

ACerS Innovation Fund

Proposal Evaluation Rubric

FOR INTERNAL USE BY THE INNOVATION FUND COMMITTEE (IFC)

Proposal Title: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Scoring: 1 = Inadequate 2 = Weak 3 = Adequate 4 = Strong 5 = Exceptional

Criterion	Weight	1 – Inadequate	2 – Weak	3 – Adequate	4 – Strong	5 – Exceptional	IFC Score	Weighted Score
Revenue Potential & ROI	35%	No revenue model described; unclear how money would be recouped. Inability to scale.	Vague financial intent; revenue path is speculative or poorly defined. Difficulty scaling.	Reasonable revenue model described but lacks supporting detail or projections. Some challenges scaling.	Clear, realistic revenue model with supporting projections; payback timeline is credible. Moderately scalable.	Compelling revenue model with detailed projections; strong likelihood of exceeding ROI expectations. Highly scalable.		
Benefit to the Society & Community	20%	No clear benefit to ACerS or the community	Marginal benefit; serves a very narrow audience	Moderate benefit; serves a meaningful segment of the community	Strong benefit; addresses a clear need and could enhance ACerS' visibility or value proposition	Exceptional benefit; fills a significant gap and could become a flagship offering		
Feasibility & Implementation Plan	20%	No implementation plan provided. Inability to repeat the process.	Vague plan with unrealistic timeline or unclear resource needs. Difficulty repeating the process.	Reasonable plan but missing key details (e.g., milestones, dependencies, staff needs). Some hurdles repeating the process.	Well-structured plan with clear milestones, timeline, and realistic staff support requirements. Moderately repeatable process.	Highly detailed, actionable plan; proposers demonstrate relevant experience and have anticipated risks. Highly repeatable process.		
Innovation & Differentiation	15%	Duplicates an existing ACerS offering or is not a product/service	Minor variation on something ACerS already does	Somewhat new but similar offerings exist elsewhere in the market	Clearly new to ACerS and addresses an unmet need	Highly innovative; creates a new category of value for the Society		
Budget Appropriateness	5%	No budget or budget is clearly unrealistic	Budget is incomplete or poorly justified	Budget is reasonable but lacks detail in some areas	Well-detailed budget with clear justification for all line items	Highly detailed budget; demonstrates cost-consciousness and smart use of resources		
Assessment Methodology	5%	No assessment methodology provided	Vague metrics; unclear how success would be determined	Reasonable metrics defined but methodology for tracking is unclear	Clear, measurable metrics with a defined process for tracking and reporting	Comprehensive methodology with specific KPIs, reporting cadence, and decision points for continuation/discontinuation		
WEIGHTED TOTAL								/ 5.00

Recommendation

- A. Fund the project as proposed
 B. Fund a smaller pilot program
 C. Decline the project

If recommending Option B, describe the suggested pilot scope:

Comments / Notes:

Scoring Guide

Weighted Total = Σ (Score \times Weight). Multiply each criterion's score (1–5) by its weight, then sum.

Suggested thresholds (adjustable by the IFC):

- 4.0–5.0: Strong candidate for full funding (Option A)
- 3.0–3.9: Consider for pilot funding (Option B) or request revisions
- Below 3.0: Likely decline (Option C); encourage resubmission with improvements