

Academic Accountability System Framework for 2028 Ratings

Updated March 2026

What is the A-F Accountability System Refresh?

The Texas A-F accountability system, established by House Bill (HB) 22 (85th Regular Session) in 2017, is a tool to help continuously improve student performance to achieve the goals of eliminating achievement gaps based on race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status and ensuring Texas is a national leader in preparing students for postsecondary success. Valid, reliable, comparable, and objective measures of student outcomes are key to ensuring A-F ratings are fair, rigorous, and transparent to properly empower parents and educators to celebrate successes while improving student supports. The three-domain design of A-F reflects a commitment to recognize the better of student achievement or school progress, while maintaining focus on the students most in need.

Before A-F, Texas updated its accountability rules annually, with goals for students constantly increasing. With A-F, a commitment was made to maintain the same calculations and cut scores for up to five consecutive years without annual changes, to allow for better year-over-year performance comparisons. In 2023, the agency did the first 5-year refresh since the first 2018 campus ratings under A-F. The 2023 refresh included changes to cut points, domain and indicator methodology, and the overall system. HB 8 (89th Texas Legislature, 2nd Called Session, 2025) codifies this update cycle by requiring increases to performance standards only every fifth school year, unless earlier adjustments are necessary to maintain consistency of performance standards. The next 5-year refresh begins with the 2027-2028 school year. Consistent with statutory requirements in HB 8, the agency must update its goals to ensure the state ranks nationally in the top five states in preparing students for academic achievement and postsecondary success.

The scores needed to achieve performance standards on A-F indicators (cut scores) will continue to be based on specific criteria so that ratings are never a fixed distribution, and it is mathematically possible for all districts and schools in Texas to earn an A rating. HB 8 outlines the specific requirements by which cut scores must be set, to position Texas as a top 5 performer nationally in preparing students for postsecondary success and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Additional information on proposed methodology for setting cut scores to fulfill these requirements, along with proposed cut scores and scaled scores for each domain component, will be shared at a later date. This spring 2026 release of **the 2028 System Framework provides an overview of the proposed adjustments to the A-F Accountability System** and reflects changes from the [Preliminary 2028 System Framework](#), based on stakeholder feedback and legislative updates. These updates to the system are based on years of public feedback, guidance and recommendations of the Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG), the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) / A-F Integration Taskforce, a Distinction Designations Committee, and the Commissioner of Education. For more information about TAAG please refer to the most recent charter, [2025-26 Charter for Commissioner of Education's Texas Accountability Advisory Group](#), or the current TAAG members in [TAAG Membership 2025-26](#). Meeting minutes and meeting

presentations are available on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

What is the Timeline for the A-F Refresh?

The refreshed accountability system proposed in this document will be implemented with the 2028 accountability ratings. This 2028 System Framework reflects multiple changes considered by TAAG. Later this year, the proposed rule, the *A-F Accountability Rating System Manual for 2028 Ratings*, will be published on the [2028 Accountability System Manual](#) webpage for a public comment window before becoming final rule. [The 2008 A-F Refresh Summary of Stakeholder Feedback and Adjustments to Framework](#) contains additional information on stakeholder feedback received and agency responses to stakeholder feedback.

Continued Communication and Support

What If Ratings

To support educators' continued understanding of the refreshed 2028 accountability system and in accordance with HB 8, the agency will generate *2026 What If Ratings* and *2027 What If Ratings* based on the 2028 accountability manual. The 2026 *What If* ratings are expected to be released in the TEA Login (TEAL) Accountability after final official ratings are issued for 2026, and the 2027 *What If* ratings will follow a similar release timeline. Prior to the actual 2028 refresh, these ratings will only be issued in TEAL for educator review.

When ratings are issued in 2028 under the refreshed accountability rules, *What If* ratings from 2027 will be published on TXschools.gov, in the "Change Over Time" performance history section, so that the public will be able to understand how performance in 2028 compared with performance in 2027 even though standards changed with the refresh.

What If ratings do not replace the final 2026 or 2027 A-F ratings and do not carry accountability consequences; instead, they will be provided as a reference for administrators in advance of 2028 and as a comparison for the public in fall 2028, and will be based on the methodology in the final rule adopting the *AiF Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2028 ratings.

What If Differential Weighting CCMR Raw Scores

In addition to *What If* ratings for 2026 and 2027, the agency will also generate CCMR raw scores for 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, and 2030 using the calculation of CCMR indicators under differential weighting that is outlined later in this framework document.

Overview of Considerations

Based on a review of stakeholder feedback, extensive data modeling, advisory group recommendations, and Commissioner decision, an initial set of considerations for continuous

improvement of the A-F system was identified. This set subsequently expanded to include additional considerations informed by public feedback. It was further updated to include changes required to align the system with statutory provisions in HB 8.

Initial Considerations

1. Scaling, Cut Scores, Student Group Targets Update Using New Baselines
2. Integration of Results Driven Accountability (RDA) into A-F
3. Differential Weighting of College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Indicators
4. Variables for Relative Performance
5. **(Renamed): Recognition of Accelerated Testers in Middle School and High School**
 - a. Recognition of Accelerated Pathway Testers Prior to Grade 9
 - b. Assessment Score Ranges for SAT and ACT Results for Accelerated Testers in High School
6. Revisit Distinction Designations
7. Additional 'Other' Reported Information

(Initial Considerations for Continuous Improvement of A-F System. First released in TAAG February 2025 Minutes on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage)

Proposals related to the initial considerations were outlined in the Preliminary Framework. Based on stakeholder feedback, additional considerations have been shared with TAAG and may be reflected in this update to the 2028 A-F Framework. For a comprehensive review of stakeholder feedback received and the Texas Education Agency's responses, please see the [2028 A-F Refresh Summary of Stakeholder Feedback and Adjustments to Framework](#) resource document.

Additionally, legislative and other statutory updates have been incorporated into the updated framework.

(Additional considerations can be found in the TAAG December 2025, January 2026, February 2026, and March 2026 presentations on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage)

Overall Design of the Academic Accountability System

There are no changes to the general design of the 2028 accountability system that evaluates campuses' performance according to three domains. Changes are proposed to the design of the Closing the Gaps domain for district ratings as a result of the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) / A-F integration.

(Update): Beginning in school year 2027-2028, the agency will transition the statewide assessment program from the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) to the new instructionally supportive assessment program, which can be referred to as the Student Success Tool (SST) per statute, as required by HB 8. Additionally, HB 8 eliminates the English II end-of-course (EOC) assessment. Accordingly, English II assessment results will no longer be used in accountability calculations across the Student Achievement, School Progress, and Closing the Gaps domains following the summer 2027 administration of English II.

The **Student Achievement** domain evaluates performance across all subjects for all students, on both general and alternate SST assessments; College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators; and graduation rates. The rating for the Student Achievement Domain is calculated as 40 percent based from SST results, 40 percent from CCMR results, and the longitudinal graduation rate accounts for 20 percent of Student Achievement Domain calculations.

