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All requests will be scored using the rubric that follows on page 3. Use the guidance in the bullets below to strengthen your justification. This will help the scoring committee understand your request and increases the chances that your request will receive a higher score.

Please note, the rubric is **not a ranking** of which request has the most merit, rather, it is a tool the committee will use to measure **how well** the resource request has been **justified**. Keep in mind, District resource requests will go through the collegial consultation process and ultimately, Chancellor’s Cabinet will make the determination on what gets funded. As such, the committee will use the rubric, and the supporting evidence, to help refine all resource requests with the goal of maximizing the possibility that the DSO needs will be clearly understood and sufficiently considered for approval.

# Category 1: Program Review

Requests with strong justification will:

* Show a clear connection to Program Review planning goals and objectives

# Category 2: Outcomes Assessment

Requests with strong justification will:

* Provide clear connection to results of specific goals and objectives and Service Area Outcome assessments listed in the 4-year and/or 2-year review
* Include consideration of how the request will improve outcome assessment (opportunity to identify missing outcomes)

# Category 3: Institutional Alignment

Requests with strong justification will:

* Show a direct link/support for the District Mission, Values or Goals or one or more Institutional Goals (outlined in the Education Master Plan) and/or goals outlined in an EMP support plan (e.g., Tech Plan; Equity Plan, DSO plan etc.) – need to make a note somewhere that points out that the plan referenced may be old. Ask for plan year?
* Include consideration of the anticipated effect/outcome of the resource

*-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

# HIGH PRIORITY REQUEST (E.G., EXTERNAL MANDATE RISK ASSESSMENT)

If the requested resource supports a federal, state or local mandate, addresses health and safety, and/or is required to support programmatic accreditation or licensure already in place, that request will be given special consideration.

Please note, simply having a resource request that is “mandated” is not a necessary and sufficient condition for placing the request at the top of the District priority list. All “mandate-related” requests will be critically evaluated by the committee to verify the provided justification of the **self-assessed priority** and **level of** **risk**. Requests justified as high-risk mandates will be placed at the top of the district priority list and all other mandated requests will be considered with the larger pool of requests.

Also note, it is the responsibility of the department/requestor to provide evidence and justification for their **self-assessed priority** and **level of risk**. The committee will only review evidence provided with the submission but may ask for additional evidence or explanation if something is unclear.

|  |
| --- |
| **IS THE REQUEST LINKED TO A MANDATE?** |
|  |  | No – Complete the Resource Request Form |
|  |  | Yes – Complete the “Explanation of Mandate” form provided below **in addition** to the Resource Request Form |
|  |  |  |

**EXPLANATION OF MANDATE**

|  |
| --- |
| Please answer the questions below concerning the nature of the mandate, as it relates to your resource request. Please be specific in your responses and, to the extent possible, please use lay terminology that will be easily understood by the committee.  |
| Is this a federal, state or local mandate (e.g., state licensure, sustainability, health and safety)?: |  |
| Is this mandate given by a non-governmental governing body (e.g., accreditation, certification, contracts, etc.)?: |  |
| When did/does the mandate take effect?: |  |
| Please provide a reference for the mandate (e.g., an electronic document, a bill identifier [e.g., AB540], a link to a website): |  |
| In your assessment, is this mandate a low, medium or high priority?: |  |
| Please describe the nature of the mandate and why it is considered to have the above priority (be specific and use lay terminology)?: |  |
| How does the resource request comply with the mandate and mitigate the associated risk?: |  |
| Is there a consequence/penalty for failure to adhere to the mandate (Yes/No)?: |  |
| Is current funding designated for the mandate? If yes, why is additional funding needed?:  |  |
| Please describe the consequence/penalty (e.g., monetary or impact on accreditation): |  |

**Note:** The levels of risk are primarily distinguished by time and penalty.

**High:** (1) Takes effect in 2 or fewer years or requires an implementation time greater than 2 years (2) Has a monetary penalty or has an impact on operations.

