

## 2028 A–F Refresh Summary of Stakeholder Feedback and Adjustments to Framework

Updated: March 2026

The 2028 A–F System Framework has evolved based on extensive stakeholder feedback since its release in August 2025. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) solicited feedback from diverse stakeholders through regional superintendent forums, regional education service center (ESC) discussions, public feedback forms, and statewide information sessions.

Stakeholders represented a wide range of perspectives, and feedback often reflected competing priorities related to rigor, transparency, fairness, and statutory alignment. To help weigh competing recommendations, the Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG), the ESC Accountability Group (EAG), a Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/A–F Integration Taskforce, a Distinction Designation Committee, and the Commissioner of Education reviewed stakeholder feedback and provided guidance and recommendations.

Stakeholder feedback has been invaluable in informing adjustments for the 2028 accountability system as part of the 2028 A–F Refresh. The chart below highlights the impact of feedback received between February 2025 and February 2026. The [Academic Accountability System Framework for 2028 Ratings](#), which was updated in spring 2026, reflects revisions to the initial considerations, updates to proposals, and changes proposed to be implemented with the 2028 accountability ratings. The proposed rule and the Proposed 2028 *Accountability Rating System Manual* are anticipated to be released later this year on the [2028 Accountability Manual](#) webpage.

The following chart:

- is organized by domain and component,
- includes around TEA’s initial recommendations published in the [2028 A–F Preliminary Framework](#),
- incorporates additional considerations,
- documents stakeholder feedback, and
- provides the resulting framework changes and the rationale for those changes.

Scaling, Cut Scores, and Student Group Targets Update Using New Baselines		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
<p><b>Target and Cut Scores Update Using New Baselines</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A wide range of stakeholder feedback has been received on targets and cut scores. In particular, stakeholders have requested increased transparency in the methodology used to establish domain rating cut scores and scaling tables, along with additional clarity regarding their role within the A–F accountability system.</li> <li>Schools are rated based on the cut scores specifically defined for their school type. The baseline data differs by school type when cut scores are calculated. Because there are different expectations by school type, stakeholders requested a review of how K-8 campuses’ school type is defined to consider both enrollment and the percent of assessments from traditionally elementary or middle school grades.</li> <li>Additional stakeholders requested the consideration of separate cut score tables for a new school type; including K-6 and K-8 schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As with any refresh, TEA evaluates cut scores and scaling tables and proposes updates. House Bill (HB) 8 (89th Legislature, 2nd Called Session, 2025) established new requirements for cut scores, outlining that the rigor of cut scores must be increased to ensure Texas is in the top 5 states on both the National Assessment of Educational Progress and postsecondary success within 15 years.</li> <li>An in-depth overview of the methodology used to create proposed domain rating cut scores, scaling tables, and Closing the Gaps, Part A and B targets, along with all proposed cut scores will be made available at a later date.</li> <li>Updated cut scores will be adopted as part of the 2028 accountability system manual</li> <li>Closing the Gaps, Part A targets were approved by the USDE in 2023.</li> <li>Closing the Gaps, Part B targets will be adopted as part of the 2028 accountability system manual.</li> </ul>

