



# Request for Alternative BOY & MOY Assessments (RFABMA)

Issued 5/8/2026

# Contents

<b>Change Log .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 1. Purpose, Background, Scope of Work, and Timeline.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Purpose .....	4
1.2 Background Information and Scope of Work .....	5
1.3 Timeline .....	8
<b>Section 2. Submission of Applications .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Application Submissions .....	7
2.2 Application Support and Submission of Questions .....	7
<b>Section 3. BOY &amp; MOY Assessment Requirements .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 General Requirements .....	10
3.2 Requirements for Writing Assessments .....	12
<b>Section 4. Scoring Rubric for Instruments.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Alternative BOY & MOY Assessment Instrument Scoring Rubric .....	12
<b>Appendix A – Relevant Statutes and Administrative Rules .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix B – TEKS and Course Enrollment .....</b>	<b>17</b>

# Change Log

A change log is included below to track revisions.

Date	Action	Page(s) Impacted	Summary of Action
5/8/2026	Initial Release	N/A	N/A

# Section 1. Purpose, Background, Scope of Work, and Timeline

## 1.1 Purpose

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is seeking qualified publishers and local educational agencies to submit Beginning of Year (BOY) and Middle of Year (MOY) assessments for review as part of the commissioner's approval process authorized under Texas Education Code (TEC), §39.023. Instruments that are reviewed and ultimately placed on the **Commissioner's List of Approved Alternative Beginning of Year (BOY) and Middle of Year (MOY) Assessments** will be eligible for statewide use beginning in the 2027–28 school year.

Instruments selected through this process may remain on the commissioner's lists for up to two school years, contingent upon continued compliance with statutory and agency requirements. Because statutory and agency requirements may evolve over time, changes to assessment specifications or program criteria may necessitate updates that, if not implemented by a vendor, could result in removal from the approved list. TEA will not pay for the assessments on this list, and school districts and open-enrollment charter schools (local school systems) choosing to utilize approved alternative BOY and MOY assessments must pay for these assessments from local funds.

**Requirements for Continued Inclusion on the Commissioner's List:** All approved vendors must comply with all requirements outlined in the RFABMA, including but not limited to technical support, data sharing and reporting expectations, interoperability with state data systems, and compliance with applicable state statutes, administrative rules, and suitability and quality criteria established by TEA, as applicable. **Failure to maintain compliance may result in removal of the instrument from the Commissioner's List of Approved Assessments.**

For this request, TEA is soliciting submissions in the following instrument category for grades 3-8 and End of Course (EOC) that will be administered following the schedule in the timeline section.

### Beginning of Year (BOY) and Middle of Year (MOY) Assessment Instruments

- Instruments designed to measure student performance in relation to the essential knowledge and skills adopted by the State Board of Education under Section 28.002 for the subject area and grade level being assessed; and to report student academic growth, including by: reporting a student's norm-referenced growth based on a comparison of the student's performance on the assessment instrument to the student's performance on a previously administered assessment instrument, as applicable, to measure growth;

For the TEKS and enrollment counts for each grade band included in this RFABMA, see [Appendix B](#).

## 1.2 Background Information and Scope of Work

### Legislative and Solicitation Authority

The 89th Texas Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 8, which amended the TEC, Chapter 39, to revise §39.023 and create §39.02301. HB 8 updated a statutory framework for assessing: mathematics, annually in grades three through eight; reading language arts, annually in grades three through eight; social studies, in grade eight; science, in grades five and eight; and any other subject and grade required by federal law, including Algebra I, Biology, and English I; and providing for the availability of optional BOY and MOY assessment instruments for those courses or subject areas.

TEC, §39.023(q) requires the agency to approve a list of alternative BOY and MOY assessment instruments that meet the requirements of this subchapter. It also requires that a school district or open-enrollment charter school administer in place of a BOY or MOY assessment instrument adopted or developed under this section.