The **School Progress** domain measures outcomes in two areas:

- Part A: Academic Growth
 - Annual Growth: Percentage of students who grew at least one year academically as measured by SST results in reading/language arts (RLA) and mathematics.
 - Accelerated Learning: Percentage of students who demonstrated more than one year of academic growth as defined by progressing from a Did Not Meet Grade Level standard in the prior year to an Approaches Grade Level standard or above in the current year as measured by SST results in reading/language arts (RLA) and mathematics.
- Part B: Relative Performance
 - The achievement of students relative to campuses with similar economically disadvantaged percentages.
 - For Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) campuses, Part B: Retest Growth is the percentage of students who earned Approaches Grade Level or above on an EOC retest during the accountability cycle.

The rating for the School Progress domain is the better of Part A: Academic Growth or Part B: Relative Performance. For AEA campuses, the rating for the School Progress domain is the better of Part A: Academic Growth or Part B: Retest Growth.

The **Closing the Gaps** domain measures campus outcomes in one area, and district outcomes in two areas:

- Closing the Gaps Domain, Part A: Student Group Performance (Districts and Campuses)
 - Uses disaggregated data to demonstrate differentials in progress to interim and long-term goals among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and other factors. The indicators included in this domain, as well as the domain's construction, align the state accountability system with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
- **(Proposed Change):** Closing the Gaps, Part B: Special Populations Program Outcomes (District Ratings Only)
 - Integrates program effectiveness measures from the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) framework that evaluate the district-level performance of certain populations of students in selected program areas. A portion of the district Closing the Gaps domain rating will come from Part B: Special Populations.

- **(Update):** Under the updated proposed methodology, 70 percent of district's Closing the Gaps domain score is derived from Part A, and the remaining 30 percent is based on Part B. Accordingly, Part A and Part B collectively determine a single Closing the Gaps domain score for districts, while Part A alone is used to assign a campus rating.

More information on Closing the Gaps, Part B methodology is available in the TAAG December 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

The **Overall Rating** calculation is unchanged; the better outcome of the Student Achievement or the School Progress domain score is weighted at 70 percent, and the Closing the Gaps domain score is weighted at 30 percent. If a scaled score less than 60 is received in three of the four areas of Student Achievement; School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth; School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance; or Closing the Gaps, the highest scaled score a campus can receive for the overall rating is a 59. If the Student Achievement domain score is 60 or higher, this provision will not be applied. If a scaled score less than 70 is received in three of the four areas of Student Achievement; School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth; School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance; or Closing the Gaps, the highest scaled score a campus can receive for the overall rating is a 69. If the Student Achievement domain score is 70 or higher, this provision will not be applied.

Proposed Domain Updates

Student Achievement

SST Component

No changes are proposed to the overall methodology of the SST component of the Student Achievement domain in which scores are calculated based on students' levels of performance at Approaches Grade Level or above, Meets Grade Level or above, and Masters Grade Level standards. The SST component evaluates SST assessments for grades 3-12, alternate versions of SST assessment, English Learner Performance Measure results, and SAT or ACT results for accelerated testers. The SST component score is calculated by dividing the total percentage points (cumulative performance for the three performance levels) by three, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all campuses. The agency will ensure that performance levels for SST assessments are set in a manner consistent with those established in prior school years, including through the implementation of equating procedures or by conducting standard-setting processes.

Recognition of Accelerated Pathway Testers Prior to Grade 9 Consideration

Accelerated Pathways Testers are students who earn Approaches Grade Level or above on the Algebra I, English I, U.S. History, and/or Biology SST EOC assessments prior to grade 9 as part of an accelerated pathway. **(Update): With the elimination of the English II EOC assessment, the definition of accelerated pathway tester has been adjusted to no longer include English II.**

(Proposed Change): A single bonus point is awarded for each assessment result for students who achieve Approaches Grade Level or above on an EOC assessment as part of an accelerated pathway (Algebra I, English I, U.S. History, Biology). The awarded bonus point is

included in the numerator of the SST component score calculation. The SST component score is still calculated by dividing by three. If the component score exceeds 100 due to the inclusion of the bonus points, the score is scaled to 100.

Example: Middle School SST Performance	Reading Language Arts	Math	Science	Social Studies	Totals	Percentages
Number of Assessments	253	212	86	74	625	
Approaches Grade Level or Above	154	142	37	23	356	57%
Meets Grade Level or Above	104	84	12	21	221	35%
Masters Grade Level	52	73	10	6	141	23%
Bonus: Number of 5 th -8 th graders with EOCs at Approaches or Above	7	18	0	9	34	5%
Total Percentage Points						120
Student Achievement Domain SST Component Score (Total Percentage Points ÷ 3)						40

Rationale: The agency received feedback that the A-F system could better recognize accelerated pathways students and remove potential disincentives for students taking advanced pathways (i.e., Algebra I in 8th grade), particularly with Senate Bill 2124 passing in 2023. This adjustment is intended to acknowledge and credit campuses for middle school students participating in advanced academic coursework and demonstrating academic readiness beyond grade-level expectations and remove any potential disincentive to enrolling students in accelerated pathways.

Assessment Score Ranges for SAT and ACT Results for Accelerated Pathway Testers Consideration

To fulfill [federal](#) testing requirements, Accelerated Pathways Testers who earned Approaches Grade Level or above on Algebra I, English I, and/or Biology SST EOC assessments must take a corresponding subject area SAT or ACT while in high school, and the SAT or ACT assessment score is used for accountability purposes.

(Proposed Change): Updated performance level standards (score ranges) are applied to accelerated testers’ SAT and ACT results used for the SST component score. All other aspects of the SAT and ACT methodology for students in advanced pathways remain unchanged. Results remain applied to the campus where reported as enrolled in Grade 12.

The following table shows the updated cut scores for SAT and ACT.

Assessment Score Range for Performance Level Standards

Standard	SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW)	SAT Math	ACT English + Reading Combined	ACT Math	ACT Science
Approaches Grade Level or above	360 – 470	380 – 520	20 – 39	14 – 21	16 – 22
Meets Grade Level or above	480 – 510	530 – 570	40 – 46	22 – 24	23 – 27
Masters Grade Level	520 – 800	580 – 800	47 – 72	25 – 36	28 – 36

Rationale: 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 SST component score of Student Achievement. This update reflects a scheduled review of college readiness benchmarks used in the state accountability system. SAT "Meets" remains anchored in statutory requirement that assessments used as a substitute for SST EOC meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness benchmarks established by THECB. ACT “Meets” updated to align with substitute assessments and passing standards to meet TSI requirements. The “Approaches” and “Masters” performance standards leverage the ACT-reported and SAT-reported standard deviations.

