Higher Education Curriculum Course Mapping Rubric
Dr. Heidi Hayes Jacobs and Team (CDI, 2015)

Course Map Design				
	I. **Emerging curriculum map**	**II. Developing curriculum map**	**III. Proficient curriculum map**	**IV. Fully operational curriculum map**
Content Alignment to Standards EdTPA and Mission of the College/ University	▪ The map's content focus appears as vague descriptions with little reference to State Standards ▪ The map content focus appears as a listing of topics with little attention to sequence, learning progressions or instructional coherence.	▪ The map is partially aligned to selected standards, but there is little evidence that identified standards is evident in the text selection or other content connections. ▪ The map appears to have some content planning but not with full alignment to the CCLS sequence.	▪ The map demonstrates standard alignments through the assessments with some connections to text selection (descriptions of text complexity and use of informational text). ▪ The map concepts are clearly aligned to the standards with a deliberate choice of how topics, problems, themes, issues, or assignments will progress over time. ▪ The map is inconsistent and does not progress in complexity and cognitive demand over time.	▪ The map content is clearly aligned to standards and mission with a deliberate choice of how topics, problems, themes, issues, or work will progress over time. ▪ The map demonstrates alignments to the embedded assessments with connections to text selection (descriptions of text complexity and use of informational text.). ▪ The map uses explicit language and connections within the map that illustrate a clear progression that describes main concepts and subject matter with a clear focus. ▪ The map includes content-related materials that increase in rigor over time. There are clear connections to other curriculum maps to help ensure program-wide coherence and cross-course area integration.
Essential questions/Big Ideas (EQs)	▪ Essential questions (EQs) are not used, nor are "big ideas" or enduring understandings stated. ▪ Essential questions are designed to evoke limited responses and/or "yes-no" replies. ▪ The rationale or purpose for the	▪ EQs are general and generate specific responses. ▪ EQs are used to help frame the curriculum map, but there is little connection between the EQs and the selected standards ▪ EQs and the embedded assessments do not appear to be strategically aligned.	▪ The EQs are written in a manner that provides multiple possibilities for student response and research. ▪ EQs are clear and aligned to the standards but not fully across the grades or content areas ▪ EQs are developmentally appropriate and are written with multiple entry points for all learners. ▪ EQs contain smaller "focusing questions" that help describe the learning arc of the units of study with some connections to the embedded assessments.	▪ EQs are written in a way that sparks student curiosity and challenges them to dig into the subject in search of possible solutions. ▪ EQs are clear, essential questions that are aligned to standards ▪ EQs are written with multiple entry points for all learners with smaller "focusing questions" that carefully scaffold the learning to the final project/assessment. ▪ EQs focus on student inquiry of the essential question(s) through learning activities. ▪ EQs are strategically planned to ensure every student gains the content, skills, and processes needed in order to complete the included assessment/project.

Special thanks to Kyle Haver for input during the NYC Common Core Pilot 2010 and to Mike Fisher with our CICU Project).