Scaling, Cut Scores, and Student Group Targets Update Using New Baselines		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What-If</i> ratings will be provided for 2026 and 2027 accountability data for educator review in TEAL.</li> <li>• TAAG reviewed a proposal related to the cut scores by school type in the February 2026 TAAG meeting. It was not recommended to change how school types are assigned, due to the complexity added to the system which can compromise transparency.</li> <li>• It is also not recommended to create a new K-6/K-8 school type given added complexity and the small number of campuses.</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
<p><b>Recognition of Accelerated Pathway Testers in Middle School and High School</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agency received stakeholder feedback that the <i>A–F</i> system could better recognize middle school students and remove potential disincentives for students taking advanced pathways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bonus points are proposed to be awarded for any student who achieves approaches or higher on any qualifying EOC prior to grade 9. The adjustment is intended to acknowledge and credit</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<p>(i.e., Algebra I in 8th grade), particularly with Senate Bill 2124 passing in 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some stakeholder feedback suggested that bonus points for accelerated pathways should be limited to <b>Meets</b> and above and only applicable to grades 7 and 8.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback recommended that the bonus points awarded for accelerated pathways testers should not be considered in cut point setting.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested that modeling for the accelerated pathway bonus point methodology be conducted for all eligible end-of-course (EOC) assessments.</li> </ul>	<p>campuses students participating in advanced academic pathways and demonstrating academic readiness beyond grade-level expectations and remove any potential disincentive to enrolling students in accelerated pathways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the March 2025 TAAG meeting, the impact of awarding bonus points for Approaches and above compared to Meets and above was reviewed. The analysis indicated a 6 percentage point difference in the number of impacted campuses would result, and TAAG recommended to retain the bonus point methodology for Approaches and above. Additionally, achieving Approaches or above counts towards a student meeting their graduation requirements for an end-of-course (EOC) assessment.</li> <li>Modeling of the 2028 methodology indicates that the inclusion of bonus points results in a marginal difference in statewide outcomes. In alignment with HB 8, cut scores are required to support the goal of Texas achieving top-five</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		<p>national performance within five years and include bonuses awarded for accelerated pathways testers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional modeling applying the bonus point methodology to Approaches Grade Level or above across all qualifying EOC assessments produced results consistent with previously shared analyses limited to Algebra I. This analysis can be found in the TAAG March 2025 presentation materials. Accordingly, the updated framework applies the bonus point methodology to any qualifying EOC assessment taken prior to grade 9, including Algebra I, English I, U.S. History, and Biology.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SAT and ACT Score Changes for Accelerated Testers</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency received feedback that the A–F system should revisit the ACT and/or SAT score ranges aligned to performance level standards (i.e., Approaches, Meets, Masters) used to include high school accelerated testers’ ACT and/or SAT scores in the Student Success Tool component score of Student Achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAT and ACT performance standards for high school accelerated testers have been statistically realigned. The proposed SAT "Meets" remains anchored in the statutory requirement that assessments used as a substitute for STAAR SST EOC meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness benchmarks established by THECB. The proposed ACT “Meets” was updated to</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One stakeholder requested the agency leverage existing concordance tables for SAT/ACT scores, rather than standard deviation modeling.</li> </ul>	<p>align with substitute assessments and passing standards to meet TSI requirements. The proposed “Approaches” and “Masters” performance standards leverage the ACT-reported and SAT-reported standard deviations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency determined that a standard deviation-based methodology is more appropriate to determine “Approaches” and “Masters” performance and it aligns better with industry standard methodology.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Differential Weighting of College, Career, and Military (CCMR) Readiness</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback on the CCMR differential weighting methodology presented to TAAG in April 2025 emphasized the need for additional time for local education agencies (LEAs) to adjust programming, as well as greater flexibility in college credit-earning pathways.</li> <li>There was some stakeholder support for implementing differential weighting in 2028.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In alignment with House Bill 8 and stakeholder feedback, the agency conducted additional correlation analyses examining the relationship between College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators and postsecondary success.</li> <li>The revised proposal, outlined in the Updated Framework, demonstrates increased simplicity and allows for more flexibility for graduates to reach Advanced Postsecondary Readiness.