

## Resource Request Ranking Rubric

### 2020-21 Annual Program Review /Comprehensive Program Review

#### Resource Request Ranking Criteria

Budget Advisory (BAC), Facilities Planning (FPC), Instructional Equipment & Library Materials (IELM),  
Technology Planning (TPC), Faculty & Classified Prioritization Committees

**Definition of “resource request”:** request for an additional allocation to be made for budget, equipment, facilities, positions for the program, department or unit.

<b>Name of Committee Member:</b>	
<b>Instructions:</b> Members should offer a total score based on the criteria. Committees rank requests based on members’ scores.	
<b>Scoring:</b> Assign a score for each ranking criteria on a scale of 1-4. Scores then totaled in adjacent box. 1 (Low) – Minimal connection to the criteria 2 (Fair) – Partial connection to the criteria 3 (Good) - Connected to the criteria, supported with examples 4 (Superior) – Fully connected to the criteria, supported with examples	<b>TOTAL SCORE (on 16)</b>

RANKING CRITERIA	SCORE	DEFINITION/ EXPLANATION of CRITERIA
1. Department Background & Performance		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The request is essential to the ability of the program, department, or service to provide quality educational services.</li> <li>The request shows evidence that the improvement will enable a program or service to offer educational opportunities that respond to the cultural, economic, social, and workforce needs of the greater Bay Area and increase community partnerships and global awareness.</li> <li>This request is justified from patterns over the last three years (supporting information: # sections, enrollment, %success/retention, fill rate average, #appointments, total students served, #orientations/workshops, #SEPs completed).</li> <li>The request impacts: student performance and outcomes, college's accreditation status and fiscal viability.</li> </ul>
2. Aligned with Institutional Planning: Education Master Plan, College Strategic & Equity Plans, Facilities & Technology Master Plans.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The request is aligned with one or all of the plans.</li> </ul>
3. Viability of the program, department or unit, including: immediate health or safety risk, and legal mandates.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The request addresses an immediate health or safety risk to the public, personnel or students.</li> <li>The request addresses a legal mandate, i.e. safety protocols, and/or disability access (ADA). Cite applicable code where appropriate.</li> </ul>
4. Assessment results (could include: SAO/SLO/PLO/ILO /AUO)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The request is supported by assessment results.</li> <li>The request addresses potential growth and student demand through curriculum development/updates and supports student access, equity and success.</li> <li>The request shows evidence of an increased demand for program, department or unit services; direct impact on student /academic success.</li> </ul>

Other considerations (non-scored) used to inform your overall committee rankings:

1. Did the program, department or unit receive funding for a request last year? Did they use these funds effectively?
2. Was the request for the resource **not** funded in the last year?
3. Was there a loss of funding (outside of Fund 01) in the last fiscal year that makes this request necessary?
4. Is there a refresh cycle/maintenance requirement/recurring cost associated with this request i.e. software annual renewal, technology refresh every three years?