**Medium:** (1) Takes effect in 2 or more years (2) Has a monetary penalty or has an impact on operations.

**Low:** (1) No penalty but failure to implement reflects poorly on the district.

*Questions for the committee:*

1. *How do we determine when to ask for a resubmission (e.g., when one response is weak?)*
2. *Do we want to meet with each requestor or just those ranked as #1 and those with a score below a certain cut off?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CRITERIA** | **NONE (0)** | **WEAK (1)** | **MODERATE (2)** | **STRONG (3)** | **SCORE** |
| **PROGRAM REVIEW** | Mandated Activities | Yes / No | Describes the mandate but no **e**xplanation of **risk mitigation** | Describes the mandate, **clear** explanation of **risk mitigation** | Describes the mandate, **clear and quantified** **explanation** of **risk mitigation** |  |
| High / Medium / Low |
| Relevance to 4-year plan  | Does not address | Request is incomplete and/or does not demonstrate a clear connection to Program Review 4-year plan. | Request is complete but does not demonstrate a clear **connection** to Program Review 4-year Plan. | Request is complete and demonstrates a clear **connection** to Program Review 4-year Plan. |  |
| Innovation:Sustainability, H&S, HR recruitment, Kiosk, Skills assessment  | Does not address If not addressed it needs to be resubmitted. | Requested resource has **weak** ties to emerging technologies, techniques, processes, and applications that prove adoption of best practices | Requested resource **has clear but weak** ties to emerging technologies, techniques, processes, and applications that prove adoption of best practices | Requested resource has **clear and strong** ties to emerging technologies, techniques, processes, and applications that prove adoption of best practices |  |
| **OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT** | Impact on Students | Does not address | Request acknowledges SAO assessments in the category generally but does not target specific assessments and the anticipated effect on those assessments. | Request clearly lists specific SAO assessments targeted in the category but does not discuss the anticipated effect on those assessments. | Request clearly lists specific SAO assessments targeted in the category and discusses the anticipated effect on those assessments. |  |
| Service Levels (customers) | Does not address | Request acknowledges SAO assessments in the category generally but does not target specific assessments and the anticipated effect on those assessments. | Request clearly lists specific SAO assessments targeted in the category but does not discuss the anticipated effect on those assessments. | Request clearly lists specific SAO assessments targeted in the category and discusses the anticipated effect on those assessments. |  |
| Effective Infrastructure/Processes (organizational infrastructure)  | Does not address | Request acknowledges SAO assessments in the category generally but does not target specific assessments and the anticipated effect on those assessments. | Request clearly lists specific SAO assessments targeted in the category but does not discuss the anticipated effect on those assessments. | Request clearly lists specific SAO assessments targeted in the category and discusses the anticipated effect on those assessments. |  |
| **INSTITUTIONAL ALIGNMENT** | Impact on Quality and Comprehensiveness of Program | Does not address | Request rationale is incomplete and/or does not demonstrate a clear connection to program quality and comprehensiveness. | Request rationale is, **complete**, but does not demonstration a clear **connection** to program quality and comprehensiveness. | Request rationale is clear, complete, includes consideration of sustainability, and/or demonstrates how the impact of the resource on the program will be evaluated for ongoing quality and comprehensiveness. |  |
| The Vision, Mission, and Goals (VMG) of the District or College Ed Master Plan (EMP)  | Does not address | Request **refers to** the VMG of the District **or** the institutional goals outlined in the College EMP **but fails** to demonstrate a **clear link** to or **support** for either. | Request demonstrates a **clear link** to and **support** for the VMG of the District **or** institutional goals outlined in the College EMP. | Request 1) has **clear link** to & **support** for the district VMG **or** specific institutional goals outlined in the college EMP, and 2) includes consideration of **how the impact of the resource will be evaluated** |  |
| The district strategic plan or college resource request  | Does not address | Request shows **general connection** to one or more initiative or plan | Request demonstrates a **clear** **link** to a specific initiative, operational plan, or EMP support plan | Request shows direct link and support for a specific operational plan or initiative, and includes consideration of how the impact of the resource will be evaluated |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | **TOTAL SCORE:**  |  |

\*\* results either weak or none will be sent back to department for more information/justification