

## Academic Innovation Fund Review Rubric

Criteria	1 - Unsatisfactory	2 – Needs improvement	3 – Satisfactory	4 – Good	5 – Excellent
Meets regional, national or international learner or workplace needs of the future	The innovation does not address current or future learner or workplace needs. It lacks relevance and fails to align with industry trends or educational standards. No evidence of alignment with national or international standards, minimal or no engagement with industry or educational stakeholders.	The innovation addresses some aspects of current learner or workplace needs but lacks a forward-looking approach. It shows limited relevance to future trends. Some alignment with current standards, limited stakeholder engagement, minimal consideration of future needs.	The innovation adequately addresses current learner or workplace needs and shows some consideration for future trends. It aligns with national or international standards. Clear alignment with current standards, moderate stakeholder engagement, some evidence of future-oriented planning.	The innovation effectively addresses both current and future learner or workplace needs. It demonstrates strong relevance and alignment with industry trends and educational standards. Strong alignment with current and emerging standards, significant stakeholder engagement, clear evidence of future-oriented planning.	The innovation is exemplary in addressing both current and future learner or workplace needs. It sets a benchmark for relevance and alignment with industry trends and educational standards. Exceptional alignment with current and emerging standards, extensive stakeholder engagement, robust evidence of future-oriented planning and impact.
Drives curricular innovation and academic excellence at K-State, using new and/or flexible methods to present up-to-date and rigorous disciplinary learning experiences	The innovation does not contribute to curricular innovation or academic excellence. It lacks relevance and fails to align with K-State's strategic goals. No evidence of methods,	The innovation addresses some aspects of curricular innovation but lacks a comprehensive approach to academic excellence. It shows limited relevance to K-State's	The innovation adequately drives curricular innovation and academic excellence. It aligns with K-State's strategic goals and uses some new or flexible methods.	The innovation effectively drives curricular innovation and academic excellence. It demonstrates strong relevance and alignment with K-State's strategic	The innovation is exemplary in driving curricular innovation and academic excellence. It sets a benchmark for relevance and alignment with K-State's strategic

	minimal engagement with current academic standards, and no alignment with the Next-Gen K-State strategic plan.	goals. Some use of methods, limited alignment with current academic standards, and minimal consideration of the Next-Gen K-State strategic plan.	Clear use of methods, moderate alignment with current academic standards, and some evidence of alignment with the Next-Gen K-State strategic plan.	goals. Strong use of methods, significant alignment with current academic standards, and clear evidence of alignment with the Next-Gen K-State strategic plan.	goals. Exceptional methods, extensive alignment with current academic standards, and robust evidence of alignment with the Next-Gen K-State strategic plan.
Alignment with the K-State Opportunity Agenda  (Community Health and Well-Being, Sustainability, Global Food Security and Biosecurity, or Enabling Technologies)	The innovation does not align with any of the four K-State Opportunity Agenda focus areas and shows no contribution to grand societal challenges.	The innovation shows minimal or vague alignment with at least one of the K-State Opportunity Agenda focus areas (Community Health and Well-Being, Sustainability, Global Food Security and Biosecurity, or Enabling Technologies). Contribution is unclear or lacks depth.	The innovation adequately aligns with at least one Opportunity Agenda focus area. Some contribution to addressing related societal or economic challenges is evident.	The innovation aligns well with one or more Opportunity Agenda focus areas. Demonstrates clear relevance and potential to impact societal or economic challenges meaningfully.	The innovation strongly advances one or more K-State Opportunity Agenda focus areas. Shows robust interdisciplinary alignment and measurable impact on grand societal challenges, with outcomes contributing to community, environmental, or technological advancement.
Supports the long-term financial viability of the university	The innovation does not contribute to the financial viability of the university. It lacks a sustainable financial model and does not generate revenue or cost savings.	The innovation shows limited potential to support financial viability. It has some elements of a financial model but lacks comprehensive planning.	The innovation adequately supports financial viability. It includes a sustainable financial model and demonstrates potential for moderate revenue	The innovation effectively supports financial viability. It has a strong financial model and demonstrates significant potential for revenue	The innovation is exemplary in supporting financial viability. It has an exceptional financial model and demonstrates extensive potential

	No evidence of financial planning, minimal or no potential for revenue generation or cost savings.	Some evidence of financial planning, limited potential for revenue generation or cost savings.	generation or cost savings. Clear evidence of financial planning, moderate potential for revenue generation or cost savings.	generation or cost savings. Strong evidence of financial planning, significant potential for revenue generation or cost savings.	for revenue generation or cost savings. Exceptional evidence of financial planning, extensive potential for revenue generation or cost savings.
Sustainability of the program long term after the initial investment is spent	No clear plan is provided, or the plan is unrealistic and not feasible. No resources are identified. No sustainability strategies are provided. No evidence of potential success.	The plan is vague, lacks detail, and has major feasibility issues. Few resources are identified and lack detail. Few sustainability strategies are provided, lacking detail. Minimal evidence of potential success.	The plan is somewhat clear but lacks specifics. It is feasible but has some issues. Some resources are identified but are not comprehensive. Some sustainability strategies are provided, but again are not comprehensive. Some evidence of potential success.	The plan is clear with some specifics. The plan is mostly feasible with minor issues. Most necessary resources are identified. Most sustainability strategies are identified. Good evidence of potential success.	The plan is very clear and detailed. The plan is highly feasible and realistic. All necessary resources are clearly identified. Comprehensive and detailed sustainability strategies. Strong evidence of potential success.
Innovation level of the program	Not innovative.	Limited innovation.	Moderately innovative.	Innovative and somewhat needed.	Highly innovative and needed in the field.