

Criteria	Insufficient	Sufficient Idea	Good
Chosen innovation	The innovation is described ambiguously and is not related to a challenge, opportunity or problem in education.	The innovation is described somewhat clearly and has a limited connection to a challenge, opportunity or problem in education.	The innovation is clearly described, relates well to a challenge, opportunity or problem in education and has similarities with previous innovations.
Underpinning	The innovation lacks a solid underpinning and relevant sources, experiential knowledge, data or literature review, and there is no theory of change or consideration of the student perspective. No thought has been given to how the innovation will be integrated into education (innovation replaces existing activities, one gets more time, etc.)	The innovation has limited evidence from experiential knowledge, data or literature review, and the theory of change is unclear or missing, with limited attention to the student perspective. Consideration has been given to how the innovation is integrated into education (innovation replaces existing activities, people are given more time, etc.)	The innovation is well supported by relevant experiential knowledge, data and/or literature, has a clear theory of change and the student perspective is considered. Good consideration has been given to how the innovation is integrated into education (innovation replaces existing activities, people are given more time, etc.)
Innovativeness	Innovation does not offer sustainable change or improvement. The innovation does not demonstrate a new approach or does not deviate from existing practice.	Innovation offers a small improvement and integrates some sustainable changes. The application contains a moderately new approach or solution but differs little from established practice.	Innovation offers a clear improvement and integrates sustainable change with a new approach that differs from existing practice.
Evaluation	Evaluation is inadequate or not defined. The stated goals for innovation are not reflected in the evaluation proposal.	Evaluation is narrowly defined and lacks detail. The stated goals for innovation are not all reflected in the evaluation proposal.	Evaluation is well defined with clear indicators and expectations. The goals set for the innovation are reflected in the evaluation proposal.

Sharing knowledge	Plan for knowledge sharing is inadequate or non-existent.	Plan for knowledge sharing is sufficient with some steps for sharing within the institute. One or two forms of knowledge sharing are described.	Plan for knowledge sharing is good with clear steps for sharing within faculty and/or beyond. Several forms of knowledge sharing have been described.
Prerequisites			
Consent ED	There has been no consultation with the ED.	The ED agreed to the proposal.	The ED agreed to the proposal.
Policy	Project does not align with university and/or faculty vision and policies.	Project aligns sufficiently with university and/or faculty vision and policies.	Project aligns well with university and/or faculty vision and policies.
Planning	Planning is unclear or unrealistic.	Planning is adequate with a basic timeline.	Planning is clear and realistic with a solid timeline.
Feasibility/capacity	No consideration has been given to the feasibility of the project.	Project shows sufficient feasibility with minimal embedding in the activities.	The feasibility of the project is well described and seems realistic, with reasonable embedding in the activities.
Budget	The budget is unclear or missing.	The budget is laid out but lacks clarity or detail.	The budget is clear and well laid out.
Continuity	Continuity is not or hardly guaranteed.	Continuity is not or hardly guaranteed.	Continuity is well secured with a clear plan.