More information on the Middle School and High School Accelerated Tester methodology is available in TAAG March 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

Graduation Rate Component

No changes are proposed for the 2028 Student Achievement Graduation Rate component. The graduation rate component includes the four-year, five-year, and six-year high school longitudinal graduation rates or the annual dropout rate, if no graduation rate is available. The graduation rate that results in the highest score is used to calculate the graduation rate score.

College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Component

(Update): In accordance with HB 8, the agency will allow districts to submit additional prior-year PEIMS data to correct previously reported CCMR indicators. This change is new to the 2028 framework; however, it will apply beginning with 2026 accountability ratings.

More information is available in the [PEIMS Working Submission Guidance](#) resource.

(Update): Beginning with the 2031 accountability cycle, Texas will transition to differential weighting of CCMR.

College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Component (2028, 2029, 2030):

No changes are proposed to the overall methodology of the 2028 CCMR component of the Student Achievement domain in which scores are calculated based on graduates' preparedness for college, the workforce, or the military. The Student Achievement CCMR denominator consists of annual graduates from the prior school year. For example, in the 2028 accountability year, CCMR reflects graduates from the Class of 2027.

Annual graduates can demonstrate college, career, or military readiness in any one of the following ways. **(Proposed Change): The 2028 system methodology includes changes specific to the following CCMR indicators: Changes to the Earn an Industry-Based Certification (IBC) and Complete an Aligned Program of Study indicator and the addition of a new Military Readiness indicator.**

- *Meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria in RLA and Mathematics.* A graduate meeting the TSI college readiness standards in both RLA and mathematics; specifically, meeting the college-ready criteria on the TSIA1 and/or TSIA2 assessment, SAT, ACT, or by successfully completing and earning credit for an agency-reviewed and approved college preparatory course in grade 12 as defined in Texas Education Code, TEC §28.014, in both ELA and mathematics.

College Preparatory course approval information is published on the Advanced Academics website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/college-career-and-military-prep/college-preparatory-courses-for-ccmr-accountability>.

- *Earn Dual Course Credits.* A graduate completing and earning credit for at least three credit hours in ELA or mathematics or at least nine credit hours in any subject.
- *Meet Criteria on Advanced Placement (AP)/International Baccalaureate (IB) Examination.* A graduate meeting the criterion score on AP or IB examinations at a level that is predictive of college enrollment and persistence consistent with other college ready indicators.
- *Earn an Associate Degree.* A graduate earning an associate degree by August 31 immediately following high school graduation.
- *Complete an OnRamps Dual Enrollment Course.* A graduate completing an OnRamps dual enrollment course and qualifying for at least three hours of university or college credit in any subject area.
- *Earn an Industry-Based Certification (IBC) and Complete an Aligned Program of Study.* A graduate earning an IBC under Texas Administrative Code, 19 TAC §74.1003.
 - Earning an IBC means the student has successfully completed all requirements defined by the certifying entity. Districts and charter schools should consult the certifying entities' webpages to determine the requirements that must be met for students to earn IBCs.
 - IBCs for 2028 accountability are listed on the 2025-30 (v4) list. The purpose of the IBC list is to identify certifications that prepare students for success in college, the workforce, or the military. Information on list updates is published on the Career and Technical

Education website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/college-career-and-military-prep/career-and-technical-education/industry-based-certifications>.

- **(Update):** HB 8 established that, to the extent possible, the IBC list will be modified concurrently with the five-year A-F refresh cycle, and IBCs removed from the list will have a two-year advance notice and a three-year phase-out period. Any IBC removed from the list is subject to a two-year notice and a phase-out period. Once a new IBC list is published, campuses and districts may continue to award CCMR credit from the prior or phaseout list for students already in process of earning credit in the aligned program of study, for up to three additional school years. There is no longer a sunseting cap as was used in 2023 to 2027 ratings.

The following table shows anticipated years for introduction of updated IBC lists and annual graduates who will benefit from phase-out lists.

		CCMR IBC and Program of Study Credit Requirement		
Annual Graduates	Accountability Year	Current List	Phase-Out List*	Program of Study Status
Class of 2027	2028	v4 list		Completer
Class of 2028	2029	v4 list		Completer
Class of 2029	2030	v5 list	v4 list	Completer
Class of 2030	2031	v5 list	v4 list	Completer
Class of 2031	2032	v5 list	v4 list	Completer
Class of 2032	2033	v5 list		Completer
Class of 2033	2034	v5 list		Completer
Class of 2034	2035	v6 list	v5 list	Completer
Class of 2035	2036	v6 list	v5 list	Completer
Class of 2036	2037	v6 list	v5 list	Completer

*Students cannot start, but can earn credit if already in progress

- An amendment to 19 TAC §74.1003 effective in June 2025 updated the criteria used to identify the industry-based certifications to be used for public school accountability. The amendment established three tiers of IBCs for purposes of public school accountability

and defined the criteria that must be met for inclusion on the list, including: a credential must be a certification or license, industry recognized and valued, attainable by a high school student, portable, and offered as a capstone or at the end of a program.

(Update): HB 8 also requires that the agency, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), and the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) to jointly develop and maintain IBCs aligned to high-wage, high skills, in-demand occupations and approved programs of study, reinforcing the recent amendment to 19 TAC §74.1003.

- *Enlist in the Armed Forces or Texas National Guard.* A graduate enlisting in the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines, or Space Force. This includes Texas National Guard and Reserves for their respective services. Enlistment verification uses data sourced directly from the US Department of Defense.
- **(Update):** *Demonstrate Military Readiness.* A graduate who has completed a Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program and received an Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) score of 31 or higher on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Test (ASVAB). JROTC program completion includes National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) programs.

Rationale: HB 8 introduced a military readiness indicator, under which students may demonstrate military readiness by achieving a passing score on the ASVAB and completing a JROTC program.

More information on the incorporation and JROTC completion and AFQT score is available on the TAAG January 2026 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Component (2031 and 2032):

Differential Weighting of CCMR Indicators Consideration

(Update): Beginning with the 2031 accountability year, the CCMR component of the Student Achievement domain will assign values to each indicator based on its correlation to positive postsecondary outcomes, as was directed by HB 8. The proposed framework for differential weighting of CCMR responds both to legislative requirements of HB 8 and stakeholder feedback, and will begin with the Class of 2030, largely comprised of those students entering 9th grade in the 2026-27 school year. Beginning with the class of 2030, reflected in 2031 accountability, CCMR will be evaluated using three postsecondary readiness levels:

- Foundational Postsecondary Readiness or above
- Demonstrated Postsecondary Readiness or above
- Advanced Postsecondary Readiness

For accountability calculations, each graduate is counted only once for CCMR, based on the highest CCMR postsecondary readiness level attained. If a graduate meets multiple CCMR criteria across the postsecondary readiness levels, the highest qualifying postsecondary readiness level is earned. If a graduate meets multiple CCMR criteria within a single postsecondary readiness level, they are counted one time for their highest postsecondary readiness level attained and as applicable to lower performance levels. Meeting additional criteria at the same level is not considered.