	sequence of learning activities is unclear.			
	I. **Emerging curriculum map**	**II. Developing map**	**III. Proficient map**	**IV. Fully operational map**
Precise skills that are aligned to standards	▪ Specific skills are missing, haphazard, and make no connection to the standards.	▪ Skills listed are generic; they have broad processes and/or are listed indiscriminately. ▪ Skills have limited connection to specific standards the learning progressions needed to reach the standards' scaffolding. (I.e. a logical sequence of learning).	▪ Specific skills are listed with a clear alignment to the identified standards. ▪ Skills are introduced throughout the unit to align to the learning progressions needed to reach the standards trajectory. ▪ Skills are strategically set as action verbs and used consistently with mission ▪ Skills for developing Habits of Mind and affective dispositions are introduced.	▪ Specific skills are listed with a clear alignment to targeted standards ▪ Skills are introduced, supported and applied throughout the learning progressions as stated in the map in order for each student to reach standards scaffolding. ▪ Skills are strategically mapped, set as action verbs, used consistently and evaluated within the final project and/or assessment. ▪ Skills are mapped on and across courses, programs and/or content areas supporting progression towards increasingly more complex and cognitively demanding tasks. ▪ Skills for developing Habits of Mind/attitudes are included throughout the curriculum if targeted.
Curriculum embedded assessments that are targeted and informed by Webb's DOK's	▪ Assessments are absent, incomplete, or unfocused. ▪ Assessments included are a generic assignment, or an evaluation is listed with no alignment to standards ▪ Assessments are not aligned to the "big idea," essential questions or the curriculum. ▪ Assessments are all on a DOK 1 or 2 levels	▪ Assessments are included in t and aligned to standards. ▪ Assessments are not clearly connected to the "big idea" and/or essential question(s). ▪ Assessment may not include any authentic student work/ learning opportunities, Performance-Based Assessments (PBAs) or any teacher-developed formative assessments. ▪ Assessments and/or smaller "tasks" do not build towards the final assessment/project. ▪ DOK levels are 1 and 2	▪ Assessments are included in the map, connected to specific standards to the "big idea" and/or essential question(s) within the unit of study. ▪ Assessments, both final and ongoing, include a range of assessment tools (i.e. rubrics, exemplars and/or anchor papers) and methodology, including authentic student work/learning opportunities, PBAs and/or teacher-developed formative assessments. ▪ Assessments and tasks are mapped so students can successfully complete the final assessment/project. ▪ There is a balance of Level 1,2 and 3 DOK assessment tasks	▪ Assessments are included on the map, connected to specific the "big idea" and/or essential question(s) and used by the program and/or department. ▪ Assessments, both final and ongoing, are balanced and include a range of assessment tools (i.e. rubrics, exemplars and/or anchor papers) and methodology, including authentic student work, PBAs and/or teacher-developed formative assessments. ▪ Assessments and/or ongoing tasks build towards the final assessment/project, thus helping to prepare the student for the final assessment/projects. ▪ Assessments vary in DOK levels (1,2,3,4) they vary in grain size; and they are designed to ensure a range of demanding tasks, including increase in use of complex texts and tasks over time. ▪ Assessments are mapped over the program to ensure a wide range of assessment processes, including the integration of digital, media, and global literacies.

Special thanks to Kyle Haver for input during the NYC Common Core Pilot 2010 and to Mike Fisher with our CICU Project).

Higher Education Curriculum Course Mapping Rubric
Dr. Heidi Hayes Jacobs and Team (CDI, 2015)

	I. **Emerging curriculum map**	**II. Developing map**	**III. Proficient map**	**IV. Fully operational map**
Program Appropriate Level with *suggested* learning progressions * (*entry level undergrad, ongoing undergrad, student teacher, graduate level)	* Program Appropriate Level (PAL) is not evident on the curriculum map. ▪ PAL for students are not reflected in the essential questions and/or big ideas. ▪ There is little evidence of how instruction is differentiated. ▪ There is no progression built into the map and across program. ▪ Random pathway for students	▪ PAL is partially included in the map. ▪ Developmental needs of students are reflected in the essential questions and/or big ideas. ▪ PAL is minimally present in aligned materials and experiences are limited. ▪ There is limited design consideration for differentiated instruction. ▪ PAL has limited consideration, as indicated in the learning assignments and do not build in complexity, nor increase in cognitive demand over time.	▪ PAL is clearly included and aligned to the learning progression through course ▪ PAL of students is reflected in the essential questions and/or big ideas. ▪ PAL is aligned in the materials and experiences are partially included in the map. ▪ Multiple pathways and differentiated instructions are clearly embedded within each map. ▪ PAL is clearly articulated to demonstrate how learning activities and/or lessons build in complexity and increase cognitive demand over time. ▪ PAL is considered in the selection of texts and increase in rigor over time	▪ PAL pathways are clear on and across different grade levels and content areas in the map. ▪ PAL is reflected in the essential questions and/or big ideas to actively engage students in inquiry. ▪ PAL is aligned in the map to include clearly articulated and supplemental sets of materials and learning experiences. ▪ PAL is clearly stated and reflected in class sessions and assignments that build in complexity and increase cognitive demand over time. ▪ Multiple pathways and differentiated instructions are clearly embedded within each map; lesson extensions and opportunities for individualized projects including digital, media, and global learning opportunities are clearly articulated. ▪ PAL in maps is regularly studied, viewed and revised to ensure there is a logical, developmental progression through the course program. ▪ PAL is evident in the selection of texts and increase in rigor over time.
Instructional coherence and alignment across program and departments	▪ The curriculum map demonstrates little to no alignment within the map components ▪ The curriculum map demonstrates no awareness or indication of alignment and/or an active mapping process.	▪ The curriculum map attempts to align curriculum, assessment and pedagogy. Some map components are aligned. ▪ The curriculum map is in content and has instructional gaps. It does not strategically align to standards. ▪ The curriculum map has little to no alignment within and program and departments (i.e. vertical or horizontal	▪ The curriculum map demonstrates a clear alignment of curriculum, assessment and pedagogy ▪ The curriculum map demonstrates a coherent relationship between the essential question, learning experiences, and student work/learning opportunities. ▪ The curriculum map's assignments, activities, and classroom-based assessments scaffold towards the final project/assessment with clear evidence of an alignment to standards ▪ The curriculum map demonstrates	▪ The curriculum map demonstrates a clear alignment of curriculum, assessment and pedagogy that includes a clear relationship between the essential question, learning experiences, student work and the culminating assessment project. ▪ The curriculum map alignment illustrates a content progression that is directly linked to relevant grade/content and to the following grade/content expectations as articulated by the standards. ▪ The curriculum map school-wide review of these maps helps plan a comprehensive, inter-disciplinary, and coherent course of study throughout the program or departments.

