

2026 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Minutes

Meeting Minutes for January 12, 2026

Date: January 12, 2026

Time: 9:00 AM - 11:30 AM

Follow-up: December 2025 TAAG Meeting

Summary: TEA staff provided follow-up information from the December 2025 TAAG meeting. Based on December 2025 TAAG feedback, the D/F gate will not be eliminated, and there are no changes moving forward to the methodology of identifying prior year's two lowest performing groups for existing campuses. Regarding the integration of Results Driven Accountability into A-F, there was agreement on target setting methodology and targets for Domain 3b, as well as the proposal to weight Domain 3b as 30% of Domain 3 for district ratings. TEA staff presented follow-up modeling requested by TAAG.

Discussion: Members further requested changes within a rating. Members also asked to see the breakdown by percent of enrolled students who are EB or SPED. A member asked whether there will be components that are report-only but not included in the scoring of Domain 3b.

TEA Response:

In the December TAAG meeting, data had been shared demonstrating the number of overall scaled score points districts could see as a result of Domain 3b, and that data was reshared in response to the TAAG member's request. TEA staff clarified that in Domain 3b, additional federally required elements (e.g., significant disproportionality) will be reported and factor only into determination levels but not impact A-F ratings. TEA will provide data illustrating the impact of Domain 3b based on the percentage of enrollment that is identified as emergent bilingual or special education.

Proposal: Revise Domain 3 Methodology for Small Numbers Analysis

Summary: TEA staff introduced a proposal to revise the Domain 3 methodology for small numbers analysis, based on stakeholder feedback. TEA staff explained that a minimum size requirement of 10 students applies across domains and measures. TEA staff also described the use of small numbers analysis (SNA) for campuses that do not meet the minimum size requirement, which within Domain 3, is only applied for College Career and Military Readiness (CCMR) and graduation rate calculations.

Stakeholder concerns that the results of SNA are not currently used as prior year data in Domain 3 were shared. Schools that were rated in the prior year using SNA are not able to

earn 1 or 2 points in the 0-4 scoring. TEA presented a proposal to use prior year SNA results as prior year data in current year Domain 3 CCMR and graduation. TEA staff presented data showing that the proposed change would allow campuses previously limited to 0, 3, or 4 points to earn 1 or 2 points

Discussion: A member asked how this proposal would impact campuses opening with a phased-in model. A member also noted that this would not entail a new calculation and affirmed its practicality, as the data already exists from the prior year. Members confirmed that the proposal applies where SNA was used and does not alter methodology for campuses that meet the minimum size requirement. Members' feedback supported the use of prior year data generated using SNA for CCMR and graduation rate within Domain 3 scoring.

TEA Response: TEA responded that this proposal would not impact those that did not receive CCMR or graduation rate Domain 3 ratings in the prior year. The Small Number Analysis would only be applied to graduation and CCMR, as is current practice. TEA staff confirmed that this would only apply if the campus had the data available from small numbers analysis in the prior year.

Proposal: Revision to Preliminary Framework for New DRS Campuses

Summary: TEA staff introduced a proposal to revise the preliminary framework for new Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS), based on stakeholder feedback. TEA staff reviewed special provisions in the accountability system for Alternative Education Campuses (AECs), and criteria for schools that are evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA). As a recall from previous meetings, TEA staff summarized stakeholder concerns regarding Domain 3 scoring for new campuses, particularly the lack of opportunity to earn 1 or 2 points without prior year data, and reviewed the preliminary framework's response: changing the source of lowest-performing groups and creating proxy prior year data using district data.

Based on stakeholder feedback from the preliminary framework, TEA staff presented an additional proposal to use the state average of DRS campuses' prior year data as proxy data for new DRS/AEC campuses, pending confirmation of compliance with Every School Succeeds Act (ESSA). Data shared demonstrated large differences between state averages and AEC state averages, confirming that a district or state average may not meet the HOUSE BILL8 requirement of appropriate alternate data.

Discussion:

A member asked whether this proposal is being made because Alternate Education Accountability (AEA) campuses would not be able to earn points in their calculations using district data. Another member asked if there is concern that the bar would be set too low. Members also inquired how many new AEA campuses were added each year. A member asked for clarification regarding the calculation of the Alternative Education Campus Dropout Recovery School state average being proposed.

A member noted that Dropout Recovery campuses, by nature, have special considerations when it comes to both the number of retesters and student enrollment, which frequently changes. The member shared an opinion that using a similar accountability system to that of traditional campuses is an unfair way to evaluate their effectiveness. Members' feedback supported leveraging Alternate Education Campuses (AEC) state averages as prior year data for new Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS) campuses, pending US Department of Education approval.

TEA Response:

TEA staff noted that a new AEA campus could potentially earn points using district or state data, but the student populations AECs are designed to serve could make this challenging. Since the students served in an AEA are different from those served in the district, comparing the district average to the highest at-risk students may not be an appropriate method of analysis.

TEA staff clarified that this proposal would only apply to campuses in their first year of operation. For future year calculations, an AEC would need to show growth from their own prior year data, in alignment with other Domain 3 calculations. TEA reiterated that federal approval is needed to include this proposal in the 2028 A-F Refresh.

Military Readiness Indicator: ASVAB and JROTC

Summary: TEA staff introduced a new requirement from House Bill 8 to include military readiness in CCMR indicators. TEA staff outlined House Bill 8 requirements for CCMR, adding the new military readiness indicator that is met with a minimum Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) score combined with Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) completion. TEA staff explained that JROTC is now recognized as a Career and Technical Education (CTE) program of study.