Postsecondary Readiness Levels and Indicators

Foundational Postsecondary Readiness	Demonstrated Postsecondary Readiness	Advanced Postsecondary Readiness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met TSI using an approved College Prep Course <i>OR</i> • Potential for college credit in any subject <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 AP/IB passed exam, or ○ 3 hours OnRamps, or ○ 3 hours Dual Credit <i>OR</i> • Completer in an aligned program of study and Tier 3 IBC <i>OR</i> • JROTC/NDCC completion and score of 31-49 on AFQT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met TSI using SAT or ACT or TSIA <i>OR</i> • Completer in an aligned program of study and Tier 2 IBC <i>OR</i> • Earned specific diploma plan and was Special Education at time of graduation <i>OR</i> • Earned Workforce Readiness and IEP completion <i>OR</i> • JROTC/NDCC completion and score of 50-64 on AFQT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associate Degree <i>OR</i> • Met TSI using SAT or ACT or TSIA and potential for college credit in any subject <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 AP/IB passed exam, or ○ 3 hours OnRamps, or ○ 3 hours Dual Credit <i>OR</i> • Level I or II Certificate <i>OR</i> • Completer in an aligned program of study and Tier 1 IBC <i>OR</i> • Military Enlistment <i>OR</i> • JROTC/NDCC completion and score of 65 or higher on AFQT

Foundational Postsecondary Readiness

A graduate meets Foundational Postsecondary Readiness if the graduate satisfies any one of the following criteria:

- *Meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria in RLA or Mathematics by a College Preparatory Course.* A graduate successfully completing and earning credit for an agency-reviewed and approved college preparatory course in grade 12 as defined in Texas Education Code, TEC §28.014, in Reading/Language Arts (RLA) and/or mathematics.
 - If earning CCMR through TSI criteria, criteria must be met in both mathematics and RLA. If either Mathematics or RLA TSI criteria are met using a College Preparatory Course, the graduate is assigned to Foundational Postsecondary Readiness, even if the other subject meets TSI criteria through SAT, ACT or TSIA. College Preparatory course approval information is published on the Advanced Academics website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/college-career-and-military-prep/college-preparatory-courses-for-ccmr-accountability>

- *Earn Dual Course Credits.* A graduate completing and earning credit for at least three credit hours in any subject.
- *Meet Criteria on Advanced Placement (AP)/International Baccalaureate (IB) Examination.* A graduate meeting the criterion score on any subject area AP or IB examination at a level that is predictive of college enrollment and persistence consistent with other college ready indicators. Criterion score is 3 or higher for AP and 4 or higher for IB.
- *Complete an OnRamps Dual Enrollment Course.* A graduate completing an OnRamps dual enrollment course and qualifying for at least three hours of university or college credit in any subject area.
- *Completer in an Aligned Program of Study and Earn a Tier 3 Industry Based Certification (IBC).* A graduate completing a Program of Study and earning a Tier 3 IBC under Texas Administrative Code, 19 TAC §74.1003.
- *Demonstrate Military Readiness.* A graduate that has completed a Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program and received an Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) score between 31-49 on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Test (ASVAB). JROTC program completion includes National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) programs.

Demonstrated Postsecondary Readiness

A graduate meets Demonstrated Postsecondary Readiness if the graduate satisfies any one of the following criteria:

- *Meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria in RLA and Mathematics by the TSIA1 and/or TSIA2 assessment, SAT, or ACT - without also earning potential college credit.* A graduate successfully meeting TSI college readiness standards in both RLA and mathematics; specifically, meeting the college ready criteria on the TSIA1 and/or TSIA2 assessment, SAT or ACT as defined in Texas Education Code, TEC §28.014, in both RLA and mathematics.
 - If meeting CCMR through TSI criteria, criteria must be met in both mathematics and RLA. If TSI criteria are met in math and RLA through a combination of SAT, ACT, or TSIA scores, but the graduate does not additionally meet criteria on AP or IB exams, earn Dual Course credit, or complete an OnRamps Dual Credit course, the graduate has earned Demonstrated Postsecondary Readiness.
- *Completer in an Aligned Program of Study and Earn a Tier 2 Industry-Based Certification (IBC).* A graduate completing a Program of Study and earning a Tier 2 IBC under Texas Administrative Code, 19 TAC §74.1003.
- *Graduate Under Specific Graduation Plans and Identified as a Student Receiving Special Education Services at Time of Graduation.* A graduate who is identified as receiving special education services during the year of graduation and whose graduation plan type is identified as Foundation High School Plan with an Endorsement (FHSP-E), Foundation High School

Plan with a Distinguished Level of Achievement (FHSP-DLA) or Texas First Early High School Completion Program (Texas First).

- *Graduate with Completed Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Workforce Readiness.* A graduate receiving a graduation type code of 54, or 55, which indicates the student has completed his/her IEP and has either obtained full-time employment with self-help skills to maintain employment or has demonstrated mastery of specific employability and self-help skills that do not require public school services.
- *Demonstrate Military Readiness.* A graduate that has completed a Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program and received an Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) score between 50-64 on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Test (ASVAB). JROTC program completion includes National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) programs.

Advanced Postsecondary Readiness

A graduate meets Advanced Postsecondary Readiness if the graduate satisfies any one of the following criteria:

- *Earn an Associate Degree.* A graduate earning an associate degree by August 31 immediately following high school graduation.
- *Meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria in RLA and Mathematics by the TSIA1 and/or TSIA2 assessment, SAT, or ACT – with potential for college credit.* A graduate successfully meeting TSI college readiness standards in *both* RLA and mathematics; specifically, meeting the college ready criteria on the TSIA1 and/or TSIA2 assessment, SAT, or ACT as defined in Texas Education Code, TEC §28.014, in both RLA and mathematics **and** meets the criteria of one of the following:
 - *Earn Dual Course Credits.* A graduate completing and earning credit for at least three credit hours in any subject.
 - *Meet Criteria on Advanced Placement (AP)/International Baccalaureate (IB) Examination.* A graduate meeting the criterion score on any subject area AP or IB examination at a level that is predictive of college enrollment and persistence consistent with other college ready indicators. Criterion score is 3 or higher for AP and 4 or higher for IB.
 - *Complete an OnRamps Dual Enrollment Course.* A graduate completing an OnRamps dual enrollment course and qualifying for at least three hours of university or college credit in any subject area.

If meeting CCMR through TSI criteria, criteria must be met in both RLA and math. If TSI criteria are met through a combination of SAT, ACT, or TSIA scores, **and** the graduate meets criteria on AP or IB exams, earning Dual Course credit, or completion of an OnRamps Dual Credit course, the graduate has earned Advanced Postsecondary Readiness.

-

- *Earn a Level I or Level II Certificate.* A graduate earning a level I or level II certificate in any workforce education area.
- *Completer in an Aligned Program of Study and Earn a Tier 1 Industry-Based Certification (IBC).* A graduate completing a Program of Study and earning a Tier 1 IBC under Texas Administrative Code, 19 TAC §74.1003.
- *Enlist in the Armed Forces or Texas National Guard.* A graduate enlisting in the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines, or Space Force. This includes Texas National Guard and Reserves for their respective services. Enlistment verification uses data sourced directly from the US Department of Defense.
- *Demonstrate Military Readiness.* A graduate that has completed a Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program and received an Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) score of 65 or higher on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Test (ASVAB). JROTC program completion includes National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) programs.

Each graduate is assigned to the highest postsecondary readiness performance level attained. For accountability calculations, graduates meeting one of the three performance levels are included in the numerator for the highest performance level attained and for all applicable lower performance levels. One point is awarded for each percentage of graduates who earn CCMR classifications at or above each category, as follows:

- Percentage at Foundational Postsecondary Readiness or above
- Percentage at Demonstrated Postsecondary Readiness or above
- Percentage at Advanced Postsecondary Readiness

The CCMR component score is calculated by dividing the total percentage points (cumulative percentage of the three postsecondary readiness levels) by three, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all campuses. The percentage by postsecondary readiness level and CCMR component score are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Rationale: HB 8 outlines that the value of each indicator must be assigned based on the strength of the indicator's correlation with postsecondary success, based on required study and analysis. The agency completed a comprehensive study to understand indicators value proportional to their correlation to positive postsecondary outcomes and the proposed differential weighting reflects the legislative intent of HB 8 better than prior proposals.

More information on the Differential Weighting of CCMR Indicators proposal is available in the TAAG January 2026 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

School Progress Domain

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth

No changes are proposed for the 2028 School Progress, Academic Growth component. Academic Growth provides an opportunity for campuses to receive credit for statewide assessment results in RLA and mathematics that show annual growth and, if applicable, demonstrate accelerated

learning.

By maintaining the transition table model as introduced with the 2023 refresh, growth is measured across assessments such as SST grade 8 reading to English I EOC, Spanish to English reading SST, and EOC retests. The transition table model can be used to evaluate assessments with scores reported on different scales, such as when changes are made to state assessments.

More information on an analysis of Spanish and English growth results that resulted in no change proposals is available in the TAAG March 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

(Update): HB 8 directs the agency to ensure that performance levels for SST assessments are set in a manner consistent with those established in prior school years, including through the implementation of equating procedures or by conducting standard-setting processes. **These procedures will ensure accurate academic progress measurement during the STAAR to SST transition in the 2027-28 school year.**

Further, the implementation of beginning-of-year and middle-of-the year assessments in SST has no implications to academic growth methodology in the Student Progress domain for 2028 through 2032 accountability cycles. While there are no changes 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 considered for implementation as part of the 2033 accountability system refresh. This timing aligns with the statutory requirement for presentation and consideration of the measure prior to any considered incorporation into accountability indicators.

School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance

No changes are proposed for the 2028 School Progress, Relative Performance component. Relative Performance measures the student achievement of all students relative to campuses with similar economically disadvantaged percentages. For high schools, CCMR performance relative to campuses with similar economically disadvantaged percentages is also included.

School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance CCMR Component

The same requirements for graduates as described in the Student Achievement Domain apply.

Variables for Relative Performance Consideration

Note: The agency replicated previous modeling of the impact of including both a campus's economically disadvantaged percentage and Special Education (SPED) percentage in School Progress, Part B to see if the conclusion still holds that SPED explains very little of the variance of SST that economically disadvantaged does not explain. The agency also modeled the impact of using prior year performance instead of economically disadvantaged percentages. **No changes are proposed.** Relationships between achievement and the demographic variables that have been examined will be published on the Performance Reporting website.

Analyses of variables considered for Relative Performance are available in the TAAG March 2025 Presentation (SPED), TAAG Meeting Presentation April 2025 (Prior Year Performance) on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

School Progress, Part B: Retest Growth (AEA)

No changes are proposed to the 2028 School Progress, Retest Growth (AEA) component. Retest Growth measures the percentage of students who earned Approaches Grade Level or above on an EOC retest during the accountability cycle.

Closing the Gaps Domain

The Closing the Gaps domain uses disaggregated data to demonstrate differentials in progress to interim and long-term goals among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and other factors.

Closing the Gaps for Campuses and Districts, Part A: Closing the Gaps Student Groups

While multiple student groups are evaluated within Closing the Gaps, Part A under ESSA requirements, the following four groups' outcomes contribute to the domain rating. No changes are proposed to the four groups. **The 2028 system methodology includes one change specific to the two lowest-performing groups methodology for new campuses.**

- All students
- Two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups determined by reviewing performance of racial/ethnic groups from the prior year.
 - The minimum size of 10 is applied to prior year data when identifying the two groups.
 - **(Update):** HB 8 directs the agency to provide alternative prior-year data for newly established campuses to complete Closing the Gaps methodology that relies on prior-year campus data. **(Proposed Change): For a new campus lacking prior-year campus data, the district's prior year two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups are evaluated.** If there are no prior year district groups (a new campus in a new district), then use the campus's *current* two lowest-performing racial/ethnicity groups. If the new campus does not meet minimum size requirements for the district's lowest-performing racial/ethnicity groups, then use the campus's *current* two lowest-performing groups.
 - If a campus only has one prior-year lowest performing racial/ethnic group that meets minimum size in the current year, only that group is evaluated.
- High focus. Students are included in the high focus student group if they are identified as any of the following:
 - Economically disadvantaged
 - Emergent Bilingual (EB) (current and monitored)
 - Served by Special Education (current)
 - Highly mobile (foster, homeless, and/or migrant)

Rationale: Feedback was received that the state’s two lowest groups were potentially dissimilar to new campus demographics. Feedback was also received that without minimum size met for the state’s groups, new campuses were not able to be evaluated on Closing the Gaps. Updating to the district’s two lowest performing may be more representative of the campus and provide a more targeted focus on the groups in greater need of support.

Components

No changes are proposed to the four components evaluated in the Closing the Gaps, Part A domain.

- Academic Achievement
 - SST Performance Status at the Meets Grade Level or above standard in reading/language arts (RLA) and mathematics
- Growth or Graduation
 - Academic Growth Status: The School Progress, Part A domain data in RLA and mathematics for elementary and middle schools and high schools and K–12s without a federal four-year graduation rate
 - Federal Graduation Status: The four-year federal graduation rate (without exclusions) for high schools or K–12s with graduation rates. If a high school or K–12 does not have graduation data, Academic Growth Status is used, if available.
- Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)
 - A student is considered having made progress if they have advanced at least one TELPAS composite level from the prior year or if the student scored as Advanced High or Basic Fluency in the current year.
- School Quality or Student Success
 - Student Achievement Domain, SST Component Score: SST component for elementary and middle schools
 - CCMR Performance Status: This component differs from the CCMR component in the Student Achievement domain. No caps/limits are applied to the CCMR component in Closing the Gaps. Additionally, for high schools and K-12 the denominator used is graduates plus students in grade 12 who did not graduate, as required by ESSA. As in the Student Achievement domain, the methodology for calculation will shift to differential weighting of CCMR in 2031.

Graded Points Methodology

The performance of each student group is compared to the performance targets for each component based on school type. Student groups earn 0–4 points for each indicator based on a graded point methodology as follows.

Points	Definition
4	Met long-term target (2037-38 target)
3	Met current interim target (target through 2031-32)
2	Did not meet current interim target but showed expected growth toward next interim target (target through 2036-37)
1	Did not meet interim target but showed minimal growth
0	Did not meet interim target and did not show minimal growth

The 2028 system methodology includes two changes specific to 0–4 scoring. One change is for new campuses and one for all campuses.

(Update): HB 8 directs the agency to provide alternative prior-year data for newly established campuses to complete Closing the Gaps methodology that relies on prior-year data. **(Proposed Change): For new campuses, use the *district’s* prior year data as campus prior-year data to create an opportunity to earn 1 or 2 points.** If there are no prior year district groups (a new campus in a new district), then use the *state’s* average as prior year baseline. If the new campus does not meet minimum size requirements for the district's lowest-performing racial/ethnicity groups, use the campus’s *current* two lowest-performing groups and use the *district’s* average as prior year baseline.

Rationale: 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. This change responds to the public feedback requesting the opportunity to earn points that are currently not available.

More information on Closing the Gaps 0-4 scoring proposals are available in the TAAG May 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

(Update): For new Dropout Recovery School (DRS) campuses under AEA that do not have prior year data, the state average of DRS’ campuses’ prior-year data will be used as proxy baseline data. The agency is currently reviewing whether this approach for a new DRS campus is allowable under ESSA.

Rationale: The change to the two lowest-performing groups methodology for new campuses meets this statutory requirement. 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).

More information on Closing the Gaps 0-4 scoring proposals specific to new AEA campuses are available in the TAAG January 2026 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

(Proposed Change): Expected growth to interim target (for 2 points) is expanded to provide a limited “Safe Harbor” to still earn 2 points if campus has demonstrated progress to current target. The actual growth from prior year must be greater than or equal to the expected growth needed to meet the Next Interim Target OR the actual growth from 2027 must be greater than or equal to the expected growth needed to reach the Current Target.

(Update): The agency is currently reviewing whether this approach remains in line with the “state measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals” required under ESSA to use Closing the Gaps, Part A for federal identifications for improvement.

Rationale: Under the 0–4 point scoring, no amount of decline has historically been tolerated. This change responds to the public feedback requesting the opportunity to provide for an “allowable” or “tolerable” dip.

(Update): If the Safe Harbor provision is not approved under ESSA and cannot be applied to the federal identification for school improvement process, the existing 0-4 scoring methodology for identifying schools requiring improvement, as delineated in the ESSA plan, will remain in effect and each school will receive a Federal Closing the Gaps report, outlining scoring for federal identification processes. A Closing the Gaps report, including modified 2-point scoring with the Safe Harbor provision, is proposed to be used in accountability calculations.

More information on Closing the Gaps 0-4 scoring proposals are available in the TAAG May 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage. More information on the specific methodology to calculate a Federal Closing the Gaps report is available in the TAAG February 2026 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

Small Numbers Analysis Methodology

Minimum size criteria are applied across all accountability domains to ensure stability, validity, and fairness of results when evaluating student group performance. When minimum size requirements are not met, 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). Data are aggregated across three years to determine whether sufficient data exist to evaluate performance and award points in Closing the Gaps. **The 2028 Methodology includes one change specific to small numbers analysis.**

(Update): A campus can earn 1 or 2 points for the Graduation Rate and School Quality components for the all students group in the Closing the Gaps, Part A domain using the results of small numbers analysis as baseline data. If the campus did not meet minimum size in the prior year and small numbers analysis was applied, the small numbers analysis results will serve as the campus’s prior-year data for purposes of earning 1 or 2 points.

Rationale: In the current methodology, a campus that does not meet minimum size in the prior year 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. This change responds to stakeholder feedback, and is intended to ensure fairness for campuses evaluated using small numbers analysis by allowing prior-year calculations based on small numbers analysis to be used in performance rating calculations.

More information on the inclusion of the results of prior year small numbers analysis as baseline data are available in in the TAAG January 2026 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

(Proposed Change): Closing the Gaps, Part B: Special Populations Program Outcomes

Closing the Gaps for Districts, Part B: Special Populations Program Outcomes

Integration of Results Driven Accountability (RDA) into A-F Consideration

In addition to the Closing the Gaps changes detailed above, there will be an additional subdomain within Closing the Gaps for districts—Closing the Gaps, Part B: Student Populations Program Outcomes. This subdomain will report selected indicators and data previously reported in Results Driven Accountability (RDA). RDA is one part of the agency’s annual evaluation of a district’s performance and program effectiveness focusing on special populations. The addition of this subdomain will eliminate the separate RDA reporting system. RDA is currently calculated solely at the district level (and not for campuses). As such, this proposed Part B applies only to district ratings (and not campus ratings), and is not used to identify schools for improvement under ESSA. Closing the Gaps, Part A is entirely unchanged with this addition of Part B.

Note: Significant Disproportionality (SD) indicators from the RDA system are not integrated, but will be reported alongside A-F. As such, SD results do not impact A-F Ratings, but remain important to meet federal requirements.

Additionally, annual federally required determination levels (DLs) used for monitoring interventions of SPED programs continue to utilize other areas of data in addition to data integrated into A-F. Determinations for SPED will continue to use the four federally required elements (FREs). Interventions are based on DL status to meet federal requirements. Performance Levels (PLs) will no longer be calculated for the integrated measures, and DL methodology will be updated to use results based on A-F cut points.

Special Populations Program Groups

The program area groups evaluated within Closing the Gaps, Part B reflect a merging into A-F those groups previously measured in RDA that provide a more holistic view of special populations program performance. A minimum size of 10 is proposed.

Each group is evaluated for specific assessments and measures outlined in the next section.

- Bilingual Education (Bil), English as a Second Language (ESL), Alternative Methods (AM), and/or Emergent Bilinguals (EBs) not-served - *measured for Student Success*
- EB Years after Reclassification (monitored + former) - *measured for Student Success*
- Ever Emergent Bilingual (ever in K-12) - *measured for Graduation*

- Current Emergent Bilingual (7-12) - *measured for Dropout*
- Current Special Education (SPED) - *measured for Student Success*
- SPED Year after Exit (one-year) - *measured for Student Success*
- Ever SPED (ever in 9-12) - *measured for Graduation*
- Current SPED (7-12) - *measured for Dropout*

- Current Foster Care - *measured for Student Success*
- Ever Foster Care (ever in 9-12) - *measured for Graduation*
- Current Foster Care (7-12) - *measured for Dropout*

- Current Homeless - *measured for Student Success*
- Ever Homeless (ever in 9-12) - *measured for Graduation*
- Current Homeless (7-12) - *measured for Dropout*

The Military Connected program area group, while previously included in RDA reporting, will not be integrated into A-F. Rationale: The absence of a measurable outcomes gap between Military Connected students and the overall student population indicates targeted interventions under this domain are not currently warranted for this group.

Assessments and Measures Evaluated

The integration of components previously measured in RDA into Closing the Gaps, Part B foster transparency by ensuring stakeholders understand how performance across diverse student groups impact overall ratings, making the accountability framework more thorough, understandable, and actionable for educators, families, and communities.

- **(Renamed) Special Populations Student Success:** SST and EOC assessment measures are calculated based on students' level of performance at Approaches or above, Meets or above, and Masters. The methodology is similar to the Student Success Student Achievement Domain Score in Closing the Gaps, Part A.
 - Program groups are evaluated based on the combined performance on all subjects, Reading/Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies
 - Program area students tested on grade 3-8 SST are measured separately from the students tested on EOCs, where possible. (Program areas of Foster and Homeless are proposed to be in a combined 3-12 measure, due to district group sizes.)
 - The calculation is modified to credit districts for Meets and Masters performance in these program areas. $(\% \text{ Approaches or above}) + 1.1 * (\% \text{ Meets or above}) + 1.2 * (\% \text{ Masters})$

- **(Renamed) English Language Proficiency for Students in U.S. Schools Multiple Years:** The percent of grade 5-12 emergent bilingual (EB) students in U.S. schools for 5 or more years who received a TELPAS composite rating of Beginning or Intermediate.
 - The emergent bilingual student group's English language proficiency (ELP) in Part B provides a new district program effectiveness lens within A-F on progress to ELP.

- **Graduation Rate:** The graduation rate measures are the percent of students ever in the specified program group who graduated with a high school diploma in six years.
 - Each student group has either K-12 or 9-12 as definition of “ever”.
- **Dropout Rate:** The dropout measures the percent of students in the specified program group in Grades 7-12 who dropped out in the school year

More information on RDA/A-F integration proposals of the RDA/A-F Integration Taskforce are available in the TAAG June 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

(Update): Graded Points Methodology

Each evaluated indicator is proposed to be scored on a scale from 0 to 4 points, based on program group performance relative to newly established interim and long-term targets. The safe harbor provision used in Closing the Gaps, Part A is not applicable to Closing the Gaps, Part B.

Points	Definition
4	Met long-term target (2037-38 target)
3	Met current interim target (target through 2031-32)
2	Did not meet current interim target but showed expected growth toward next interim target (target through 2036-37)
1	Did not meet interim target but showed minimal growth
0	Did not meet interim target and did not show minimal growth

(Update): Closing the Gaps, Part B: Program Area Components

A district can be evaluated on three Program Area Components: Bilingual Education, Special Education, and Foster and/or Homeless. The Foster Care and Homeless program areas and their corresponding indicators are grouped into one single component. Each program area component combines the indicators for specific student groups with the academic or postsecondary measures used to evaluate them. All evaluated indicators are aggregated to produce three Program Area Component scores. Program Area Component scores are weighted equally to determine a Closing the Gaps, Part B Domain Scaled Score.

Rationale: The incorporation of the RDA system into accountability will align federal reporting requirements, reduce duplication of data reporting, and create consistent focus across the state on special population performance improvements. Leveraging consistent 0-4 scoring methodology and a consistent target setting process across both subdomains of Closing the Gaps increases transparency and usability of the system. Combining Foster Care and Homeless into one Program Area Component Score more accurately reflects student population sizes and the number of indicators assessed.

Additional information on target setting, 0-4 scoring, component and domain 3b calculations can be found in the TAAG December 2025 and TAAG February 2026 Presentations on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

Overall Rating Methodology for Districts

District domain ratings for **Student Achievement, School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth, School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance**, and **Closing the Gaps, Part A: Student Group Performance** are calculated using a proportionality method. The campus weight determines how much a campus grade proportionally impacts the district rating. This methodology considers campus enrollment counts for grades 3–12, excludes Not Rated and paired campuses, is applied to each domain, and includes campuses evaluated under alternative education accountability. The district proportionality methodology is unchanged.

(Update): The **Closing the Gaps, Part B: Special Populations Program Outcomes** scaled score is calculated using the district accountability subset, which is comprised of any student enrolled in the district, as reported in the Fall PEIMS Submission. The district’s Closing the Gaps, Part A scaled score is combined with the district’s Closing the Gaps, Part B scaled score, with Part A weighted at 70% of the Domain 3 rating, and Part B weighted at 30% of Domain 3.

Rationale: Closing the Gaps, Part B, measures a district accountability subset, rather than students served by special programs as individual campuses. The weight of Domain 3, Part B at 30% of Domain 3 meets the intent of the integration of RDA and A-F by creating consistent focus on and accountability for outcomes for special populations.

Additional information on district overall weighting methodology with Domain 3b can be found in the TAAG December 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

Scores Needed to Achieve Standards on Indicators (Cut Scores)

Scaling, Cut Scores, Student Group Targets Update Using New Baselines Consideration

To the extent possible, cut scores remain static between refreshes, so that as campuses improve statewide, campus ratings also improve. This allows for easier year-over-year performance comparisons and ensures it remains mathematically possible for all campuses to achieve an A, even in the first year of the refresh.

(Update): To ensure consistency of performance standards, CCMR cut scores will need to be updated for 2031 Accountability with the transition to differential weighting. The agency will conduct analyses to establish roughly comparable standards for issuing performance ratings, and will adopt cut scores that include CCMR differential weighting in the 2030 accountability system manual, published in July 2029, two years before they become effective for 2031 Accountability.

(Update): HB 8 provides specific guidance on how cut scores are set. “The commissioner shall increase the rigor by which the commissioner determines overall performance ratings under Section 39.054(a) to continuously improve student performance to, not later than the 15th year after the commissioner modifies performance standards under Subsection (f-1), achieve the goals of: 1)

eliminating achievement gaps based on race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status; and (2) ensuring the state ranks nationally in the top five states in preparing students for postsecondary success and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress.” Additional details on the cut score setting methodology and proposed cut scores will be made available at a later date.