</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The highest categories in the April proposal included indicators such as earning five AP exam scores or completing fifteen dual credit hours (i.e., all within one pathway), and were cited as difficult for many schools to support.</li> <li>Some stakeholders recommended allowing students to mix and match across college-readiness pathways, including AP, IB, dual credit, and OnRamps.</li> <li>Stakeholders requested that the agency review the impact of differential weighting for schools with the highest economically disadvantaged populations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The implementation of differential weighting of CCMR reflects the agency both meeting requirements of HB 8, while also allowing for additional time for schools and school systems to adjust. The 2031 implementation of differential weighting outlined in the Updated Framework begins with the incoming class of 9th graders in school year 2026-27 likely to graduate in 2030.</li> <li>Cut scores for the 2031 implementation of differential weighting of CCMR will be established in the 2030 Accountability System Manual, available in July 2029. As cut scores are established, the agency will conduct disproportionality impact analysis, including by socioeconomic factors.</li> <li>In the <i>2028 Accountability Rating System Manual</i>, CCMR methodology is outlined with the addition of a 5% cap on Tier 3 Industry-Based Certifications and a Military Readiness indicator. The <i>2028 Accountability Rating System Manual</i>, will also include the proposed CCMR differential weighting framework for 2031 accountability ratings. The</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		proposed framework is based on extensive internal and external research that was presented during the January 2026 TAAG meeting and updated to reflect feedback received.
<b>CCMR Indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback reflects concerns regarding the timeline for the transition from concentrator to completer status, as well as requests for additional time for local education agencies (LEAs) to adjust to changes to the industry-based certification (IBC) list.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback reflects concerns about agency approved college preparatory courses.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated a need for local education agencies to correct prior-year CCMR data as part of the CCMR verifier process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This phase-in to CTE completer status with an aligned IBC has been adopted into rule since 2022 and no updates to prior communications are included in the updated framework.</li> <li>HB 8 has established new requirements for the timeline and CCMR implications when changes are made to the IBC list, including a phase-out period for IBCs that are not on the most current list. The timeline was shared in the December 2025 TAAG meeting.</li> <li>Evidence of a strong association with postsecondary success supports the inclusion of college preparatory courses on the agency-approved list. The 2028 Framework has no changes to the college preparatory course requirements.</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated that military readiness should not be limited to students who enlist.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested that AP exams taken in 8th grade should be counted toward CCMR indicator achievement, as the student has satisfied CCMR requirement and should be counted in achievement of CCMR indicators.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback recommended that the agency pursue a long-term solution to obtain military readiness data directly from Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS), rather than relying on district reporting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In accordance with HB 8, the agency will allow districts to submit additional prior-year PEIMS data to correct previously reported CCMR indicators. Additional details available through <a href="#">To the Administrator Addressed Correspondence</a> from February 19, 2026.</li> <li>HB 8 introduced a military readiness indicator, under which students may demonstrate military readiness by achieving a passing score on the Armed Serviced Vocational Aptitude Battery Test (ASVAB) and completing a Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program, including National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC). The minimum passing Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) score on the ASVAB is proposed to be a 31. Please see January 2026 TAAG Meeting for additional information.</li> <li>During the February 2026 TAAG meeting, it was recommended to include AP</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		<p>exams taken in 8th grade in the CCMR achievement indicator. This change is proposed to be applied consistently to other CCMR assessment data sources (IB, SAT, ACT, TSIA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency acknowledges the benefits of obtaining military readiness data directly from national sources and will continue to explore long-term solutions.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Assessments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested in the inclusion of additional assessments for consideration in Student Achievement calculations, such as K-2 assessments, College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Cambridge Assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In preparation for the 2028 A–F Refresh, the agency will share proposals related to additional reporting categories with TAAG, in alignment with HB 8. Results from additional assessments, such as K-2 assessments, may be included in statewide reporting as part of the Other Reporting Information required in HB 8. Additional information is anticipated beginning in late fall 2026.</li> <li>For Student Achievement ratings calculations, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires all students are evaluated on the same instrument. While the US Department of Education does allow tests such as the</li> </ul>