TEA explained that the Armed Forces Qualifying Test (AFQT) is a composite score derived from four ASVAB tests and is the score the military uses to determine enlistment eligibility. TEA staff proposed a minimum passing AFQT score of 31 for CCMR credit. TEA staff shared

that districts will be responsible for collecting the AFQT score reports and reporting scores via PEIMS.

Discussion:

Members asked if a student needed to have completed a JROTC program to earn CCMR credit through Military Readiness. Members also inquired whether there are any military professions a student could pursue with an ASVAB score of 30 or below. A member asked if the intention is to update the minimum AFQT score every 5 years with the next refresh. Members' feedback supported the minimum score of 31 proposed for a new military readiness indicator for CCMR through completing the CTE JROTC Program of Study.

TEA Response:

The TEA staff clarified that this would be an additional pathway option available. Students could pursue either actual military enlistment OR completion of JROTC, along with achieving a score of 31 or higher on the AFQT, in order to achieve CCMR. TEA staff also shared that students must (currently) achieve a score of 31 or above to be accepted into any military branch. Additionally, the TEA staff indicated that cut scores will be reevaluated with each refresh.

Consideration: Differential Weighting of CCMR Indicators

Summary: TEA staff introduced the topic of differential weighting of CCMR indicators. TEA staff shared stakeholder feedback regarding the varying reliability of CCMR indicators as predictors of postsecondary success. TEA staff summarized the first draft of a CCMR differential weighting proposal, shared with TAAG in April 2025, including feedback received. TEA staff described the preliminary framework's 5% cap on Tier 3 IBCs. TEA staff explained that House Bill 8 requires the agency to study the correlation between CCMR indicators and postsecondary success and assign values accordingly. TEA shared that the preliminary framework proposal meets House Bill 8 requirements, as it places differential value on IBCs through the 5% cap on Tier 3 IBCs.

In accordance with House Bill 8, TEA staff presented a proposal for differential weighting of CCMR indicators, seeking TAAG feedback on the methodology and approach for 2028. TEA staff summarized internal and external research studies demonstrating the correlation between CCMR indicators and postsecondary outcomes. TEA staff presented data showing higher numbers of college credits and advanced coursework are generally associated with better post-secondary outcomes; however, within these results are students who are and are not meeting Texas Success Initiative (TSI) standards. Compared to students who did not meet TSI, students who met TSI while also completing pathways to earning college credit in high school demonstrated the strongest correlation with postsecondary success.

on college-readiness indicators. TEA staff explained that the proposed differential weighting has an anchor of meeting TSI criteria, specifically with ACT, SAT, and TSIA test scores. TEA staff compared the value of various college readiness indicators, referencing both internal and external studies. TEA staff compared the value of career readiness indicators, including wage outcomes and credential attainment. TEA staff explained that, due to limited data, recommendations for the weighting of the military readiness indicator are based on national trends.

TEA staff requested TAAG feedback on whether college preparatory courses should be included in the Meets category for CCMR, if students also earn potential college credit in math or reading while in high school. TEA staff provided detailed data on the comparative value of these additional college prep indicators and noted that data are limited by small sample sizes for these additional indicators.

TEA staff additionally presented two options for calculating CCMR ratings based on the proposed differential weighting.

Discussion:

A member noted concern that workforce-ready IEP students could only achieve approaches, and there was no special education specific indicator in Masters. The member wanted to ensure that we are not unintentionally or disproportionately impacting campuses with large numbers of special education students. Members suggested defining a Masters pathway for SPED students.

A member raised a concern that within the categories, indicators were not on par in rigor, providing an example of AP courses and college prep courses in Approaches. Members also raised concerns about aligning to community college reforms (e.g., 15 dual credit hours); members encouraged more explicit incentives for advanced sequences and combinations. Members inquired about why the decision was made to move away from within-indicator weighting of advanced courses by credit quantity and subject.

One recommendation was to move advanced coursework (AP/IB/Dual Credit/OnRamps) into Meets, and raise rigor in Masters, potentially considering credit hour thresholds and core subject weighting (ELA/Math/Science). One member also recommended a phase-in such that higher Masters criteria apply to cohorts with sufficient runway to respect scheduling and program buildout.

TEA Response:

Feedback was received and will be taken into consideration. Additional correlation studies will be conducted for special education indicators and inclusion of potential for earning

college credit while in high school in the meets category. House Bill 8 charges TEA to present where the data places items in each category, and the agency aimed conversation with members about the data findings and other considerations, such as those raised in this discussion.

TEA staff shared that the initial analysis considered credit hour thresholds and core subject weighting; however, internal research showed that among students taking AP courses, earning one AP exam correlates most strongly with both GPA and college persistence, when that student also met TSI, versus those who did not meet TSI. Staff also shared previously received stakeholder feedback that LEAs were concerned with the inflexibility of initial pathways that required 15 dual credits, 15 On Ramps courses, or 5 AP/IB exams, given the unique systems and staffing required for so many courses. TEA staff noted that the feedback received indicated that fully committing to one of those for smaller districts would be difficult, and that stakeholders supported the categories being simplified.

TAAG members reflected that the proposal shared in January 2026 is stronger than the initial proposals shared, in terms of the strength of correlation of indicators to postsecondary outcomes and simplicity.

Members supported scoring differential weighting of CCMR indicators using the Domain 1 STAAR scoring model. 1 point is awarded for approaches, 2 points for meets, and 3 points for masters, with the average representing the raw score.

TAAG was asked to consider whether the proposal is strong enough to move forward with 2028 implementation, and feedback largely suggested that additional research is needed and that the proposal is not ready for 2028 implementation.

Closing and Next Steps

Summary: TEA staff outlined the next steps, including the distribution of meeting minutes and the final slide deck for review. TEA staff shared information about the upcoming TAAG meeting and the topics to be discussed. Topics include NAEP alignment and cut score proposals for 2028.