(Update): Proposed long-term and interim targets for Closing the Gaps, Part B: Special Populations Program Outcomes have been established leveraging the same ESSA methodology used in Closing the Gaps, Part A for campuses. Additional details on the cut score setting methodology and proposed cut scores will be made available at a later date.

Distinction Designations

Districts and campuses that demonstrate acceptable accountability ratings (A, B, or C) are eligible to earn distinction designations. Distinction designations are awarded for achievement in several areas and are based on performance relative to a group of campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics (%Economically disadvantaged, Mobility rate, %Emergent bilingual, %Special education, %Enrolled in an Early College High School program).

Revisit Distinction Designations Consideration

The 2028 system methodology includes three proposed changes for Distinction Designations.

(Proposed Change): For the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction, add 4 indicators focused on student success after graduation. These indicators will measure a single cohort for: College Enrollment within 6 years after HS, Continued College Enrollment 2 years after HS, 2-year College Degree Attainment within 6 years, 4-year College Degree Attainment within 6 years.

To earn a Postsecondary Readiness Distinction, a High School or K-12 campus must be in the Top 25% of their comparison group for 33% of indicators. The requirement is unchanged, but the count is now 4 of 12 indicators, updated from 3 of 8 indicators. The district requirement is also unchanged; at least 55% of all campuses’ postsecondary indicators are in top 25% of their comparison group.

Rationale: The 4 proposed postsecondary indicators respond to public feedback to give new options for the Postsecondary Distinction to highlight schools that are outperforming expectations when it comes to student success after graduation, to offer a wider range of information about schools.

(Proposed Change): For the Academic Achievement Distinctions by subject area, remove Attendance Rate. The 2028 refresh methodology removes attendance rate as an indicator in the Academic Achievement Distinction, to maintain alignment to outcomes driven accountability system.

Rationale: Public feedback named a concern that the Attendance Rate indicator is not an “academic” indicator and may incentivize student attendance despite illness or other circumstances.

(Proposed Change): Add campuses measured under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA)/Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS) as a comparison group to be evaluated for the Postsecondary Readiness Indicators. The 2028 refresh methodology creates AEA/DRS

comparison groups for the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation only.

To earn a Postsecondary Readiness Distinction, an AEA High School must be in the Top 25% of their comparison group for 33% of indicators (not applicable to Middle School or K-12 campuses). The comparison group methodology for AEA/DRSs is the same as non-AEA/DRS; a 40-campus comparison group based on the same eight categories.

Rationale: Recognizing DRSs is responsive to feedback as a way for these schools to demonstrate excellence. Maintaining 40-campus groups maintains simple alignment with the non-AEA methodology in place. An analysis showed an acceptable level of similarity within the groups, in line with the non-AEA High School 40-campus groups currently used.

More information on Distinction Designation proposals are available in the TAAG May 2025 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

(Update): Add OnRamps course completion to the Advanced/Dual Credit for Academic Achievement Indicators. The 2028 refresh methodology adds OnRamps to the list of courses considered in Advanced/Dual Credit indicators, to recognize OnRamps as a dual credit course offering.

Rationale: Public feedback named a concern that while OnRamps is a dual credit pathway, OnRamps completion was not considered in the Advanced/Dual Credit courses to fulfill the indicator for Academic Achievement Distinction Designations.

More information on OnRamps Distinction Designation proposal is available in the TAAG February 2026 Presentation on the [Accountability System Development](#) webpage.

Other System Information in the Academic Accountability Rating System Manual

Accountability Rating Labels for Districts and Campuses

Districts, open-enrollment charter schools, and campuses, including alternative education campuses (AECs), with students enrolled in the accountability year are assigned an overall state accountability rating and as well as a rating for each domain. The rating labels for districts and campuses are either a letter grade (A, B, C, D, or F), Data Under Review, or Not Rated for the reason(s) specified. The calculation of rating labels is unchanged.

Accountability Appeals

The appeals process and timeline are provided in 19 TAC §97.1002. The rule specifies the process and timeline by which school districts and open-enrollment charter schools can challenge an agency decision relating to an academic rating that affects the district or school, including a determination of consecutive school years of unacceptable performance ratings. The appeals process is unchanged.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Identification

All campuses identified on the final list of AEA campuses are either residential treatment facilities or dropout recovery schools. The methodology for identifying AEA campuses is unchanged.

Public Education Grant (PEG) Identification

Campuses that receive an overall F rating are placed on the PEG List for the following school year. The criteria remain unchanged.

Local Accountability Systems

The Local Accountability System (LAS) allows districts and open-enrollment charter schools to develop local accountability system plans for their campuses. A district's local accountability plan provides stakeholders with detailed information about school performance and progress over time.

(Update): 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.

Adult Education High School Charter Program

(Update): Pursuant to TEC, §12.262, the commissioner annually evaluates the performance of adult education program charter high schools using standards established to measure the performance of an adult education charter program. These campuses are ‘Not Rated’.

Campus Identification Numbers

A campus represents the organization of students and teachers, not a physical facility. TEA assigns county-district-campus (CDC) numbers to instructional campuses as defined in the Texas Education Data Standards. Within any given year, districts or charter schools may need to update one or more CDC numbers due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grades or populations served by an existing school.

(Update): TAC §97.1066 requires that school districts and charter schools request to make campus numbers obsolete by May 31 to ensure time for processing before TSDS PEIMS deadlines in late September for the class roster and charter waitlist collections. Previously, the deadline was September 1.

(Update): When proposing to close a campus, districts must evaluate where students are being reassigned, including the performance history of campuses receiving students from the closed campus, and the receiving campus may be required to assume the rating history of the closed campus under certain circumstances. Ratings history may be linked across campus numbers to determine consecutive years of unacceptable performance. In these cases, the receiving CDC number can assume the prior campus's rating history, including consecutive years of *D*, *F*, *Improvement Required*, *Academically Unacceptable*, or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* ratings, for the purposes of accountability determinations and continued intervention requirements.

Rationale: Anticipated amendments to Chapter 97, Subchapter EE, §97.1066 will revise the deadline for submission of school closure requests and the receiving campus may be required to assume the closed campus's accountability rating history.

Texas Performance Reporting System

As the most comprehensive reporting system published by TEA, the Texas Performance Reporting System (TPRS) provides additional performance reports, results, and indicators for student groups not previously reported on state accountability data tables, the Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR), or the School Report Card. TPRS is updated on a rolling basis as more current data become available.

Additional 'Other' Reported Information Consideration

Updates on this consideration will be communicated after 2028 accountability manual publication. 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.

(Update): HB 8 outlines the reporting of local indicators of student engagement and workforce development on TXschools.gov, reinforcing the addition of 'other' information for public reporting.

Rationale: The addition of updated or new reporting information to TXschools.gov or TPRS addresses public feedback about sharing a broader set of information that demonstrate school success beyond the current academic indicators of the A-F system.