Student Achievement Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		SAT/ACT for EOC accelerated testers, the ESSA requirement would not apply to alternate assessments where statewide assessments are available. As such, no changes are proposed for the 2028 refresh.
<b>Graduation Rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested the consideration of additional reporting, to include adequate progress toward graduation, such as an 9<sup>th</sup> grade “on track” indicator with consideration for 2033 refresh consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency is committed to maintaining outcomes based calculations and reporting within the A-F system. An on-track indicator, while an important input, does not measure the goal of high school graduation.</li> </ul>

Student Progress Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
<b>School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated interest in the inclusion of through-year growth measures.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested a reevaluation of the School Progress transition tables to allow for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While no changes are proposed to Academic Growth for the 2028 accountability system refresh, HB 8 requires the agency to develop a measure of student through-year instructional growth from the beginning of the school year through the end of the school year. SST beginning-of-year (BOY) to end-of-year (EOY) growth will be</li> </ul>

Student Progress Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<p>awarding of additional points to students demonstrating growth across multiple performance levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited stakeholder feedback indicated a request for additional measures of academic progress, specifically TELPAS growth and College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR), and alternative growth measures for schools that only have enrollment up to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested having a separate growth methodology for students that transition from Spanish to English assessments.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested incorporating the bonus point for accelerated testers into the School Progress domain.</li> </ul>	<p>presented for consideration for inclusion as part of the 2033 accountability system refresh.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of the 2023 refresh, additional options outlined during the January 2023 TAAG meeting were explored during the initial adoption of the academic growth transition tables. No changes are proposed to the transition tables.</li> <li>CCMR Growth: The School Progress Domain is designed to measure individual student academic progress, while growth in College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) reflects cohort-level outcomes over time and is already calculated as part of Closing the Gaps, Part A: Student Performance. TELPAS Growth: Year-over-year campus improvement on Progress to English Language Proficiency is measured within the Closing the Gaps, Part A methodology, and an additional measure of TELPAS performance is incorporated into the updated framework under Closing the Gaps, Part B: Special Populations Program</li> </ul>

Student Progress Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		<p>Outcomes. Growth Prior to 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade: As there are no normed statewide assessments for early literacy or math, the agency cannot include K-2 assessments in growth measures. However, the through year growth measure, to be considered for the 2033 refresh could meet the needs of schools that only have enrollment of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders who are assessed on statewide assessments. No changes are proposed to the Academic Growth methodology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agency conducted a data check analyzing the growth of students who transitioned languages between STAAR assessments. This analysis demonstrated results consistent with students assessed in the same language. There are no proposed changes related to language in the 2028 refresh.</li> <li>• The transition table model is intended to measure individual student academic progress based on instruction received during the school year. The bonus point methodology proposed in the Student</li> </ul>

