Commissioner’s List would be available at no cost to LEAs?**

No. There is no requirement that K–3 Foundational Literacy or K–3 Foundational Numeracy instruments approved under TEC, §28.0063 be made available at no cost to local educational agencies. Instruments approved under this statute are made available at a price that will be negotiated by TEA.

The requirement for an instrument to be provided at no cost to LEAs applies only to the Kindergarten Reading Readiness Instrument, as required under TEC, §28.006.

### OTHER

#### **Per Sec. 28.0063, we understand that the Commissioner will establish a process for LEAs to submit K-3 instruments for review and approval. Could you please share when this process will be announced?**

As stated in TEA communications, including the RFLNI, TEA is seeking qualified publishers and local educational agencies to submit literacy and numeracy instruments for review as part of this commissioner’s approval process authorized under Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.006 and §28.0063. This current RFLNI submission process applies to both publishers and local educational agencies and satisfies the statutory requirement. TEA does not anticipate establishing a separate submission process solely for local educational agencies.