## Solicitation and Approval Process

The solicitation process for BOY and MOY assessment instruments is designed to ensure that all Texas students have access to high-quality, research-based assessments that measure student performance in relation to the essential knowledge and skills adopted by the State Board of Education under Section 28.002 for the subject area and grade level being assessed. This process emphasizes transparency, rigor, and consistency and includes multiple stages of technical, academic, and implementation review. The process is divided into seven (7) distinct phases:

1. **Application:** Applicants submit required materials to participate in the review process, including basic instrument information, assurances, psychometric evidence, and all documentation necessary to confirm initial eligibility. Submissions must provide complete access to all components of the instrument for review.
2. **Preliminary Review by TEA:** TEA conducts an initial evaluation of submitted instruments to verify completeness, statutory compliance, and readiness for further review.
3. **Instrument Academic Review by Institute of Higher Education:** Instruments that pass the preliminary review advance to an in-depth academic review conducted by a qualified institute of higher education. Reviewers evaluate each instrument for developmental appropriateness, alignment to TEA and statutory expectations and requirements, quality of assessment content, psychometric rigor, and scoring and reporting structures. During this stage, reviewers may request clarification, supplemental documentation, or additional technical materials. Reviewers submit findings and technical recommendations to TEA.
4. **Comparability Study of Instruments by Institute of Higher Education:** An institute of higher education conducts a comparability study to evaluate how instruments perform relative to one another across key technical, content, and reporting dimensions. This phase ensures that instruments on the commissioner's lists are high-quality, appropriately calibrated, meet the comparability requirements set forth by TEC, §39.02301, and are capable of producing consistent, actionable data for Texas educators and families. Study findings and technical recommendations will be sent to TEA.
5. **Preliminary Notification of Selection:** Based on findings from the academic review and comparability study, TEA issues preliminary notifications to applicants indicating whether their instruments are being considered for inclusion on the commissioner's lists.
6. **Final Notification of Selection and Publication of Lists:** Upon verification of statutory and technical requirements, TEA issues final notifications of commissioner approval. Approved instruments are included on the Commissioner's List of Approved BOY and MOY Assessments for the 2027–2029 approval period. These lists are published to support statewide planning, procurement, and implementation beginning in the 2027–28 school year.

### 1.3 Timeline

The timeline below reflects the anticipated sequence of activities for the review and approval process. All dates are tentative and subject to change based on agency needs and operational considerations. TEA will provide updated timelines as necessary throughout the review cycle.

**Disclaimer:** TEA reserves the right to adjust timelines and request additional information from publishers as needed.

Date	Event
May 8, 2026	Request for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments posted and applications available.
May 12, 2026   11:00 a.m. CST	Informational webinar will be held via Zoom to provide an overview of the RFABMA and its requirements. <a href="#">Registration Link</a> .
May 15, 2026   12:00 p.m. CST	Questions due to TEA to be answered in this RFABMA. Questions must be submitted no later than 12:00 p.m. (noon) CST and should be submitted through the <a href="#">Questions for TEA Call for Alternative BOY and MOY Assessments Survey</a>
May 22, 2026	Frequently Asked Questions posted on the <a href="#">Call for Alternative BOY &amp; MOY Assessments webpage</a> .
<b>June 05, 2026   5:00 p.m. CST</b>	<b>Applications due. Applications must be received by the deadline to be considered.</b>
Summer 2026	TEA conducts preliminary reviews of submitted instruments. Instruments undergo academic review and comparability studies by institute of higher education.
September 2026	TEA issues final notifications of commissioner approval and publishes the Commissioner’s List of Approved Instruments for use in the 2027–28 and 2028-2029 School Years
August 2027	Authorization for approved instruments begins.
June 2029	Authorization for approved instruments ends.

***Instruments selected for a commissioner’s list may remain approved for up to two school years, subject to continued compliance with TEA criteria and commissioner discretion.***

## Section 2. Submissions of Applications

### 2.1 Application Submissions

Applicants must complete the RFABMA Response Form, which collects both organizational information and instrument-specific details for each instrument submitted for review. Applicants should carefully review the entire RFABMA before beginning their submission.

A separate RFABMA Response Form is required for each language version of an instrument. Instruments available in both English and Spanish must be submitted independently using one form per language. Each language version must include its own technical evidence and will be evaluated independently against the criteria outlined in this RFABMA.

