

# Innovation Evaluation Rubric

## Purpose When to Use

This rubric is a practical tool for assessing the adaptability and potential of a learning innovation to scale across institutions. Developed by a faculty-led workgroup and refined with expert input, the rubric helps surface which ideas are most promising for wider use.

Use this tool to evaluate learning innovations identified through campus redesign efforts, internal pilots, or external discovery. It is ideal for teams reviewing potential candidates for scale, improvement, or investment.

## How to Use

Each innovation should be reviewed across six dimensions. For each criterion, use the guiding questions to determine how well the innovation meets expectations, then assign a rating:

1

### Emerging

Minimal evidence or design consideration

2

### Developing

Some elements present; uneven or early

3

### Established

Clear, thoughtful integration

4

### Exemplary

Comprehensive and outstanding alignment

Evaluation Criteria		Notes	Rating
1	<b>Student-Centered Problem Alignment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assesses whether the innovation clearly addresses a real, documented student need or barrier to success.</li> <li>Is the problem clearly defined and based on student data?</li> <li>Does the innovation target a common challenge in gateway courses?</li> </ul>		
2	<b>Evidence-Informed Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluates whether the innovation is grounded in research, theory, or promising practices.</li> <li>Is the approach backed by literature, prior data, or comparable implementations?</li> <li>Are underlying assumptions explicit and supported?</li> </ul>		
3	<b>Responsiveness to Differentiated Student Needs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examines how the innovation supports a broad range of learners with diverse experiences, needs, and starting points.</li> <li>Does the innovation account for variability in student preparation and circumstances?</li> <li>Are there design features that support success across student populations without requiring individual exception processes?</li> </ul>		

<b>4</b>	<b>Faculty Leadership &amp; Usability</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers whether faculty are meaningfully engaged in leading or shaping the innovation — and whether it's practical for instructors to adopt.</li> <li>• Is the approach sustainable in real teaching environments?</li> <li>• Can faculty implement it with available time, training, and tools?</li> </ul>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Scalability Potential</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assesses how easily the innovation can be adapted across courses, departments, or institutions.</li> <li>• Are key components transferable across contexts?</li> <li>• Does the innovation rely on highly localized or unique conditions?</li> </ul>		
<b>6</b>	<b>Institutional Fit &amp; Integration</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examines whether the innovation supports broader institutional priorities or existing systems.</li> <li>• Does it align with institutional goals (e.g., retention, student success)?</li> <li>• Can it be integrated into current infrastructure, policies, or platforms?</li> </ul>		

## Interpreting Results & Recommendations

Once all six criteria are rated, tally your scores. Use the chart below to guide next steps:

**< 10**

Not ready for scale; consider pausing or further development.

**10-14**

Needs significant adaptation or clarity; revisit design and alignment.

**15-19**

Promising, with minor refinement; explore adjustments to strengthen readiness.

**20-24**

Strong candidate for scale; consider prioritizing support and diffusion.