***Personnel 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 6 areas of consideration that have 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.

 **Personnel Request**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AREA | Requested Position | Type of Position | Rank Order | Decision (Internal funding? Refer for categorical funding? Refer for budget augmentation?) |
| Admin 1 Manager | Classified Confidential |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

 **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. **Mission Critical:** Is the position critical to carrying out the operations of your program. 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. **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).
6. **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.

**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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Area | Action Plan |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |