

TAAG Meeting Minutes

Date: December 15, 2025

Time: 9:00 AM - 11:30 AM

2025 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Minutes

Meeting Minutes for December 15, 2025

The primary objective of the December 2025 TAAG meeting was to share updated proposals for the 2028 A-F Refresh, based on stakeholder feedback and to finalize the proposal for the integration of Results Driven Accountability into the A-F framework.

Topic 1 – Welcome, Introduction, and Q&A session

Summary: An optional pre-reading was shared with members before the meeting, which included an Accountability Overview, a House Bill 8 (HB8) Accountability Overview, and information on the 2027 Accountability Rating System Manual. Members had an opportunity to ask questions.

Discussion: Members had questions about the HB8 required removal of English II and its impact on Domain 2A. Members also had questions about the HB8 study on a through-year growth assessment. Members also inquired how Domain 2 will be calculated from the through-year assessments and how it will affect the Teacher Incentive Allotment. Members also asked questions about 2025 appeals and the appeals process and the Local Accountability System Grant introduced in HB8.

TEA Response: As additional information and modeling on the impact of English II become available, they will be shared with TAAG.

Through-year growth measures will not be used in the 2028 Refresh. In alignment with HB8, an initial study will be completed by 2030 and presented to the legislature regarding possibilities of through-year growth studies. As additional information becomes available in the coming years, it will be shared with TAAG.

There were more appeals in 2025 than a typical year, and nearly all were related to the PEIMS Working Submissions allowed for districts to correct their prior year data errors related to CCMR accountability results. The details of the PEIMS working submission can be found in the July 17, 2025 To the Administrator Addressed correspondence, [PEIMS Working Submission for 2025 A-F Accountability Ratings](#), and resulted in a higher than typical number of appeals being submitted and granted, as PEIMS errors are typically not favorable appeals. Moving forward, per HB8, prior-year PEIMS errors will be corrected prior to the preliminary ratings are released and will not be a part of appeals. PEIMS data error corrections will return to being considered unfavorably for appeals decisions.

TEA affirmed there will be a grant available for LEAs interested in Local Accountability Systems, additional information is forthcoming.

Topic 2 – Applying New Campus Domain 3 Scoring to All Schools

Summary: TEA began by providing an overview of how Domain 3 is scored and the proposal in the preliminary framework for new campuses, including the creation of prior year proxy data. TEA also shared public feedback received as part of the release of the preliminary framework, including that the methodology proposed for new campuses in the preliminary framework could be considered for all campuses. A consideration to evaluate all campuses, both new and existing, based on the **current** year's two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups, rather than relying solely on **prior**-year data was presented for discussion. TAAG members were invited to provide feedback on the consideration to use the current year's two lowest performing groups in Domain 3 scoring for campuses.

Discussion: A TAAG member shared their perspective from when Domain 3 prior-year's two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups methodology was first developed during the 2023 Refresh. They shared that they see the purpose of Domain 3 is to take a long-term approach to improve previously underperforming groups' outcomes. If the consideration presented were implemented, the TAAG member felt it would be challenging to plan support to improve long-term outcomes for the two lowest-performing groups before it's too late. A member asked when districts would know the racial/ethnic groups identified for accountability. One member raised concern that each year, the two lowest groups may keep changing and that this new approach may create more instability than when viewed over a two-year period. A member also wondered how much volatility is typically seen in the two lowest-performing groups. A member also raised the concern that there would not be enough time to plan to better serve the two lowest-performing groups. A member inquired how many students were not meeting minimum size requirements. A concern was also raised that the Domain 3 calculations are complex and challenging to explain to stakeholders. There was discussion about the target tables and Domain 3a targets, and it was asked if the system had considered going back to sharing the same cut scores for all grade levels.

TEA Response: In the presented consideration, both new and existing campuses would use their own lowest-performing groups from the current year, and they would not know for certain which groups meet minimum size to be evaluated in Domain 3 until assessment results were released. In response to the question regarding changes in groups from year to year, the agency shared that 25% of campuses had a change in "two lowest performing racial/ethnic groups" from year to year (2023 to 2024). Additionally, in 2025 accountability, nearly 1,000 campuses statewide did not meet minimum size requirements in current year for both racial/ethnic groups identified from prior-year performance. Based on TAAG feedback, this consideration will not move forward, and the methodology for identifying the two lowest performing race or ethnicity groups within Domain 3 will be unchanged for existing campuses in the 2028 refresh, and will continue to be based on the two lowest performing groups that met minimum size requirements in the prior accountability year. In response to questions about Domain 3 targets, the agency shared that there are no plans to adjust Domain 3a targets for the 2028 refresh, and long-term targets have been pre-identified through 2037-38.

Topic 3– Integration of RDA System into A-F Academic Accountability System

Summary: TEA provided an overview of the proposed integration of the RDA system into the A-F accountability system. It was communicated that integrating the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system into the A-F Academic Accountability System would create a unified approach for district accountability. This integration has been designed to align federal reporting requirements, reduce duplication in data reporting, and ensure a consistent statewide focus on improving outcomes for special populations.

An overview covered the new "Closing the Gaps, Part B" domain (Domain 3b) that would be added to district ratings. Domain 3b would evaluate the efficacy of four program areas: Emergent Bilingual (EB), Special Education (SPED), Homeless, and Foster Care students. Each program area would be assessed using multiple indicators, such as student achievement: student success, English language proficiency, graduation rates, and dropout rates.

TEA proposed scoring and weighting methodology for both Domains 3a and 3b. The agency proposed the same 0–4-point scoring methodology used in Domain 3a and a target setting methodology for Domain 3b that is the same used with federal target setting methodology. Each program area in Domain 3b would contribute equally to the overall Domain 3b score, ensuring balanced representation of program area groups.

The agency proposed Domain 3b should account for 30% of the overall Domain 3 score for districts, with Domain 3a making up the remaining 70%. If a district does not receive a Domain 3b score, its Domain 3 rating will be based entirely on Domain 3a.

TEA also shared modeling of the proposed weighting. If Domain 3b were added to 2025 ratings at 30% and Domain 3 cut scores were not changed, the overall impact would improve some ratings due to strong program area results while some ratings would decline due to this added focus on program efficacy at the district level.

Discussion: TAAG members requested additional data analysis, including any disproportionality based on the percent of economically disadvantaged students and district type and size. An additional concern regarding targets for AEA/DRS districts was shared. A member raised a question if this proposal for Domain 3b would be capturing kids' multiple times both within Domain 3b and across Domains 3a and 3b. Members new to TAAG asked for additional context on the feedback that has led to this integration and prior decisions that are reflected in the 2028 Preliminary Refresh Framework. Districts have mentioned that they need to file the federal requirements currently fulfilled through RDA and would like a single system so they can have a single strategic plan based on a single set of data.

TEA Response: In future TAAG meetings, we will provide additional proportionality analysis and will be discussing cut scores. In response to the question regarding students being assessed in Domains 3a and 3b, the agency shared feedback from the RDA integration taskforce that reflected the need for all 22 indicators to adequately assess program efficacy.

Topic 4 – Remove D/F Gate- with Implementation of Domain 2a and 2b Average

Summary: TEA provided background on the D/F Gate for members. The current accountability system uses a “D Gate” and an “F Gate” to cap campus ratings at 69 (D) or 59 (F) if a campus receives three Ds or three Fs across the four domains (Domain 1, 2a, 2b, or 3). This mechanism ensures that campuses with unacceptable performance in most domains cannot receive an overall acceptable rating due to the “best-of” calculation method. This methodology is aligned to agency interpretation of Senate Bill 1365 that Ds are included as an unacceptable rating. Stakeholder feedback was shared. The agency communicated that a mechanism must exist to ensure that campuses, where the majority of their ratings are unacceptable, also receive an unacceptable overall rating.

TEA also covered statutory constraints. By law, TEA must retain the “best-of Domain 1 or Domain 2” for 70% of the overall rating. Eliminating this best-of would not be an option.

Two pathways were presented:

- **Path 1:** Maintain the best-of calculation within Domain 2 and keep the D/F Gate.
- **Path 2:** Average Domain 2a and 2b scores for Domain 2 and eliminate the D/F Gate.

TEA also provided an overview of modeling outcomes. Averaging Domain 2a and 2b, rather than using the best-of, results in lower Domain 2 scores statewide.

TEA also shared that when both the D/F Gate were removed, and Domain 2a/2b are averaged, the data showed about 1% of campuses saw a rating increase, while 11% experienced a decline; 37% were unaffected because their “best-of” for 70% was Domain 1.

Discussion: A member emphasized that the intent behind the accountability system is to reward schools for student growth, especially those not yet performing at high levels, and also cautioned that averaging growth and performance measures (Domains 1 and 2) could dilute the focus on true growth and potentially defeat the purpose of the system. A member mentioned that performance metrics should not overshadow growth and that the system should clearly distinguish between the two.

Concerns were also raised about averaging different types of measures (e.g., 2a and 2b). Members noted that this practice can obscure what the accountability ratings actually mean for parents and the public, making it harder to interpret school performance and growth.

A member questioned whether schools that receive higher ratings due to growth (but have low achievement) eventually improve their achievement over time. The member called for data to track the long-term outcomes of these schools and suggested that if growth does not lead to higher achievement, the system may be fundamentally flawed.

A member raised the concern that with the removal of E2 as an EOC, 2a ratings for high schools will be based solely on A1 and E1 growth. For many high schools, A1 is also offered in 8th grade, so high school growth will be based on a very small subset of students relative to the overall campus. Without E2, the TAAG member was concerned that the impact on 2a will be drastic for many high schools.

A member mentioned that averaging different types of growth (i.e., 2a and 2b) seems to dilute the purpose of different types of growth captured in the School Progress domain. Another member noted that we should consider distributions as related to levels of poverty. A member inquired whether a "better of" methodology could be used for Domain IIIA and Domain IIIB.

One member noted they would support averaging but did not want to change the 3-of-4 rule. A member requested to review the data used for modeling.

NAEP Discussion: A member highlighted troubling trends in NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress) results, particularly for economically disadvantaged students. The TAAG member pointed out that while many schools receive high accountability ratings, a significant portion of students are performing below basic levels in reading and math. This discrepancy raises questions about whether state standards and accountability measures are aligned with national benchmarks.

A member noted that NAEP is valid to measure what is designed to do. However, it is not designed to look at schools in Texas in as much detail as the accountability system is. The member continued to state that we need to improve our performance in NAEP, but we have to be careful when comparing two systems designed to do different things.

TEA Response: TEA named that an additional study is currently underway, in alignment to House Bill 8 requirements, to more clearly understand relationships between state assessments and STAAR, as well as setting long term goals to ensure strong NAEP performance by 2040. More information and analysis will be available in future TAAG meetings.

Based on clear TAAG feedback, the 2028 Refresh Framework will not include the elimination of the D/F gates. Additionally, the best of methodology for Domains 2a and 2b will be unchanged.

Topic 5 – Upcoming TAAG Topics and Meeting Closure

Summary: Upcoming TAAG meetings will focus on College Career and Military Readiness, a review of stakeholder feedback on the preliminary framework, and Small Numbers Analysis.

Action Items:

- TAAG Members to review the TAAG minutes and provide feedback.
- Meeting materials and minutes to be publicly posted.
- TAAG membership list to be publicly posted.