Special thanks to Kyle Haver for input during the NYC Common Core Pilot 2010 and to Mike Fisher with our CICU Project).

		alignment).	alignment within and across programs and departments.	
	I. **Emerging curriculum map**	**II. Developing map**	**III. Proficient map**	**IV. Fully operational map**
Integration of 21st century Literacy Development: Digital tools, Media Making, and Global Connections in maps	▪ Curriculum maps do not include any reference to digital tools, media making, media response, global connections. ▪ Maps do not include any reference to student use of Web-based resources.	▪ Some curriculum maps include student use of or digital tools, media making, media response, global connections to explore and exhibit content understanding. ▪ Maps include some web-based resources to support content understanding.	▪ The majority of curriculum maps include both the teacher and student using digital tools, media sources, media making and global connections so that students can research content understanding via mixed media. ▪ Digital media tools are interwoven throughout different units of study so that student use becomes increasingly more complex and cognitively engaging. ▪ Students have multiple opportunities to use, access and create projects using a range of media making tools.	▪ Curriculum maps include digital tools, media making opportunities, media response, and global connections carefully embedded in all maps so that students and instructors have access to and experience using a range of tools and opportunities to demonstrate content understanding via mixed media over time. ▪ Curriculum maps include assessments/projects and/or exhibitions that include the use of digital media. ▪ All students have multiple opportunities to use, access and create projects using a range of digital tools, media making applications including group work, connections with students from different schools and/or countries. ▪ Students are engaged in creating and supporting digital portfolios of their work.
Use of software platform to create, share and revise maps	▪ Mapping process is not posted and/or shared online.	▪ Mapping process is done online and saved electronically on a non-interactive site; ▪ Maps are not shared so others can view them and provide feedback and/or suggested changes.	▪ Online Mapping process is done using a passive web-based tool (i.e.Google Docs), where maps are archived and others can view them. ▪ Program is non-searchable but available to identified faculty groups. ▪ There is no mapping process or expectation to edit and/or provide suggestions.	▪ Online Mapping process employs and archives via a web-based software platform that is searchable. Other faculty members can work together to create, revise and/or enrich their maps. ▪ Online maps share resources online, including lesson plans, assessments, web activity links, URLs and classroom resources. ▪ Online mapping platform promotes faculty searching the maps of other teachers in the program as well as maps created by other school partners locally and global

Special thanks to Kyle Haver for input during the NYC Common Core Pilot 2010 and to Mike Fisher with our CICU Project).