Instructional Units
Rubric

| Rubric <br> Resource Allocation 2020-2021 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I. | Accomplishments/Progress on <br> Recommendations | Rubric |
| II. | Other Accomplishments | $0-5$ |
| (Max 15 pts) | Strong $=15 \mathrm{pts}$ <br> Good $=12 \mathrm{pts}$ <br> Moderate $=9$ pts <br> Weak $=6$ pts |  |
| III. | Justification for request | $0-20$ points based on factors identified as releva |

## Alignment with ASC-approved

considerations
Don't punish a deparment for having a faculty member doing release time work
Committee participation by department nembers?

Department asked for position in the $p$ but did not obtain a new hire (request w near the top)
Replace retirement
Will be teaching transfer courses (GE
and major)
Unit plan documents need
Growth (new certificates and transfer
majors were created ... need faculty to staff)
Labor market and transfer degrees, for example

|  | (Max 20 pts) | considerations including expected outcomes, timeline, clarity and quality of justification, etc.; an whether or not theneed was identified and validated through program review |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IV. | Performance metrics (Max. 15 pts ) |  |
|  | Productivity or fill rate, if appropriate, for the prior years <br> (FTES/FTEF, Max. 5 pts) | $>16.5$ FTES/FTEF and/or $>80 \%$ fill rate $=5$ poin <br> $<16.5$ and/or $<80 \%$ fill rate $=1$ to 4 points |
|  | Average success and retention rate for th prior years <br> (Max. 5 pts) | $\begin{aligned} & >70=5 \text { points } \\ & 65-70=3 \text { points } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Degrees/Certificates awarded (Max 5 pts) | $<65=0$ |
| V. | Divison Prioritization (Max 10 pts) | Other considerations 0-10 points based on factors identified as relevant including safety issues, Federal, State and/or Accrediation mandates, grov or outside Accrediting info/data, external reviews, Certificates of Accomplishment awarded, availability of other sources of funding, etc. | faculty hiring

ational Accreditation requires faculty o the work
Don't punish for having hired someone ast year if there is still a need this yea

## Analysis by KK

Hard to make progress on program recommendations if nder-staffed. Is the idea to 'prove' that its not some oth structural factor besides staffing causing this need

How the heck does a department "accomplish" if it is und staffed?

## OK with FTES/FTEF b/c then the PT/FT ratio is not a

 scheduling issueNote that schedilng should be student-need focused - sc there are a few sections at other times with lower fill justified

This is an INVERSE scale, right? With lower retention/success, more of a need for a new faculty memb

