

Innovative Course Application Rubric: Complete the information listed below and score the application within the rubric below.

- Course Title:
- TEA Reviewer:
- Date reviewed:
- Reviewer recommendation: [Choose an item.](#)

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Application is complete. ➤ Districts can implement without additional documentation or guidance. ➤ The application is written in neutral/ balanced language. ➤ The application is accessible to and inclusive of diverse student populations (i.e., EL and SpEd). ➤ Uses specified styles and formatting consistently. ➤ Few or no grammatical errors (<5 per page). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Application is complete. ➤ Districts can implement with modest documentation or guidance. ➤ The application is written in neutral/ balanced language; some editing needed. ➤ The application is accessible to and inclusive of diverse student populations (i.e., EL and SpEd); some editing needed. ➤ Minor gaps or inconsistencies between the sections of the application. ➤ Uses specified styles and formatting inconsistently. ➤ Few grammatical errors (5-9 per page). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Application is complete. ➤ Districts may face difficulty in implementation due to errors or inconsistencies in the application. ➤ The application is written in negative/ biased language. ➤ The application is not accessible to or inclusive of diverse student populations (i.e., EL and SpEd). ➤ Major gaps or inconsistencies between the sections of the application. ➤ Does not use specified styles and formatting. ➤ High number of grammatical errors (> than 10 per page). 	<p>Course application is incomplete; must be returned to applicant for completion before consideration.</p>	

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
<p>Course Description</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Description is of sufficient length to effectively summarize the course content. ➤ Paragraph response; well-organized and structured. ➤ The course content is specific and summarized clearly and succinctly. ➤ The specific purpose or goals of the course are clearly identified. ➤ Clearly addresses a regional or statewide need. ➤ The topics in the description are evident in and supported by the essential knowledge and skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Description is too short/long without adequately summarizing the course content. ➤ Paragraph response; needs editing for clarity. ➤ The course content is summarized clearly and succinctly. ➤ The purpose or goals of the course are identified; may need specificity. ➤ Statewide applicability is unclear; more specificity is needed. ➤ The topics in the description are reflected in and supported by the essential knowledge and skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The description is vague or does not provide adequate description of the course content. ➤ Paragraph response; needs significant editing for clarity and cohesion. ➤ The specific purpose or goals of the course are not identified or overly generalized. ➤ Describes the course in language specific to the applying district. ➤ The topics in the description are not supported by the essential knowledge and skills. 	<p>The description is missing or does not adequately reflect expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Description is presented as a bulleted list or other non-narrative format. ➤ Course content or goals are missing from the description. ➤ Describes a specific teaching methodology. 	

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
Justification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Paragraph response; well-organized and structured. ➤ Summarizes the need for the course in terms of the student. ➤ Provides an overview of the unique content not available in the TEKS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Paragraph response; needs editing for clarity. ➤ The justification is general to the subject area or cluster/program of study but not the specific course content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The justification is vague or circular in argument. ➤ Does not describe the need for the course in terms of unique content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The justification is missing or does not adequately reflect expectations. ➤ Justification is presented as a bulleted list or other non-narrative format. ➤ Describes a district need or use for the course rather than a statewide need. 	
Data/Pilot (New application)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear evidence that course was piloted with Texas high school students. ➤ Provides sufficient explanation of the pilot for the course in terms of student outcomes. ➤ Data are complete, appropriately cited, and clearly presented. ➤ Other description adds sufficient context to data. ➤ CTE only: labor market data are included, aligned, and cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course has been piloted as an industry-based course or as a course at an institution of higher education. ➤ The pilot is described very generally; not in relation to the proposed course. ➤ Data from the pilot are not present or is not clearly presented. ➤ Data not cited. ➤ CTE only: labor market data are included, aligned, but not cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evidence of pilot is unclear; connection of the pilot to the application is vague. ➤ The pilot is not cited or described in any detail. ➤ Data from the pilot are not present. ➤ CTE only: labor market data are included but does not align to course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The data and/or pilot is missing or does not adequately reflect expectations. ➤ Applications without pilot data will not be considered for advancement in the process. ➤ CTE only: labor market data are not included. 	

