

Text Complexity and Relevance Evaluation

At least 2 educators and the department chair should read the entire text and analyze the text independently. Each educator should evaluate the text using the **two evaluations** below (the relevance evaluation and the OSDE text complexity evaluation).

Once completed individually, the committee will complete a committee evaluation of these two rubrics to be kept with the Secondary ELA Curriculum Coordinator and the reserved novel list, if approved. All individual and committee evaluations should be uploaded to the [Request to Teach a Literature Selection Form](#).

Relevance Evaluation

	Strong	Adequate	Limited
Encourages Cultural Responsiveness	Text reflects a range of identities, experiences, or perspectives that help students better understand themselves, others, or their community. Content is respectful, relevant, and broadens awareness.	Text includes some relevant perspectives or identities, though representation may be limited or surface-level. Content is mostly respectful and appropriate.	Text centers only one viewpoint or culture. May lack relevance to students' lived experiences or risk promoting stereotypes or exclusion.
Fosters Academic Success	Text is age-appropriate and rich in vocabulary, structure, and theme. Promotes close reading, analysis, and aligns well with academic standards.	Text is generally appropriate with moderate complexity. May need some scaffolding to meet academic goals.	Text is overly simplistic or misaligned with academic goals; lacks depth or challenge for the intended grade level.
Supports Critical Thinking	Text invites students to question, analyze, and engage with complex themes or multiple perspectives. Encourages deep discussion and inquiry.	Text includes opportunities for discussion or reflection but may not challenge students consistently.	Text does not promote deeper thinking or analysis; ideas are presented without room for exploration or critique.

Text Complexity: Qualitative Measures Rubric

LITERARY TEXTS

Title: _____ Author: _____

	Less Complex	Complex	More Complex
MEANING	☐ Meaning: One level of meaning; theme is obvious and revealed early in the text	☐ Meaning: Multiple levels of meaning clearly distinguished from each other; theme is clear but may be conveyed with some subtlety	☐ Meaning: Multiple levels of meaning that are difficult to identify, separate, and interpret; theme is implicit or subtle, often ambiguous, and revealed over the entirety of the text
TEXT STRUCTURE	☐ Organization: Is clear, chronological, or easy to predict ☐ Use of Graphics: If used, either illustrations directly support and assist in interpreting the text or are not necessary to understanding the meaning of the text	☐ Organization: May have two or more storylines and occasionally be difficult to predict ☐ Use of Graphics: If used, illustrations or graphics support or extend the meaning of the text	☐ Organization: Is intricate with regard to such elements as point of view, time shifts, multiple characters, storylines, and detail ☐ Use of Graphics: If used, illustrations or graphics are essential for understanding the meaning of the text
LANGUAGE FEATURES	☐ Conventionality: Largely explicit and easy to understand with some occasions for more complex meaning ☐ Vocabulary: Contemporary, familiar, conversational, rarely academic ☐ Sentence Structure: Mainly simple sentences	☐ Conventionality: Fairly complex; contains abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language ☐ Vocabulary: Fairly complex language that is sometimes unfamiliar, archaic, subjectspecific, or overly academic ☐ Sentence Structure: Primarily simple and compound sentences, with some complex constructions	☐ Conventionality: Dense and complex; contains abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language ☐ Vocabulary: Complex, generally unfamiliar, archaic, subjectspecific, or overly academic language; may be ambiguous or purposefully misleading ☐ Sentence Structure: Many complex sentences with several subordinate phrases or clauses and transition words
KNOWLEDGE DEMANDS	☐ Life Experiences: Experiences portrayed are everyday and common to most readers ☐ Intertextuality and Cultural Knowledge: Few, if any, references or allusions to other texts or cultural elements	☐ Life Experiences: Experiences portrayed are uncommon to many readers ☐ Intertextuality and Cultural Knowledge: Some references or allusions to other texts or cultural elements	☐ Life Experiences: Experiences portrayed are distinctly different from the common reader ☐ Intertextuality and Cultural Knowledge: Many references or allusions to other texts or cultural elements

Adapted from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Qualitative Measures Rubric (2012) and Fisher, D., Frey, N., and Lapp, D., *Text Complexity: Stretching Readers with Texts and Tasks* (2016), Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Literacy.

INFORMATIONAL TEXTS

Title: _____ Author: _____

	Less Complex	Complex	More Complex
PURPOSE	☐ Purpose: Explicitly stated, clear, concrete, narrowly focused	☐ Purpose: Implied but easy to identify or infer based upon context or source	☐ Purpose: Subtle and intricate, difficult to determine; includes many theoretical or abstract elements
TEXT STRUCTURE	☐ Organization: Connections between ideas, processes, or events are explicit and clear; organization of text is chronological, sequential, or easy to predict ☐ Text Features: If used, help the reader navigate and understand content but are not essential to understanding content ☐ Use of Graphics: If used, graphics, pictures, tables, and charts, etc. are mostly supplementary to understanding the text	☐ Organization: Connections between an expanded range of ideas, processes, or events are often implicit or subtle; organization may contain multiple pathways or exhibit some discipline-specific traits ☐ Text Features: If used, enhance the reader's understanding of content ☐ Use of Graphics: If used, graphics, tables, etc. support or are integral to understanding the text	☐ Organization: Connections between an extensive range of ideas, processes, or events are deep, intricate, and often ambiguous; organization is intricate or discipline-specific ☐ Text Features: If used, are essential in understanding content ☐ Use of Graphics: If used, intricate, extensive graphics, tables, charts, etc., are extensive and integral to making meaning of the text; may provide information not otherwise conveyed in the text
LANGUAGE FEATURES	☐ Conventionality: Largely explicit and easy to understand with some occasions for more complex meaning ☐ Vocabulary: Contemporary, familiar, conversational, rarely academic ☐ Sentence Structure: Mainly simple sentences	☐ Conventionality: Fairly complex; contains abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language ☐ Vocabulary: Fairly complex language that is sometimes unfamiliar, archaic, subject-specific, or overly academic ☐ Sentence Structure: Primarily simple and compound sentences, with some complex constructions	☐ Conventionality: Dense and complex; contains considerable abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language ☐ Vocabulary: Complex, generally unfamiliar, archaic, subject-specific, or overly academic language; may be ambiguous or misleading ☐ Sentence Structure: Many complex sentences with several subordinate phrases or clauses and transition words
KNOWLEDGE DEMANDS	☐ Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on everyday, practical knowledge; includes simple, concrete ideas ☐ Intertextuality: Few, if any, references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.	☐ Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on common practical knowledge and some disciplinespecific content knowledge; includes a mix or simple and more complicated, abstract ideas ☐ Intertextuality: Some references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.	☐ Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on moderate to extensive levels of discipline-specific or theoretical knowledge; includes a mix of recognizable ideas and challenging abstract concepts ☐ Intertextuality: Many references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.

Adapted from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Qualitative Measures Rubric (2012) and Fisher, D., Frey, N., and Lapp, D., *Text Complexity: Stretching Readers With Texts and Tasks* (2016), Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Literacy.