All application materials, including the RFABMA Response Form and all supporting documentation, must be submitted electronically through the [Qualtrics submission portal](#) provided by TEA. Submissions received through any other method will not be reviewed.

All applications must include submitting organization name, primary contact name, primary contact email address, and primary contact phone number.

The designated primary contact must be available to respond promptly to reviewer inquiries; delayed responses may result in an incomplete review and disqualification.

**The deadline for submission is June 05, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. CST. No late submissions will be accepted.**

### 2.2 Application Support and Submission of Questions

#### Informational Session

TEA will provide application support to prospective applicants through a live informational webinar. This webinar will offer an overview of the Request for Alternative BOY & MOY Assessments (RFABMA), including submission requirements, timelines, and key statutory and technical expectations. Attendance is open to all interested publishers and organizations.

A live informational webinar will be held on:

- Tuesday, May 12, 2026, from 11:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. CST  
Registration: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87575621257>

#### Submission of Questions and Posting of Answers

To ensure equitable access to information, all questions related to this RFABMA must be submitted in writing through the survey available at: <https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/019db1a31616755da27ffbf88ec74a88>

Questions must be submitted no later than **12:00 p.m. (noon) CST on May 15, 2026**. Only questions submitted through the survey link will be addressed. TEA will consolidate all submitted questions and publish written responses as Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the [TEA Call for Alternative Beginning of Year \(BOY\) and Middle of Year \(MOY\)](#) webpage by **May 22, 2026**. All applicants are encouraged to review the posted FAQs regularly throughout the application period.

## Section 3. Instrument Requirements

All instruments submitted under this RFABMA must meet the following foundational requirements, unless otherwise specified, to ensure accessibility, technical rigor, usability for Texas educators, and compliance with state expectations. Requirements are listed alphabetically.

### 3.1 General Requirements for All Instruments

#### Accessibility and Accommodation Requirements

Instruments must comply with all federal accessibility requirements, including:

- Requirements outlined in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- Requirements outlined in Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act
- Instruments must provide appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities consistent with these statutes.

#### Administration Requirements

- All instrument components must be individually administered.
- Submissions must include estimated administration time for each component and each subtest.
  - Administration times must meet the timing requirements listed in this document.
- Instruments should be adaptive to each student to measure and report individual student growth.
- Administration must be allowable and feasible for classroom teachers, meaning required qualifications must align with the training, certification, and coursework typical of Texas public school teachers.
  - Instruments requiring extensive timing rules, basal/ceiling determination, complex scoring judgments, or ratings requiring specialist certification (e.g., diagnostician-level training) are not considered feasible.
- Instruments should allow administration by additional trained school or district personnel (e.g., interventionists, instructional aides) where permitted by instrument guidelines.

#### Data Sharing Requirements

- School systems must have the ability to upload student demographic information and student assessment data using campus-level data in accordance with the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) data standards, specifications, and processes to support integration with the state longitudinal data system.
- Instrument vendors or entities offering commissioner-approved instruments must demonstrate technology capability and adherence to Ed-Fi Application Programming Interface (API) guidelines by securing, or actively working toward securing, the Ed-Fi Assessment Outcomes API Certification for Data Standard v4 or v5. Additional information can be found on the [Available Certifications | Ed-Fi Alliance](#) webpage.
- Instrument vendors must support school system use of Texas Education Exchange tools to populate assessment roster/registration information and school systems must be able to access all relevant assessment results data upon release in their Texas Education Exchange environment via Ed-Fi API.

#### Content Requirements

- All submissions must be standardized assessments, meaning the instrument uses consistent questions, tasks, materials, and scoring protocols across administrations.
- Instruments should measure TEKS for which the assessment was designed.
- All items should be appropriate for students in the grade and contents that is being assessed.
- English and Spanish instruments must align with:
  - English Language Arts and Reading TEKS, and
  - Spanish Language Arts and Reading TEKS, as applicable.

## Cost Requirements

TEA will not pay for the assessments on this list, and school districts and open-enrollment charter schools (local school systems) choosing to utilize approved alternative BOY and MOY assessments must pay for these assessments from local funds.