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
Implementation Data (Renewal application)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Describes the successful implementation of the course in terms of student outcomes. ➤ Includes implementation data from last 5 years or initial approval period, whichever is greater. Cites or documents data and other description. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The implementation of the course is described generally but not in terms of student benefit or outcome. ➤ Data provided are partial or an incomplete history; less than 5 years or the full initial approval period. ➤ Data not cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The implementation of the course is not described in any detail, e.g., student outcomes. ➤ Data are imprecise, not clearly presented, or from a singular source (e.g., district v. statewide). ➤ Data not cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The data are missing or do not adequately reflect expectations. ➤ Applications without implementation data will not be considered for advancement in the process. 	
EKS: General Requirements/ Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ General Requirements contains all three elements: grade level; prerequisites; award of credit. ➤ General Requirements matches page 1 of the application (prereqs and award of credit). ➤ Introduction contains elements that align it to TEKS-based courses in same subject area. ➤ The description embedded in the Introduction aligns to the Course Description. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ General Requirements contains all three elements. ➤ General Requirements does not match page 1 of the application (prereqs and award of credit). ➤ Introduction is missing one or more elements that would align it to TEKS- based courses in same subject area. ➤ The description embedded in the Introduction does not align to the Course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ One or more elements are not present in General Requirements. ➤ General Requirements does not match page 1 of the application (prereqs and award of credit). ➤ Introduction contains elements that align it to TEKS- based courses ➤ The Introduction does not contain the Course Description. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ General requirements are missing. ➤ Introduction is missing. 	<p>Document TEKS-based course title in comments column and cite duplication (via comment) on EKS in the application.</p>

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
(Continued)	section of the application	Description section of the application.			
EKS: Knowledge statements (KS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Written in complete sentences in present tense. ➤ Addresses “student”: singular. Clear and well written statements that broadly describe the knowledge and skills addressed by the student expectations (SEs). Ends with: “The student is expected to:” ➤ All SEs listed as clearly associated with the topics of the KS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Written in complete sentences; future or inconsistent tense. ➤ Addresses “students”: plural. The knowledge statements (KS) employ vague or non-specific language. ➤ Does not end with: “The student is expected to:” or is inconsistent. ➤ Most student expectations (SEs) listed are clearly associated with the topics of the KS; some editing is needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ KS are incomplete sentences or phrases only. ➤ Use conditional or future tense. ➤ Overly broad or too many topics. ➤ Addresses “students”: plural. ➤ Does not end with: “The student is ed to:” ➤ Some student expectations (SEs) listed are not associated with the topics of the KS; reorganization is needed. 	The EKS duplicate an existing TEKS-based course. Applications that duplicate an existing TEKS-based course cannot be approved.	Document TEKS-based course title in comments column and cite duplication (via comment) on EKS in the application.
EKS: Student expectations (SEs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Formatted correctly. ➤ Clearly demonstrate a level of rigor appropriate for the subject matter and recommended grade level of the course. ➤ Clearly connected to the KS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Formatting needs consistency or editorial work. ➤ The level of rigor appropriate for the subject matter and recommended grade level of the course need minor adjustments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The level of rigor does not align with the subject matter or recommended grade level of the course. ➤ Unrelated to the KS. ➤ Employs vague or non-measurable verbs and will not clearly result in observable or 	The EKS duplicate an existing TEKS-based course. Applications that duplicate an existing TEKS-based course cannot be approved.	Document TEKS-based course title in comments column and cite duplication (via comment) on EKS in the application.

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
<p>EKS: Student expectations (SEs) continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Employs a variety of rigorous and measurable verbs (higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy). ➤ Employs verbs that will clearly result in student outcomes that are both observable by the teacher and measurable on a formal or informal assessment (e.g., quiz, unit test, classroom discussion, activity, etc.). ➤ Provides a variety of ways for students to demonstrate learning. ➤ Organization of knowledge indicates clear progression or sequence of learning. ➤ Identifies specifics about what students are expected to know and be able to do and is well written and free from error or confusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unclear connection to the KS. ➤ Employs verbs repetitively or of insufficient rigor (lower-order Bloom’s taxonomy). ➤ Employs verbs used in SE will result in student outcomes that are either observable or measurable, but not both (e.g., demonstrate, research, examine, etc.) or that may not be observable in a classroom setting or assignment. ➤ Are overly broad and does not provide specifics about what students should know and be able to do. ➤ Describes activity rather than skill demonstration. ➤ Organization of knowledge is unclear, or sequence of learning has gaps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> measurable student outcomes (e.g., understand, explore, know, consider, etc.) ➤ Are vague and lacks specifics about what students should know and be able to do and or contains errors (grammatical or factual), is overly wordy, or structured in a confusing manner. ➤ Dictates how the SE must be taught or only provides one method of skill demonstration. ➤ No clear organizational structure to knowledge or sequence of learning. ➤ Overpacked with too many concepts; bad breakouts. ➤ Ineffective use of “including” or “such as” phrases. ➤ Content is insufficient for award of credit. 		

