**Resource Request Review/Ranking Procedures:**

- After discussing and understanding each position, each person will apply the scoring rubric to each requested position. The scoring rubric consists of 8 areas of consideration and used a scale of 5 (highest) to 0 (lowest).

- Upon completing the initial scoring rubric, deans/directors will meet and discuss the questions and concerns about the scoring. Assigned scores will then be adjusted and totaled by each person for each resource item requested.

- For each Type of Resource Request the relative placement was determined. The resulting rank order for each position was then totaled with the lowest Relative Place Score being ranked the highest in priority.

- Program review resource requests are forwarded for prioritization through established integrated planning processes for operational requests and for planning requests.

- Operational requests are aggregated and prioritized in collaboration with appropriate areas or departments. The prioritized budget requests are forwarded up through the administrative structure to the respective Vice President.

- The collaboration that takes place from the unit levels to the Vice President level helps define the resource allocation direction given the objectives of area strategic planning and the finite resources at hand. The prioritized recommendations of the Vice President will then be summarized into one or several combined resource requests of $5,000 or more, and each forwarded to the Budget Planning Committee.

### Personnel Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Requested Position</th>
<th>Type of Position</th>
<th>Relative Placement Score (lower = better)</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Decision (Internal funding? Refer for categorical funding? Refer for budget augmentation?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMD</td>
<td>Clerical/ISS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Planning Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Requested Budget Item (Technology, Facilities, Budget, Professional Development)</th>
<th>Type of Budget Requested</th>
<th>Relative Placement Score (lower = better)</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Decision (Internal funding? Refer for categorical funding? Refer for budget augmentation?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCORING CONSIDERATIONS DISCUSSION

1. **Relationship to Institutional Plans**: Does the request have a connection to the Strategic Plan goals, Educational and other Master Plan goals, and annual plan objectives? A request would significantly impact or influence the ultimate achievement of an outcome would have a high point value (5 points). A request that has no or little connection or impact would be of a low point value (0 points).

2. **Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)**: Does the request have a connection to the ACCJC accreditation standards: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness, Student Learning Programs and Services, Resources, and Leadership and Governance? A request that would help this College significantly maintain accreditation or address identified areas of accreditation concern would have a high nexus (5 points). A request that has no or little connection or impact would be of a low nexus (0 points).

3. **Regulatory Compliance**: Does the request respond to a statute (i.e., law), regulation, or administrative procedure from an external agency? A request that ensures that the College complies with legal or policy requirement made of the College would have the highest need (5 points). A request that has no regulatory compliance would be rated low (0 points).

4. **Current Need**: Does the request meet a current need (not a “nice to have” situation)? If a request does, the points awarded should be based on the degree of significance and pervasiveness of the problem. If a request does not address a current need, it would be rated low (0 points).

5. **Future Need**: Does the staffing request meet a future (2014-2017) need (not a “nice to have” situation) that has not shown itself yet? If a request does, the points awarded should be based on the degree of significance and pervasiveness of the perceived problem. If a request does not address a current need, it would be rated low (0 points).

6. **Improves Program and Student Success**: Will the request enhance the core functions, efficiency, and/or effectiveness of the requestor’s program/department or is it a “nice to have”? A request that improves the requestor’s service delivery, efficiency, effectiveness and capacity to positively affect student success would rate high (5 points). One that fails to demonstrate improvement of the requestor would be rated low (0 points).

7. **Involves Other Units**: Will the request incorporate and benefit other College programs/department or is it limited to the requestor alone? The greater the involvement of other units beyond the requestor’s the higher the rating (5 points).

8. **District-wide Impact**: Will the request have district-wide impact? The wider that impact of the request if granted, the higher the rating (5 points) should be.

RELATIVE PLACEMENT SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

1. Rate each position by the 8 scoring considerations using a scale of 5 points (highest) to 0 (lowest). Total your raw scores for each position.

2. We will determine the relative placement of each position within each Type of request by totaling the individual dean/director’s relative placement scores for a particular position. Example: For AMD position #1, Director A may give a relative placement score of “1”, Director B may give a score of “4” and Director C may give a score of “3” for a combined relative placement of “8”. However, for AMD position #2, the scoring was “2” + “3” + “2” for a total of “7”.
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**Review to recommend for further evaluation**
The Deans/Directors will develop action plans to address weaknesses identified in the program review. The action plan will be tracked for progress and information considered for the annual planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>