## Psychometric Requirements

### General

- Complete psychometric data must be submitted for all components of the instrument and for both the English and Spanish versions.
- All normative and technical data for the instrument must be no more than 5 years old (2021+).
- All normative and technical data must be representative of the current version of the instrument. For example, if items, stories, (read or heard), etc. have been modified over the lifespan of the instrument, the required psychometric evidence must be for the current set of items and content, not a previous versions of the instrument.
- If the instrument is norm referenced, the norming sample must be a representative sample in terms of the sample size and the student populations represented. **Norming samples should be representative of the demographics of the student population in Texas at the grade levels assessed.**

### Reliability

- An instrument must possess adequate reliability as demonstrated by independent research.
- Reliability should be reported for **all** tests, subtests, domains, etc. scores generated by the instrument.
- Reliability should be reported for student demographic subgroups – preferably by gender, race/ethnicity, emergent bilingual status, and economic strata.
- Reliability data/information should include internal consistency (e.g., alpha coefficients), alternate form reliability (when applicable), and test-retest reliability. Instruments that depend on subjective ratings or observations must demonstrate inter-rater reliability.
- For instruments developed using item response models, suitable psychometric data from the test development process should be submitted, including, but not limited to, the standard error of measurement, indices of item discrimination and difficulty, and total test information.

### Validity

- An instrument must possess adequate validity as demonstrated by independent research.
- Validity should be reported for **all** tests, subtests, domains, etc. scores generated by the assessment.
- The following types of validity evidence should be provided:
  - Content validity
    - For example, alignment of instrument content to [grade level TEKS](#), expert review of alignment, etc.
  - Convergent and discriminant validity
    - For example, correlations with measures of similar and/or dissimilar constructs at the same point in time, results of confirmatory factor analysis, etc.
  - Predictive validity
    - Evidence of predictive validity should be submitted for measures that claim to predict future status or the likelihood of subsequent success.
    - Predictive validity for the following should be reported (if applicable):
      - Evidence that performance on a beginning of year screener is related to future performance on the middle and end of portions of the instrument.
      - Evidence that performance on the beginning and/or middle of year portions of the instrument is related to end of year performance.

## Classification Accuracy and Consistency

- Classification accuracy (e.g., sensitivity and specificity rates, Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) analysis, etc.) and classification consistency data should be presented for **any** classification of a student based on the instrument data (e.g., mastery, non-mastery, at-risk, impairment, assignment to a performance category, etc.). This includes classifications based on screening data as well as classifications made using progress monitoring (e.g., BOY and MOY) data.
- Ideally, classification accuracy and consistency data would also be reported for different subgroups of students along the following dimensions: gender, race and ethnicity, English learner/emergent bilingual status, economic status, and special education status.

## Test Bias

- Evidence of analyses aimed at identifying bias in items and scores, and efforts to mitigate identified bias should be included for all components of the instrument and include information at the item level, for subtest scores, and overall scores (e.g., DIF analyses, factor analyses, etc.).
- Preferably, bias would be analyzed for different subgroups of students along the following dimensions: gender, race and ethnicity, emergent bilingual status, economic status, and special education status.

## Growth and Improvement

- Evidence of the instrument's ability to measure growth and improvement in student performance.
- Psychometric examination of growth (or improvement) can take many different forms. As such, one specific type of psychometric approach is not required over another. Instruments are rated based on the psychometrics resulting from valid psychometric approaches indicating the instrument is sensitive and detects change or improvement over time (e.g., ROC curve analysis, repeated measures analyses with student or group factors, t-tests of sample means of change scores, correlational analyses, etc.).

## Reporting Requirements

- Instruments must generate easy-to-understand reports for educators, administrators, and families.
- Instruments should provide:
  - Student reports
  - Classroom/teacher reports
  - Grade-level reports
  - School reports
  - District reports
  - Reports identifying students requiring targeted intervention
  - Parent reports
    - Parent reports must be clear, actionable, available in English and Spanish, and deliverable electronically or in print.
- Reports should be available not later than two business days after the date the applicable administration schedule window closes.
- The results should include a diagnostic report for each student and recommendations for use by teachers and parents for practical and useful instructional strategies to better meet the individual needs of the student based on the student's performance on the assessment instrument.
- Results of Lexile and Quantile should be reported for each student after each administration as appropriate.