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
EKS: Student expectations (SEs) continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Effective use of “including” or “such as” phrases. ➤ Recommended award of credit is clearly justified by content of the course. ➤ is well written and free from error or confusion. ➤ Effective use of “including” or “such as” phrases. ➤ Recommended award of credit is clearly justified by content of the course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Does not read coherently; bad breakouts. ➤ Inconsistent use of “including” or “such as” phrases. ➤ Content not commensurate with recommended award of credit; may need some addition or subtraction of content. ➤ Organization of knowledge is unclear, or sequence of learning has gaps. ➤ Does not read coherently; bad breakouts. ➤ Inconsistent use of “including” or “such as” phrases. ➤ Content not commensurate with recommended award of credit; may need some addition or subtraction of content 			

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Five to ten possible resources listed. ➤ Variety in types of resources and authors/sources. ➤ Published works are available and accessible. ➤ Published resources are current and up to date (most recent editions or <5 years old). ➤ Published works are in Chicago Manual of Style (CMS) citation format. ➤ Brand agnostic (to the extent possible); lists products generically; or if specific products must be cited then appropriate trademark is used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Too many possible resources (>10); may need editing. ➤ Insufficient variety in the types of resources in resources. ➤ Published works are not current (5-10 years old). ➤ Sources are on a private site/server or behind a paywall. ➤ CMS format needs editing (e.g., URLs are incorrect). ➤ Brand agnostic (to the extent possible); or if specific products must be cited then appropriate trademark is used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Too few possible resources (<5 listed). ➤ Insufficient variety in the types of resources or single source. ➤ One or more resources are not clearly related to the content of the course. ➤ Published works are not current (>10 years old). ➤ Published works are not available to general public or out of print. ➤ Published works not in CMS citation format. ➤ Specifically calls for branded content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No resources present. ➤ Cites only specific brands or products. ➤ Does not use CMS format for citations. ➤ Does not use HTTPS websites. 	
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Five to ten activities listed. ➤ Sufficiently linked to course content. ➤ Provide variety of ways for all students to demonstrate learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Too many (>15) activities listed; needs editing. ➤ Activities not reflective of or loosely connected to course content as described in the EKS. ➤ Describe academic standards rather than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Too few (<5) activities listed. ➤ Activities not reflective of course content as described in the EKS. ➤ Does not provide ways for students to demonstrate learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The activities are missing or do not adequately reflect expectations ➤ Dictates a methodology or grading rubric. ➤ Lists activities that are not available to all 	

Application Section	4	3	2	1	Comments/ Recommendations:
Activities continued		ways to demonstrate learning.	➤ Activities are over-generalized.	districts using this course.	
Assessment Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Five to ten methods listed. ➤ Balance of reliable and authentic ways to demonstrate learning. ➤ Methods are primarily district developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Too many (>15) methods listed. ➤ Methods are inauthentic to the course content. ➤ Relies heavily on third-party, non-district assessments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Too few (<5) methods listed. ➤ All formative or all summative. ➤ Methods are unrelated to the course content or over generalized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The assessment methods do not adequately reflect expectations. ➤ Assessment methods are missing. ➤ Based solely on a third-party assessment (e.g., an industry-based certification). 	
Certifications	Recommended certifications are related to the course content and in accordance with the related TAC 231 teacher assignment rules.	Recommended certifications are related to the course content; may need some addition or subtraction per TEA guidance.	Recommended certifications are unrelated to the course content or to the TAC 231 teacher assignment rules.	The certification recommendations are missing or do not adequately reflect expectations.	
Additional required trainings (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lists cost. ➤ Cites where or from which organizations teachers may receive trainings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lists requirements but not cost. ➤ Organizations from which trainings may be received are not cited or linked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lists requirements but not cost. ➤ Organizations from which trainings may be received are not cited or linked. 	Lists information not available to all districts who use this course.	