

Educational Technology Tool Adoption Rubric

FOOTHILL COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE

Original Date: March 15, 2021

Update Date: TBA, 2026

Overview

This rubric is used by the **Teaching with Technology (TwT)** committee to evaluate new technology tools for campus-wide or classroom adoption at Foothill College.

Questions that should generally be asked and investigated

- Who will the tool serve?
- What need does the tool fill?
- The tool doesn't have to be perfect, but how is the tool better than alternatives or an improvement in the current tool(s) being used?

Questions to Ask the Vendor

- Does your company have an equity statement?
- What key considerations guided the development of this tool in relation to student learning, accessibility, and effective instructional support?
- What student feedback did you receive, did it reflect diverse demographic perspectives, and what changes were implemented in response?
- What faculty feedback did you receive, did it reflect diverse demographic perspectives, and what changes were implemented in response?

Tools that collect data or use Artificial Intelligence (AI)

- What student data is collected, where is it stored, and how long is it retained?
- Is any student data used to train AI models or shared with third parties?
- What data protection measures are in place?
- Has the organization experienced any significant data breaches?

1. Security & Privacy

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
Security Policy	Provider has a well-articulated security policy.	Provider has a well-articulated security policy; student data is gathered but not monetized and is protected.	Provider has a security policy, but the tool requires students to have an account outside our institution.	Provider does not have a security policy and/or uses student data for purposes outside our use.
Data protection	Data collection is minimized and used only for instructional purposes; clear retention limits; compliance with FERPA and California data privacy laws. Clear process for users to remove personal data	Student data is gathered but not monetized and is protected complying with FERPA and California privacy laws.	Data gathering and retention policy is unclear. Tool complies with FERPA and California Privacy laws	Tool does not comply with FERPA and California privacy laws. Data is used beyond instructional purposes.

2. Equity

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
Disproportionate Impact	Tool is specifically designed to decrease disproportionate impact and includes documented bias testing or impact data	Tool has demonstrated the ability to decrease disproportionate impact	No evidence of consideration of possible disproportional impact to specific student populations	Demonstrated disproportionate impact (either qualitative or quantitative evidence) for specific student populations
Equity	Tool is proactively designed with inclusive features and flexible options that support multiple means of representation, e.g., multilingual supports, neurodivergent-friendly interface, adaptable navigation action and engagement	Tool includes specific inclusive and flexible design features that benefit diverse learner populations beyond minimum accessibility standards.	Limited evidence of inclusive or flexible design; tool relies primarily on a single mode of interaction	Tool enforces a rigid, one-size-fits-all instructional approach that may disadvantage certain student populations.

DRAFT

3. Accessibility (Section 508 / VPAT)

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
Compliance	Meets all WCAG 2.1 AA or higher standards. Up-to-date VPAT provided and verified. Third party accessibility testing conducted	Meets WCAG 2.1 (or higher) standards; VPAT provided.	Some aspects not fully accessible but workarounds exist.	Major accessibility hurdles exist (e.g., screen reader issues, no captions). No VPAT available. Significant barriers to use for students with disabilities.

4. AI Transparency & Responsible Use

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
Responsible use	AI clearly disclosed; human oversight maintained; Transparent disclosure around any AI decision making process. when feasible, alternative pathways available for AI-dependent features; vendor provides detailed documentation regarding model training data sources.	AI use disclosed; human oversight present; vendor provides general documentation regarding AI training practices.	AI functionality not clearly explained; limited transparency.	AI operates opaquely; automated decision-making replaces instructor judgment without meaningful human oversight.
AI Models	No model training without institutional agreement; Source of model training material disclosed; frequency of model updates documented			

5. Functionality

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
Mobile Design	Specifically designed for mobile; works seamlessly with LMS or includes a free app.	Works on mobile with no functional difference from desktop version.	Some features are not accessible on mobile; app has limited features.	Not mobile-friendly; core features are unreliable on mobile devices.
User Interface	Tool has a user-friendly interface; easy for instructors and students to become skillful intuitively.	Tool requires specific training, but the provider has excellent support materials.	Tool has a high learning curve that may affect widespread adoption.	Interface is cumbersome, unintuitive, and inflexible for both instructor and learner.
Training	The tool has a user-friendly interface and is easy for instructors and students to become skillful without extensive training	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.
Technical Support	Support for both faculty and students is provided during extended hours. Vendor provides a way to report biases or other issues and there is a clear explanation of how those reports are handled.	Support for both faculty and students is provided	Limited support for faculty and students is provided	No support is offered for faculty or students

6. Cost

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
Licensing & Cost to Institution	At or lower than comparable options	Within 5% of comparable options	Higher than comparable options by over 10%.	More than 20% over comparable options

7. Canvas Integration

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
LMS Connectivity	SSO integration with Canvas that offers full functionality of the tool.	Integrates with Canvas but not with full functionality.	Requires a separate login but embeds within Canvas.	Can only be accessed via a link; all functionality is outside Canvas.

8. Implementation Support

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Minor Concerns	Major Concerns
LMS Connectivity	Clear rollout and onboarding plan provided; live or recorded training available to faculty and staff; technical support available beyond standard business hours	Standard implementation resources during business hours (e.g., live group webinars, detailed documentation) and clear, structured	Implementation relies almost entirely on self-guided tutorials with little to no live vendor assistance.	No implementation support provided.

Committee Notes:

This rubric was transitioned from the Committee on Online Learning (COOL) to **Teaching With Technology (TWT)** to reflect the expanded scope of technology-enhanced education.