

# Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments: FAQs

This document compiles questions submitted by instrument vendors through the Question Submission Form for the Request for Alternative BOY & MOY Assessments (RFABMA). Questions included reflect submissions received by May 15, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. Central Time.

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

For further details about the call, including links to the informational packet and application, visit our [Call for House Bill 8 \(HB 8\) Alternative BOY & MOY Assessment Instruments](#) webpage.

## PSYCHOMETRICS AND ASSESSMENT DESIGN

### STANDARDIZATION AND ASSESSMENT DESIGN

#### **Are lack of psychometrics an automatic disqualifier?**

It is likely a lack of any psychometrics in a product will lead to disqualification unless a vendor can show widely accepted research of approaches that produce valid and reliable results that provide consistent results from administration to administration.

### INDEPENDENT RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS

#### **Regarding "An instrument must possess adequate reliability as demonstrated by independent research."(p9) What is an "adequate" mean and is it required that this be done by a 3rd party?**

Adequate reliability should be demonstrated by the response using best practice research to support the claims. Vendors must demonstrate that the findings are independent. One manner to show independence is to have the work done by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party.

## ADMINISTRATION, SCORING, AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

### INDIVIDUAL ADMINISTRATION

#### **On testing duration reporting: Could you clarify the expected reporting path for student testing duration data at the state level — specifically, whether this is a vendor-side submission to TEA or a district-side submission, and whether any vendor infrastructure or data feeds are required to support it?**

Vendors will need to submit initial timing information with this submission for initial consideration. Additional submissions should be planned from the vendor to TEA for each separate administration to TEA on a yearly basis. More information will be provided if vendors make the preliminary approved vendor list.

# Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments: FAQs

**The webinar of May 12 mentioned that vendors would be required to submit timing data for operational administrations to TEA. The RFABMA does not provide detail on this requirement. Can you please provide further detail on how these data are to be collected (i.e., file format)? What data will be required (i.e., data elements)? What level of aggregation is expected (e.g., student level detail or some level of aggregation and at what aggregation unit)?**

For each assessment, vendors will need to submit the estimated testing time for students at the 85th percentile at each administration window. Refer to Section 2. Assessment Content of the [Request for Alternative BOY & MOY Assessments Response Form](#) for additional details.

**Would TEA please further articulate the requirements for Section 3.2? Do these requirements outline an assessment component \*if\* it contains student-generated writing responses or is this for a stand-alone writing assessment? Is such a response mode required in the RLA assessment? Or is it acceptable that we measure Language Arts skills through other item types?**

Vendors should propose their recommended assessment design for measuring the full RLA construct in a valid and reliable manner.

## RFABMA RESPONSE FORM AND SUBMISSION LOGISTICS

### INSTRUMENT ACCESS AND CONTENT SUBMISSION

**If a vendor has two assessments that are accessed through the same platform, utilize the same administration method, cover the same grade span, have technical analyses included in the same technical report, and are both administered in English, but one is for ELA and one is for math, may the vendor submit both assessments using the same (single) Request for Alternative BOY & MOY Assessments Response Form or should each assessment be submitted separately by content area?**

For the scenario described, the vendor should submit two forms, one for ELA/RLA and one for math.

**In Section 2 of the Request for Alternative BOY & MOY Assessments Response Form, does the list of accommodations offered pertain to the assessment as a whole? Or is the expectation that the item-specific rows apply to item type, scoring mechanism, and accommodations offered?**

The accommodations offered pertain to the assessment as a whole. If there are item-level accommodations, those should be noted as such.

**Can the same products submitted in response to the previous K-3 Early Numeracy and Literacy RFP be submitted for this RFP?**

Yes, the same products can be submitted for this response and the previous K-3 Early Numeracy and Literacy response. However, no responses can be automatically transferred from one to the other.

**Are there alternative data points or correlations that we can provide to meet this request?**

Vendors may submit any data that will help support their response to this call.

# Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments: FAQs

**Is it required to submit a response for Math 3-5 with both English and Spanish? Should the application be combined to cover both languages?**

No grade/subject/language combinations are required. If submitting a Math 3-5 product with both English and Spanish versions but only one set of psychometric data, one submission is acceptable as long as it explains all necessary components.

**Section 2.1 states "a separate RFABMA Response Form is required for each language version of an instrument" yet in response form section 1.2, Math 3-5 is consolidated into a single bilingual entry. If submitting for both English and Spanish in Math 3-5, would TEA prefer one submission or two?**

If submitting a Math 3-5 product with both English and Spanish versions but only one set of psychometric data, one submission is acceptable as long as it explains all necessary components.

**In section 1.2 of the response form, it asks respondents to select all grades served which apply. If submitting for RLA 3-5 and RLA 6-8, can a response form be combined to address RLA 3-8. If so, can the same approach be applied for Math 3-8?**

No, because of the nature of the review and where Spanish language versions are offered, grades 3-5 should be separated from grades 6-8 in all submissions.

**The timing requirement in Section 3.1 has two bullets, one for Grades 3-5 and another for Grades 6-8; however, the Grade 3-5 bullet references Grades 3-4 and the Grades 6-8 bullet references Grades 5-8. Should Grade 5 be completed by 85 percent of applicable students in 60 minutes, or in 75 minutes?**

Grade 5 is 75 minutes.

## ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE FORMATS

**Section 3.6 asks for "Provide documentation that lists the Lexile and/or Quantile ranges of the assessments submitted for review." Are there alternative data points or correlations that we can provide to meet this request?**

If Lexile and/or Quantiles are not available, the vendor should propose a solution for the agency to consider that is researched based and that will allow for the same interpretation.

