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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Area** | **Related Components** | **Scoring Rubric** | **Score** |
| **Program Review** |  Program Review (PR)/Annual ProgramAssessment (APA) Student Learning Outcome Program Learning Outcome Service Area Outcome* Institutional Learning Outcome
* Goals Linked to SLO/PLO/SAO/ILO
* Unit/Division Plan

 Unit/Division Plan | **Max 20 points:****0 pts –** No demonstrated need supported by PR or APA**10 pts –** Demonstrates need from PR/APA andUnit/Division Plan**20 pts –** Demonstrates need from PR/APA, Unit/DivisionPlan with project goals linked to SLO/PLO/SAO/ILO |  |
| **Alignment with****Annual Institutional Goals** |  2012-13 Institutional Goals | **Max 20 points:***Sum points for all Institutional Goals for which the**RAP explicitly supports* **6 pts** - Student Success **5 pts -** Access, Persistence & Completion **4 pts -** Innovation & Improvement **2 pts -** Partnerships **2 pts -** Culture of Planning, Inquiry & Evidence **1 pts -** Growth & Efficiency |  |
| **Alignment with****Institutional****Plans** |  Education Master Plan (AY 2011-2016) Annual Institutional Goals Project Goals (RAP) | **Max 20 points:****0 pts** -demonstrates no support of Annual InstitutionalGoals or Educational Master Plan**5 pts -** Demonstrates support of Annual InstitutionalGoals *or* Educational Master Plan**15 pts -** Demonstrates support of Annual InstitutionalGoals *and* Educational Master Plan**20 pts -** Demonstrates support of Annual Institutional Goals *and* Educational Master Plan *with* stated project goals from Resource Allocation Proposal |  |
| **Measureable Assessment Outcomes** |  Project Goals (RAP) Project Outcomes (RAP) Student Learning Outcome Program Learning Outcome Service Area Outcome* Institutional Learning Outcome

 Key Indicators | **Max 20 points:****0 pts** -No outcomes**5 pts** -Documented measureable outcome(s)**10 pts** -Documented measureable outcome(s) tiedto SLO/PLO/SAO/ILO or Key Indicators**20 pts** -Documented measurable outcome(s) tied to SLO/PLO/SAO/ILO  *and* Key Indicators |  |
| **Implementation****Plan** |  Implementation Plan | **15 points**Demonstrates an implementation plan whichoutlines the steps needed to accomplish the specific proposal. |  |
| **Other Compelling Evidence**  | * Compliance
* Health & Safety
* Other
 | **20 Points:** |  |
|  | **Divisional Prioritization Bonus (Max 5)***Only for top 5 divisional priorities established by the**V.P. with input from the units* |  |
| **Total Points:** |  |

**Final Rating from PAR:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Rating** | **Score from PAR** | **Description** |
| Excellent | 100—120 |  |
| Good | 80—99 |  |
| Satisfactory | 60—79 |  |
| Not So Much | <59 |  |

A subgroup of the PIEAC will score all of the Resource Allocation Proposals according to the PAR and then report out the Overall Rating from the above scale. The subgroup will then report back all of the scores to the full committees and recommendations will be sent forward to College Council. The purpose of the PAR is not to assign a strict number that will automatically rank a proposal but rather to separate the proposals into categories according to predefined criteria.

Those proposals that are on the border will have an opportunity to come to PIEAC meeting to answer some follow-up questions and give more information if needed. This will not be used a time to lobby for their proposal but rather answer any additional questions members of the committee might have. All of the evidence for the proposal should have been presented in the original Resource Allocation Proposal.

**Program Review/Annual Assessment Level:**

At the program review level the PAL checklist should be used to be certain that all areas are covered in the RAP.

**Unit Plan Level:**

At the Dean level the Resource Allocation Proposals will be ranked according to the PAR so Deans can make informed decisions about which proposals to send forward in their Unit Plans. If a proposal does not have enough documented

support (scores low on the PAR) and the Dean decides not to send it forward as part of the Unit Plan then feedback will be sent back to the requesting department or service area so that the proposal may be updated or amended as necessary.

**Division Plan Level:**

At the Vice President level the Resource Allocation Proposals received from the Deans will be combined so there is a ranking for the entire Division. At this point if any RAP is not forwarded to PIEAC/Budget there will be feedback sent to the Dean who will then give feedback to the department or service are that submitted it.