## Scoring Requirements

- Submissions must include estimated scoring time for each component and each subtest.
- Scoring must be feasible for teachers, unless automated, including interpretation guidelines aligned with typical teacher training.
  - Instruments requiring complex scoring rules (e.g., basal/ceiling determination, high-subjectivity ratings, specialist-level interpretation) are not considered feasible.

## Timing Requirements

- Grades 3-5: For each BOY or MOY assessment instrument separately administered to students in grades three and four, 85 percent of students who do not require accommodations are expected to complete the assessment instrument within 60 minutes.
- Grades 6-8: For each BOY or MOY assessment instrument separately administered to students in grades five through eight, 85 percent of students who do not require accommodations are expected to complete the assessment instrument within 75 minutes.

## Administration Windows

- Beginning of Year: Between the fourth Monday in August and September 30
- Middle of Year: Between January 2 and February 21

## 3.2 Requirements for Writing Assessments

BOY and MOY writing assessment Instruments must meet all general requirements in [Section 3.1](#) and the additional requirements outlined below to ensure alignment with statutory expectations under [TEC, §39.023](#).

### Content Requirements

- Instruments should measure skills listed in the TEKS for assessed grade.
- English and Spanish instruments must align with:
  - English Language Arts and Reading TEKS, and
  - Spanish Language Arts and Reading TEKS, as applicable.
- Instruments must provide separate scores for each skill set assessed.
- Scored using a process that:
  - involves classroom teachers in setting grading standards;
  - allows for a school district or open-enrollment charter school to submit student responses for rescoring

## Section 4. Scoring Rubric for Instruments

The following criteria will be used to evaluate English and Spanish instruments submitted under this RFABMA.

Vendors must submit complete and independent documentation for each language version of an instrument, including but not limited to full test content, psychometric evidence, administration procedures, scoring guidance, and reporting capabilities. The Spanish version must demonstrate equivalency to the English version in skills assessed, administration methods, scoring, and reporting features. **Each language version will be evaluated independently against the rubric criteria.** Incomplete submissions or failure to demonstrate version equivalency will result in lower scores and may impact eligibility for approval.

Reviewers will score each criterion based on the completeness, clarity, and quality of the evidence provided. Scores will be combined to determine the overall strength of the instrument in meeting statutory requirements, psychometric

expectations, and TEA-identified priorities.

**Disclaimer: Final selection of instruments for inclusion on the Commissioner’s Lists will be made by the Commissioner of Education, based on analysis and recommendations. TEA reserves the right to approve or not approve any instrument submitted in response to this request.**

## BOY and MOY Assessment Instrument Scoring Rubric

### General Criteria and Reporting Features

General criteria and reporting features are examined and recorded as Yes or No.

BOY & MOY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT GENERAL CRITERIA (Yes, No)	
Comply with federal accessibility requirements	Y / N
Individually administered to each student	Y / N
Standardized assessment	Y / N
Accommodated versions offered	Y / N
Provides administration time per student for each component of the instrument	Y / N
Provides scoring time per student for each component of the instrument	Y / N
Allows for administration by additional trained school or district personnel	Y / N
Offered in English and Spanish	Y / N
English and Spanish versions assess same domains/skill sets	Y / N
Normative/technical data no more than 5 years old (i.e., 2021+)	Y / N
Technical and normative data provided for both English and Spanish instruments	Y / N
Ed-Fi Compatibility	Y / N
BOY & MOY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT REPORTING FEATURES (Yes, No)	
Immediate, easy-to-understand reports generated	Y / N
Student reports provided	Y / N
Classroom/teacher reports provided	Y / N
Grade-level reports provided	Y / N
School reports provided	Y / N
District-level reports provided	Y / N
Reports identifying students requiring further action or targeted intervention provided	Y / N
Clear, actionable, easy-to-understand parent reports provided	Y / N
Parent reports available in English and Spanish	Y / N

## Content Development

Each domain or skill is scored based on the degree to which the instrument addresses the expectations of the TEKS and has been reviewed by Texas educators for alignment and appropriateness for students.

