



Foothill College Academic Senate

Educational Technology Tool Adoption Rubric

Approved March 15, 2021

If an educational technology tool needs to be evaluated before it is made available to Foothill College, this rubric will be used by the Academic Senate's Committee On Online Learning (COOL), most likely by the COOL Technology Tools sub-committee.¹

The following questions generally should be asked and investigated:

Who will the tool serve?

What need does this fill?

The tool doesn't have to be perfect, but is it better than the alternatives?

Questions for Equity consideration:

Questions to ask the vendor:

Does your company have an equity statement?

What were the most important considerations to you as you developed the tool?

What feedback did you receive from students? Did this feedback come from varying demographic groups? What are the demographics of the students you surveyed?

What feedback did you receive from faculty? Did this feedback come from varying faculty demographic groups? What are the demographics of the faculty you surveyed?

¹ Special thanks to the COOL Technology Tools Sub-Committee who worked on this rubric: organizer Baba Kofi Weusijana, Patricia Crespo-Martin, Carolyn Holcroft, Brian Lewis, Bitia Mazloom, Mike Murphy, and Online Learning Dean Lené Whitley-Putz

The following rubric must be used as the primary evaluation of the tool.

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Serious Concerns
Racial Equity	Tool is specifically designed to decrease disproportionate impact for African American, Latinx, and/or Pacific Islander students	Tool has demonstrated ability to decrease disproportionate impact for African American, Latinx, and/or Pacific Islander students	No evidence of consideration of possible disproportional impact to African American, Latinx, and/or Pacific Islander students	Demonstrated disproportionate impact (either qualitative or quantitative evidence) for African American, Latinx, and/or Pacific Islander students
Equity	Tool is specifically designed to decrease disproportionate impact for other marginalized student groups	Tool has demonstrated ability to decrease disproportionate impact for other marginalized student groups	No evidence of consideration of possible disproportional impact to other marginalized student groups	Demonstrated disproportionate impact (either qualitative or quantitative evidence) for other marginalized student groups
Accessibility	Tool meets WCAG 2.0 standards, a VPAT was provided, and the tool undergoes 3 rd party testing	Tool meets WCAG 2.0 standards, a VPAT was provided	Some aspects of the tool are not 100% accessible, but meaningful workarounds provide equitable access	Important aspects of the tool are not accessible
Security & Privacy	The provider has a well-articulated security policy, student data is not gathered. Student privacy is paramount. Students are not required to have a separate account to use the tool	The provider has a well-articulated security policy, student data is gathered, but not monetized and is fully protected.	The provider has a well-articulated security policy, but the tool requires students to have an account outside our institution	The provider does not have a security policy and/or keeps and uses student data for purposes outside our use

Functionality	The tool has a user-friendly interface and is easy for instructors and students to become skillful with in a personalized and intuitive manner.	The tool requires specific training, but the provider has excellent training to support adoption.	The tool requires specific training and has a high learning curve that may affect widespread adoption	The interface is not user-friendly for either the instructor or learner; it is cumbersome, unintuitive, rigid, and inflexible.
Mobile Design	The tool is specifically designed to support use on mobile devices, and works seamlessly with the LMS or includes a free app	As appropriate, the tool works on mobile devices there is little to no functional difference between the mobile and the desktop version, regardless of the device used to access it.	Some features of the tools are not accessible on a mobile device, or the app has limited features when using a mobile device.	The tool is not mobile-friendly, or the mobile app functions poorly such that core features are not reliable or non-existent. Significant difference in functionality depending on the mobile device's operating system used to access the tool.
LMS (such as Canvas) Integration	SSO integration with LMS that offers full functionality of the tool	Integrates with LMS, but not with full functionality	Requires a separate log in, but embeds within the LMS	Can only be accessed via a link within the LMS, and all functionality takes place outside of the LMS
Implementation Support	Implementation and ongoing	Implementation and ongoing support is provided during business hours	Limited implementation and ongoing support is offered	Lacks implementation or ongoing support
Technical Support	Support for both faculty and students is provided during extended hours	Support for both faculty and students is provided	Limited support for faculty and students is provided	No support is offered for faculty or students
Cost	At or lower than comparable options	Within 5% of comparable options	Higher than comparable options by over 10%	More than 20% over comparable options