Student Progress Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		Achievement domain is designed to remove a potential disincentive for placing students in accelerated pathways. No changes are proposed to Academic Growth methodology.
<b>School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested that Relative Performance should consider the impact of a campus’s special education enrollment, rather than relying solely on economically disadvantaged percentages, to better account for special education and other student populations without increasing system complexity. Additionally, stakeholders recommended comparing campuses based on similar prior-year student achievement, in place of comparisons based on economically disadvantaged percentages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency replicated prior modeling to examine the impact of including both a campus’s economically disadvantaged percentage and special education (SPED) percentage in School Progress, Part B, to determine whether SPED explains additional variance in student achievement beyond that explained by economically disadvantaged status. The agency also modeled the use of prior-year performance in place of economically disadvantaged percentages. These analyses did not support proposed changes. Thus, no changes are proposed to the School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance domain. Percent Economically Disadvantaged will remain the sole comparison variable.</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
<p><b>Integration of RDA into A-F</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback from the 2023 refresh indicated that multiple reporting systems created redundancy and confusion. The agency determined it would be phasing-in the integration of Results Driven Accountability (RDA). As an initial step, the 2023 Accountability Manual included RDA as Chapter 12. Additionally, a high level overview of the new Closing the Gaps, Part B Domain was outlined in the preliminary framework. Stakeholder feedback acknowledged limited information on the methodology for the Closing the Gaps, Part B: Student Populations Program Outcomes Domain in the preliminary framework.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated concerns that Closing the Gaps, Part B Domain may disproportionately impact district ratings               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for rural school districts and districts with high percentages of students who are identified as economically disadvantaged</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The incorporation of the RDA system into the A-F accountability framework is intended to align federal reporting requirements, reduce duplication of data reporting, and create a consistent statewide focus on improving outcomes for special populations. Significant Disproportionality (SD) determinations, previously reported through RDA and not integrated into A-F accountability, remain required under 34 CFR §300.647 and will be published alongside A-F reports for transparency and compliance. Annually federally required determination levels (DLs) for special education monitoring activities and interventions will use performance data from the Closing the Gaps domain, Part B in its overall calculation method for DLs. Program monitoring of bilingual education (Title III), foster (Title I, Part D), and homeless (McKinney Vento) will be conducted separately from A-F accountability. Nonacademic compliance and outcome indicators previously reported through RDA will be addressed through program monitoring.</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for districts with high percentages of emergent bilingual students and students receiving special education services</li> <li>for non-traditional districts, especially those comprised solely of Dropout Recovery Schools.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested consideration that the “best of” methodology is applied to Closing the Gaps, Part B.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback recommended combining Foster Care and Homeless Programs into one component, to account for one third of Closing the Gaps, Part B domain scaled score.</li> </ul>	<p>The Updated Framework outlines the full methodology for Closing the Gaps, Part B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on analyses shared in the December 2025, January 2026 and February 2026 TAAG meetings, Closing the Gaps, Part B has no disproportionate impact on rural school districts, districts with high percentages of emergent bilingual students, or students receiving special education services, and districts comprised of exclusively Dropout Recovery Schools.</li> <li>Because Closing the Gaps, Part A and Part B evaluate different student populations, the “best of” methodology cannot be applied.</li> <li>An adjustment to Closing the Gaps, Part B was made in the updated framework to place the four student program areas into three components: 1: Bilingual Education, 2: Special Education, and 3: Foster and Homeless. This more accurately represents both program small group sizes that may be found at</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		the district level and reflect the similarity in mobility patterns across these student groups.
<b>New Campus Scoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested the opportunity to earn points that are currently not available for new campuses who do not have prior year data and are unable to earn 1 or 2 points for demonstrating minimum or expected growth in Closing the Gaps, Part A.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested the proposed 0-4-scoring methodology for new campuses also be applied to existing campuses.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested that reliance on the state average for prior year data may not fulfill the requirement for “appropriate alternative prior-year data” for new Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HB 8 establishes that, for a newly established campus that lacks prior-year data, the agency will use appropriate alternative prior-year data to evaluate the Closing the Gaps Domain, Part A: Student Performance. The change to the two lowest-performing groups methodology for new campuses meets this statutory requirement. Under the graduated points methodology, new campuses have been historically unable to earn 1 or 2 points due to a lack of prior year data to measure minimal or expected growth, and could only earn 0, 3, or 4 points. District prior-year data will be used as proxy data for first-year campuses to allow access to the full scoring range. For new campuses is a new district, the state averages will be used as proxy data.</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested consideration of assigning no accountability rating for a campus during its first year of operation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the December 2025 TAAG meeting, a proposal to use an existing campus' current year two lowest performing groups in accountability calculations was reviewed; however, TAAG did not recommend its inclusion in the updated framework due to potential conflict with federal school improvement identification along with limiting a campus' ability to strategically plan for its two lowest performing race or ethnicity groups.</li> <li>For new DRS campuses under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) that do not have prior year data, the state average of DRS' campuses' prior-year data is proposed to be used to evaluate the two-lowest performing groups. The agency is currently reviewing whether this approach for a new DRS campus is allowable under ESSA.</li> <li>Campuses cannot be exempted from accountability ratings because federal and state law require the agency to</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		<p>evaluate and publicly report campus performance each year. Only campuses that meet predefined, unique campus-type criteria based on the students served may be designated Not Rated. Otherwise, campuses are evaluated either under the standard accountability system or through alternative provisions designed for nontraditional settings. Additionally, HB 8 authorizes the agency to evaluate newly established campuses using alternative or proxy prior-year data.</p>
<p><b>Safe Harbor Provision</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency received stakeholder feedback requesting the opportunity to provide for minor declines in performance in Domain 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Safe Harbor provision was shared with TAAG in May 2025 and will allow campuses to two earn 2 points when expected growth to the next interim target was not met, while continuing to demonstrate progress to current target. This change responds to the public feedback requesting the opportunity to provide for an allowable dip in year-over-year performance.</li> <li>While the agency is confirming with the U.S. Department of Education, it is anticipated that the Safe Harbor</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		provision does not apply to the federal school improvement identifications.
<b>Small Number Analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested that a campus who was evaluated using small numbers analysis in the prior year should have the results of small numbers analysis used as prior year data in the current year. Small number analysis is applied to the graduation rate in the CCMR component in both the Student Achievement domain and Closing the Gaps domain (only applied to the All Students group).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the current methodology, a campus that does not meet minimum size is considered as having no prior-year data. Additionally, if small number analysis is applied using three years of data, the campus is also considered as having no prior-year data. As a result, a campus can only earn 0, 3, or 4 points. The updated framework includes a change for campuses previously evaluated using small numbers analysis. Specifically, it allows prior-year calculations based on small number analysis to be used in School Quality and Graduation Rate component scoring for the all students group.</li> </ul>
<b>Racial/Ethnic Student Group Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested evaluating performance for all racial and ethnic student groups, rather than limiting calculations to the two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups in the Closing the Gaps domain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis indicated that evaluating all racial and ethnic student groups resulted in roughly equal proportions of campuses receiving higher and lower scores compared to the two-lowest-performing-groups approach. This proposal is not reflected in the 2028 Framework, as the Closing the Gaps domain is designed to focus</li> </ul>