**Section 3.1, Reporting Requirements includes a requirement that "Results of Lexile and Quantile should be reported for each student after each administration as appropriate." Since there is no explicit criteria in the scoring rubric for Lexile or Quantile reporting, would TEA consider applications for assessments that do not include Lexile and Quantile reporting?**

If Lexile and/or Quantiles are not available, the vendor should propose a solution for the agency to consider that is researched based and that will allow for the same interpretation.

**Are there alternative data points or correlations that we can provide to meet this request?**

If Lexile and/or Quantiles are not available, the vendor should propose a solution for the agency to consider that is researched based and that will allow for the same interpretation.

# Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments: FAQs

Section 3.3 asks for “Evidence that performance on the end of year portion of the assessment (minimally) is related to future performance on the Texas STAAR reading assessment.” For submissions of math products, is there a similar requirement for “Evidence that performance on the end of year portion of the assessment (minimally) is related to future performance on the Texas STAAR math assessment.”

Yes, similar evidence is required for math.

## APPLICATION TIMING

**Can we submit development plans that would be finalized before implementation? For example, if there is an additional report that will not be fully user facing by the June 5 due date, can we submit development plans that will show what that report will look like by the August 2027 authorization?**

Future development plans are unlikely to be considered compliance for current requirements.

**Will the results of this procurement or vendor submissions be publicly posted by TEA?**

The preliminary lists of approved vendors are the only results that will be publicly posted by TEA.

## DATA REPORTING

**Can TEA please confirm whether assessment vendors are required to provide any direct state-level reporting to TEA, or will the districts be responsible for providing their BOY and MOY student data to TEA directly?**

Vendors may be required to send data to TEA directly. More information will be made available once the preliminary list of vendors is published.

**Could the State please provide the TSDS data standards and specifications?**

Refer to the 2026-2027 Texas Education Data Standards via TWEDS and ECDS Assessment Specifications information on [TSDS website](#).

## SCORING, RUBRICS, AND EVALUATION PROCESS

### EVALUATION STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

**HB 8 provides for the provisional approval of alternative BOY and MOY assessments (Texas Education Code Section 39.023(q)). Will TEA use this RFABMA to grant provisional approval to instruments that do not fully meet the requirements of the RFABMA?**

The external reviewers will consider all vendor submissions based on the criteria in this call and make recommendations based on what products are most likely to be in full compliance with all requirements by 2029.

# Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments: FAQs

## SCORING RUBRICS AND THRESHOLDS

**Can you please provide clarification on how points will be assigned for the "Growth and Improvement" category? It notes on page 10 that "instruments are rated based on the psychometrics results from valid psychometric approaches..." What would be an example of evidence that would gain the full 3 points?**

The agency does not have any single best answer. Vendors should propose how they can best meet the requirements using research-based best practices.

**On Yes/No evaluation items: We want to make sure we understand how reviewers interpret these responses in context. Is the intent that each Yes/No item is evaluated independently as a hard requirement such that a 'No' determination on any item would disqualify a response from further evaluation? Or does the overall evaluation allow reviewers to weigh responses holistically alongside supporting documentation?**

As long as the entries are completed, no single criterion is an automatic disqualification.

## COMPARABILITY STUDY

**For the purposes of Education Code §39.0226 (Assessment Instrument Study), please confirm TEA's expectations for vendor participation as to: (a) whether all proposed assessment items will be subject to the IHE-led study, or only those advancing beyond an initial TEA review; and (b) what documentation or evidence, if any, vendors will be expected to provide to support TEA's coordination with the institution of higher education (e.g., readability analyses, alignment mappings, or item metadata). Does HB 8, section 39.0226 (a) and (b) apply to the approved alternative BOY/MOY assessments, or only the TEA created BOY/MOY assessments?**

There will be a comparability done as part of the external review process. If vendors have not submitted sufficient documentation to complete the comparability study, the agency will be reaching out for additional details.

## PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

**What is the timeline for TEA in announcing what alternative BOY and MOY assessments will be allowed to meet the HB8 requirements?**

TEA intends to publish the preliminary list of assessments by the end of this summer 2026.

# Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments: FAQs

## TEKS CONTENT ALIGNMENT

### CONTENT

**Regarding "Content validity: For example, alignment of instrument content to grade level TEKS, expert review of alignment, etc. " (p9) - Is it required that we submit an independent 3rd party alignment study or can it be an internal study?**

This study should be completed by an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party unless the vendor has a different approach that it would like to submit for consideration.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### ELIGIBILITY

**Grades 6-8 will be available for the 26-27 school year and is currently in a research year. Can we still submit grades 6-8 for consideration?**

This answer depends on the completeness of the requirements and data that need to be submitted and met in this call.

### OTHER

**How many teachers in each grade will require training on the chosen program?**

Training of teachers will depend upon district adoption of the vendor's product. Trainings will be necessary.

**What is the district's preferred method of professional development delivery: onsite, virtual, or asynchronous?**

Vendor should propose what will work best for district needs and is most cost effective.

**Will the district accept proposals that address a subset of grades K-12?**

Yes, vendors can propose whatever subsets they currently test within the bounds of the entry fields set up for the responses.

**On post-approval compliance: For vendors approved under this framework, what does TEA envision for ongoing compliance monitoring? Are there specific artifacts, audits, or reporting cycles vendors should be prepared to support?**

Yes. Once a preliminary list of vendors is published, the agency will establish the data and frequency of reporting required.