BOY & MOY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT CONTENT DEVELOPMENT	
<b>Score</b> ( <i>Addresses key aspects of skill</i> ) <i>3 = Strongly; 2 = Moderately; 1 = Minimally; 0 = Does not address</i>	
<b>Skills</b>	
Alignment to TEKS	0 - 3
Content Reviewed by Texas Educators for Alignment and Appropriateness	0 - 3
<b>Overall Content Score</b>	<b>3</b>

## Psychometrics

Psychometric properties to be reviewed fall into six categories: (1) reliability, (2) validity, (3) classification accuracy and consistency, (4) test bias analysis and mitigation, (5) evidence of sensitivity to growth/improvement, and (6) generalizability. Ratings of psychometrics will focus on the assessment scores relevant to the required domains and skills. Because different assessments create and apply scores in different ways, the exact number of assessment “scores” reviewed for the ratings will differ somewhat across instruments. Because the number of scores may vary across instruments, ratings for specific aspects of reliability and validity will be averaged (separately). Hence, all instruments receive reliability and validity scores on the same scale (0-3). All ratings for each type of evidence are summed (separately by type) across instrument components and averaged based on the total number of applicable components for each instrument. Resulting average scores for types of evidence are then summed and averaged, resulting in one overall score for each type.

BOY & MOY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT PSYCHOMETRIC EVIDENCE	
<b>Score</b> <i>3 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 1 = Minimal; 0 = No evidence; NA = Not applicable</i>	
<b>Reliability</b> (average of reliability components)	<b>0 - 3</b>
Internal Consistency	0 - 3
Test-Retest	0 - 3
Inter-rater reliability	0 - 3
Alternate form	0 - 3
<b>Validity</b> (average of validity components)	<b>0 - 3</b>
Construct	0 - 3
Convergent/Discriminative	0 - 3
Predictive	0 - 3
<b>Classification Accuracy and Consistency</b>	<b>0 - 3</b>
<b>Test Bias Analysis and Mitigation</b>	<b>0 - 3</b>
<b>Growth and Improvement</b>	<b>0 - 3</b>
<b>Generalizability</b> (average of generalizability components)	<b>0 - 3</b>
Sample size	0 - 3
Representativeness	0 - 3

## Administrative Feasibility

Feasibility is rated holistically regarding teacher feasibility, student feasibility, and administrator feasibility.

<b>FEASIBILITY</b>	<b>Score</b> <i>3 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 1 = Minimal; 0 = No evidence</i>	
Teacher Friendly	Administration time is manageable, training requirements are minimal, and minimal additional materials are required for administration. Scores and score reports are immediately available, easy to interpret, and reports for parents are easily generated. Aggregated score reports are easily generated (e.g., groups, whole class, skills).	0 - 3
Student Friendly	Time requirement is manageable. Directions and tasks are easy to understand. Assessment is visually appealing and engaging.	0 - 3
Administrator Friendly	Administration requirements are minimal. Scoring requires minimal time and is easy to interpret. Score reports for parents and aggregated score reports are easily generated.	0 - 3
<b>Overall Average Feasibility Score</b>		<b>3</b>

### Overall Instrument Score

An overall score will be calculated for each instrument using the overall scores for different features described above.

<b>BOY &amp; MOY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT OVERALL</b>	<b>Score</b>
Overall Content Development	0 - 3
Overall Reliability	0 - 3
Overall Validity	0 - 3
Classification	0 - 3
Test Bias	0 - 3
Growth/Improvement	0 - 3
Overall Generalizability	0 - 3
Overall Feasibility	0 - 3
<b>Total Sum</b>	<b>0 - 24</b>
<b>Overall Percent Score (percentage of total possible score)</b>	<b>0 - 100%</b>

<b>Overall Average Percent Score of Grade Bands Included</b>	<b>0 - 100%</b>
--	-----------------

