## 2022-2023 Needs Assessment Timeline

August 29, 2022 - Needs Assessment Forms sent to Managers and Department Chairs
September 23, 2022 - Needs Assessment Workshop 9:00-10:30 am - Location TBD
October 14, 2022 - Needs Assessment Workshop 9:00-10:30 am - Location TBD
November 2, 2022 - Needs Assessment Forms due to Committee
November 4, 2022 - December 2, 2022 - Committee Prioritization
November 4, 2022 - Optional Listening Session: 3 minutes to share information with the Committee
November 12, 2022 - Optional Listening Session: 3 minutes to share information with the Committee
December 7, 2022 - Prioritization results submitted to President's Cabinet, College Council, Academic Senate, Managers, and Department Chairs

TBD - College Council completes funding process
TBD - Funding results are reported to Academic Senate, Managers and Department Chairs

## Needs Assessment Form and Instructions:

- Departments may make more than one request in each category
- Estimated Cost for faculty and classified professionals will be provided by the committee
- Include in estimated cost for equipment, facilities, and technology any long-term costs (ie: license renewal) as applicable
- Facilities \& Technology Requests should be reviewed by the Facilities \& Safety Committee or Technology Committee prior to submission to Program Review.


## 2022: Needs Assessment Form

Part 1: Data
Instructional Programs Only: Data
Q1: Capacity - Fill Rate Based on Course Caps (3-year average): $\qquad$

| Part 1: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 - 4}$ Points | 5-7 Points | $\mathbf{8 - 1 0 ~ P o i n t s ~}$ | Score |  |
| Average Fill Rate is $60 \%-$ <br> $72 \%$ | Average Fill Rate is $73 \%-$ <br> $88 \%$ | Average Fill Rate is $89 \%$ or <br> higher |  |  |

## Q2 Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)

$\qquad$

| Part 1: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 Points | 1-4 Points | 5-7 Points | 8-10 Points | Score |
| The gap between FTF and FTEF is less than 2.00. | The gap between FTF and FTEF is between 2.00 and 4.99. | The gap between FTF and FTEF is between 5.00 and 7.99 OR program has no FT faculty. | The gap between FTF and FTEF is greater than 8.00. |  |


|  | Score |
| ---: | ---: |
| Part 1: Q1 |  |
| Part 1: Q2 |  |
| Total |  |
| Weighted Total (x4) |  |

(Proceed to Part 2: Narrative)

## Part 1: Student Services and Administrative Programs Only

Q1 Minimum required/recommended staff to student ratio or other similar metric (e.g., number of recommended custodians or groundkeepers per sq. ft.) vs current ratio. Recommended sources might include CCR Title 5, Division 6, external accrediting bodies, comparison with other Community Colleges, and/or other reliable authorities.

| Part 1: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric-For Committee Use Only. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0}$ Points | $\mathbf{1 - 4}$ Points | $\mathbf{5 - 7}$ Points | $\mathbf{8 - 1 0}$ Points | Score |  |
| Current staffing is | Current staffing is | Current staffing is | Current staffing |  |  |
| on par with | 25\% or less under | between $26 \%$ and | more than $50 \%$ |  |  |
| recommended | recommended | $50 \%$ under | under |  |  |
| staffing metrics. | staffing metric. | recommended staffing | recommended |  |  |
|  |  | metric. |  |  |  |
| staffing metric. |  |  |  |  |  |

Q2 Provide an analysis and evaluation of the request's impact, directly or indirectly, on student success and/or satisfaction. Recommended data points might include campus climate surveys, success/retention of population served compared to general population, outcomes assessment, or student feedback.

Part 1: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric-For Committee Use Only.

| 1-4 Points | 5-7 Points | 8-10 Points | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Request is minimally <br> supported by data or <br> moderately supported by 1 <br> point of data. | Request is supported by 2 <br> points of data. | Request is supported by <br> 3 or more points of data. |  |

## (Proceed to Part 2: Narrative

|  | Score |
| ---: | :--- |
| Part 1: Q1 |  |
| Part 1: Q2 |  |
| Total |  |
| Weighted Total (x4) |  |
|  |  |

## Part 2: Narrative: All Programs

Q1: How does the department and the request(s) align with the Mission, Vision, and Values of the College?

Q2: Referencing the department's data and planning documents provide a rationale each item requested.

| Brief Rationale |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| FACULTY | Estimated Cost |
| 1. |  |
| CLASSIFIED |  |
| 1. | Estimated Cost |
| EQUIPMENT |  |
| 1. | Estimated Cost |
| FACILITIES |  |
| 1. | Estimated Cost |
| TECHNOLOGY |  |
| 1. |  |
| BUDGET |  |
| 1. |  |

## Rubric Part 2: Narrative - For Committee Use Only

Q1 Program request clearly supports SBVC's mission, vision, and values

| $\mathbf{1 - 4}$ Points | $\mathbf{5 - 7}$ Points | $\mathbf{8 - 1 0}$ Points | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Request aligns minimally <br> with some combination of <br> SBVC's mission, vision, <br> and values. | Request aligns with <br> most aspects of <br> SBVC's mission, | Request clearly <br> aligns with all <br> aspects of SBVC's |  |

Q2: Program's Rationale, Data, Outcomes Assessment, Program Efficacy and Planning, over the past three years supports the request.

| 1-4 Points | $\mathbf{5 - 7}$ Points | $\mathbf{8 - 1 0 \text { Points }}$ | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Written (and optional verbal) <br> Request is minimally <br> supported by data analysis, <br> Outcomes and Planning, or <br> moderately supported by 1 <br> area | Written (and optional <br> verbal) Request is <br> supported by 2 areas. | Written (and optional <br> verbal) Request is <br> supported by 4 or <br> more areas. |  |
| WEIGHTED SECTION TOTAL |  |  |  |
| (x4) |  |  |  |


| If Division Rank is | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| The Point Value is | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |


| Weighted Total |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| Part 1 |  |
| Part 2 Q1 |  |
| Part 2 Q2 |  |
| Division Rank |  |
| TOTAL SCORE |  |