Closing the Gaps Domain		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
		improvement efforts on the lowest-performing student groups, and including higher-performing groups could dilute this focus by either inflating scores due to stronger performance or lowering scores due to higher performance targets. Additional information is available in the TAAG May 2025 Meeting materials.
<b>Bonus Points for Accelerated Pathways Testers in Closing the Gaps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested that bonus points for accelerated testers be included in components of Closing the Gaps for Algebra I and English I EOC assessments, that bonus points not be incorporated into target setting or scaling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bonus point methodology is intended to recognize participation in advanced academic pathways within the Student Achievement domain and is not designed to measure growth, subgroup performance, or inform target setting or scaling. Bonus points for accelerated pathways testers are included in the updated 2028 Framework in Domain 1 and 2b, to remove perceived disincentives. Bonus points are not reflected in Domain 3 component scoring and were not considered in Domain 3 target setting.</li> </ul>

Accountability System Framework		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
<b>D and F Gate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested the agency consider the elimination of D and F gate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency shared the consideration for the elimination of the D and F gate in the December 2025 TAAG meeting. The agency is not proceeding with the removal of the D and F gate.</li> </ul>
<b>Student Mobility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback suggested that the agency conduct additional research into the impacts of high mobility on student achievement and growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency routinely conducts data checks on the efficacy of the system, and this request can be considered as part of ongoing research. It is also important to note that the accountability subset exclude students who are mobile within a school year, if they are assessed at a different campus than where they were enrolled in the TSDS PEIMS Fall Snapshot.</li> </ul>
<b>Middle Eastern/North African Race Category</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback recommended recognizing Middle Eastern/North African students as a distinct race/ethnicity category, separate from Asian, noting that current subgroup targets may not be appropriate or reflective of student self-identification and referencing recent federal acknowledgment of this group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency agrees, and plans are in place to establish Middle Eastern/North African as a new race/ethnicity category beginning in the 2028–29 school year. Due to agency timelines, this change will be reflected in the <i>2029 Accountability Rating System Manual</i>.</li> </ul>