# Appendix A – Relevant Statutes

## Texas Education Code, Chapter 28, Courses of Study; Advancement

- [TEC, §28.002, Required Curriculum](#)
- [TEC, §39.022, Instructionally Supportive Assessment Program](#)
- [TEC, §39.0225, Transition of Assessment Program](#)
- [TEC, §39.0226, Assessment Instrument Study](#)
- [TEC, §39.0223, Adoption and Administration of Instruments](#)
- [TEC, §39.02301, Adoption or Development and Administration Requirements for Assessment Instruments](#)
- [TEC, §39.0234, Electronic Administration of Assessment Instruments](#)
- [TEC, §39.02342, Paper Administration of Assessment Instruments on Request](#)
- [TEC, §39.0236, Integrated Formative Assessment Pilot Program](#)

## Texas Education Code, Chapter 39, Public School System Accountability

- [TEC, §39.023, Adoption and Administration of Instruments](#)

## Appendix B – TEKS and Course Enrollment

Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) describe what students should know and be able to do for each grade level and course in the required curriculum. The following tables provide links to the TEKS for the areas specified in this RFABMA and the reported course enrollment for the 2025-2026 school year.

### Chapter 110. English Language Arts and Reading (inclusive of Phonics)

Course	Enrollment
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Kindergarten, Adopted 2017</a>	261,301
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 1, Adopted 2017</a>	396,343
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 2, Adopted 2017</a>	455,067
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 3, Adopted 2017</a>	486,292
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 4, Adopted 2017</a>	522,399
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 5, Adopted 2017</a>	539,774
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 6, Adopted 2017</a>	468,698
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 7, Adopted 2017</a>	454,415
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, Grade 8, Adopted 2017</a>	436,107
<a href="#">English Language Arts and Reading, English I, Adopted 2017</a>	477,119

### Chapter 111. Mathematics

Course	Enrollment
<a href="#">Mathematics Grade K, Adopted in 2012</a>	242,695
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 1, Adopted 2012</a>	352,173
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 2, Adopted 2012</a>	393,200
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 3, Adopted 2012</a>	421,733
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 4, Adopted 2012</a>	444,856
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 5, Adopted 2012</a>	448,261
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 6, Adopted 2012</a>	304,038
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 7, Adopted 2012</a>	300,735
<a href="#">Mathematics, Grade 8, Adopted 2012</a>	304,475
<a href="#">Mathematics, Algebra I, Adopted 2012 (One Credit)</a>	452,926

## Chapter 112. Science

Course	Enrollment
Science Grade K, Adopted 2021	221,167
Science Grade 1, Adopted 2021	333,262
Science Grade 2, Adopted 2021	368,952
Science Grade 3, Adopted 2021	395,417
Science Grade 4, Adopted 2021	415,243
Science Grade 5, Adopted 2021	428,881
Science Grade 6, Adopted 2021	318,297
Science Grade 7, Adopted 2021	419,754
Science Grade 8, Adopted 2021	411,136
Science Biology, Adopted 2020	470,185

## Chapter 113. Social Studies

Course	Enrollment
Social Studies, Kindergarten, Adopted 2022	217,169
Social Studies, Grade 1, Adopted 2022	332,552
Social Studies, Grade 2, Adopted 2022	367,958
Social Studies, Grade 3, Adopted 2022	394,314
Social Studies, Grade 4, Adopted 2022	415,275
Social Studies, Grade 5, Adopted 2022	418,194
Social Studies, Grade 6, Adopted 2022	203,850
Social Studies, Grade 7, Adopted 2022	420,960
Social Studies, Grade 8, Adopted 2022	426,899
Social Studies, United States History Studies Since 1877, Adopted 2022	343,948

## Chapter 128. Spanish Language Arts (inclusive of Phonics)

Course	Enrollment
Spanish Language Arts and Reading, Kindergarten, Adopted 2017	28,691
Spanish Language Arts and Reading, Grade 1, Adopted 2017	36,139
Spanish Language Arts and Reading, Grade 2, Adopted 2017	36,279
Spanish Language Arts and Reading, Grade 3, Adopted 2017	34,293
Spanish Language Arts and Reading, Grade 4, Adopted 2017	33,712
Spanish Language Arts and Reading, Grade 5, Adopted 2017	29,373