<b>Accountability System Framework</b>		
<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Stakeholder Feedback</b>	<b>Framework Updates and Rationales</b>
<b>Local Accountability Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback supported providing local school systems with the opportunity to develop Local Accountability Systems (LAS).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HB 8 requires the agency to “establish a grant program to assist at least one school district in each education service center region in developing a local accountability plan.” Additional details are forthcoming.</li> </ul>
<b>District School Progress Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested consideration of calculating district Domain 2 scores using the higher of School Progress, Part A or Part B from each campus, rather than using all campus domains under the current methodology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis demonstrated minimal impact from this alternative approach, with limited changes in overall scaled scores and minimal changes to overall ratings. Given the limited effect, increased calculation complexity, reduced predictability for districts, and how this approach does not fully reflect performance across all four accountability domains, this methodology change is not reflected in the 2028 Framework. Additional details can be found in the TAAG April 2025 Meeting materials.</li> </ul>

<b>Distinction Designations</b>		
<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Stakeholder Feedback</b>	<b>Framework Updates and Rationales</b>
Distinction Designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated interest in additional options within the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the 2028 Framework, it is proposed that Postsecondary Readiness</li> </ul>

Distinction Designations		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<p>Postsecondary Distinction to better highlight schools that exceed expectations for postsecondary student success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback raised concerns that the Attendance Rate indicator may not be an academic measure and could create unintended incentives related to student attendance in circumstances such as illness or other extenuating conditions.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated a need to create distinction designations specific to Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) and Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS) to more appropriately recognize performance within these settings</li> <li>One stakeholder expressed reservations about adding four additional indicators to the Postsecondary Success Distinction designation, noting that students are disproportionately impacted by factors beyond the control of the PK-12 school system, including</li> </ul>	<p>distinctions indicators expand, attendance rate be removed, and AEA/DRS campuses be included through appropriate comparison groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agency acknowledges that postsecondary attainment may be influenced by a range of factors. Because campuses are compared only to others within their campus comparison group, these challenges are likely to be comparable among peer campuses.</li> <li>Maintaining the proposed addition of postsecondary readiness distinction designation indicators supports a more comprehensive recognition of postsecondary readiness outcomes and aligns with the purpose of this distinction designation to highlight campuses that demonstrate exceptional performance across multiple measures of postsecondary success.</li> <li>During the February 2026 TAAG Meeting, the agency shared this consideration for OnRamps, and it was determined that OnRamps dual enrollment course</li> </ul>

Distinction Designations		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<p>circumstances affecting graduation. The stakeholder also noted concerns related to data validity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some stakeholder feedback did not agree with the proposal to add four new indicators to the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation.</li> <li>Stakeholder feedback requested that OnRamps, which is a dual credit pathway, be recognized in the Advanced/Dual Credit course completion indicator across all four Academic Achievement Distinction Designations.</li> </ul>	<p>completion will be included in the Advanced/Dual Credit course completion indicator across all four Academic Achievement Distinction Designations.</p>

Other Reporting Information		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
<p><b>Refine Other Reporting Information</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback indicated that the addition of updated or new reporting information to TXschools.gov or the Texas Performance Reporting System (TPRS) would better respond to public interest in a broader set of measures that demonstrate school success beyond the academic indicators currently reflected in the A–F system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TEA will explore enhancements to TXschools.gov and TPRS to include additional reported information following manual publication. In accordance with HB 8, the agency shall collect optional information provided by school districts and open-enrollment charter schools on local indicators of student engagement and workforce</li> </ul>

Other Reporting Information		
Considerations	Stakeholder Feedback	Framework Updates and Rationales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder feedback recommended the inclusion of indicators beyond academic achievement in the domains in determining accountability ratings.</li> </ul>	<p>development for districts or campuses serving students in prekindergarten through eighth grade. Updates to this consideration will be communicated after 2028 accountability manual publication in early summer 2026 and will not impact accountability calculations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of this consideration is to investigate and determine processes for report updates, or other new campus and district information to include on TEA reports. Includes self-reported data on programmatic components from districts to include on TXschools.gov search.</li> <li>HB 8 includes language requiring the agency to conduct a study regarding methods to diversify the performance standards, such as the potential impact of developing indicators that reflect advanced academic coursework, student engagement, workforce development, and parental engagement. These additional reporting categories will not impact accountability ratings.</li> </ul>