**Needs Assessment Request
Instructional Faculty**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of person submitting request: |  |
| Program: |  |
| Division: |  |
| Divisional rank of request: |  |
| Position/title being requested: |  |
| Number of positions: |  |
| Program Review Efficacy Report current and on-cycle?: |  |
| Current Program Review Efficacy ranking (i.e., continuation, conditional, 1st year probation, 2nd year probation): |  |
| Recent (past 2 years) program external awards or accolades:  |  |

**Section 1: Program Data**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q1: Provide an analysis and evaluation of student success, retention, and FTEs data over the past three years. How does the data support the request?** |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric**  |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Request is minimally supported by student data or moderately supported by 1 point of data. *For example, student data is below or at campus average and does not support program growth; or student data is below or at campus average and one data points supports program growth.*  | Request is supported by 2 points of data. *For example, one measure of student data is below or at campus average and two data points support program growth.* | Request is supported by 3 or more points of data. *For example, all data points meet or exceed campus average supports program growth.* |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q2:** **Capacity - Fill Rate Based on Course Caps (3-year average):** Data is available in Tableau on the District Website: <https://public.tableau.com/profile/sbccd#!/vizhome/FCPPFall2019Dashboard007/Story1> |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric**  |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Average Fill Rate is 60% - 72% | Average Fill Rate is 73% - 88% | Average Fill Rate is 89% or higher |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 1: Q3 Demand** * 1. **Industry Demand**
	2. **Certificates and Degrees Awarded**
	3. **Catalog Demand**
 | Select one category (a, b, or c) that **best** illustrates the demand for the program. (Use of more than one demand category will not increase the number of points earned.) Provide an analysis and evaluation of how the data supports the request.Suggested data sources: EMP Sheets, College Catalog, Schedule of Classes, Labor Market Information (LMI), Environmental Scan, Occupational Outlook Handbook, and/or internal employment data collected from students. |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Q3 Committee Scoring Rubric** |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Industry and job demand is stable. Industry need is being met and there is no surplus of workers; **OR**Program certificates and degrees arestable ordeclining; **OR**Program offers 1 – 3 non-elective courses that satisfy general education for AA/AS, IGETC, CSU or UC requirements. Courses are offered regularly. | Industry and job demand is growing. Students who job out or graduate will obtain living wage positions; **OR**Program certificates and degrees arestable ormoderately increasing; **OR**Program offers 4 – 7 non-elective courses that satisfy general education for AA/AS, IGETC, CSU or UC requirements. Courses are offered regularly.  | Industry and job demand is growing, and the demand for employees is 25% higher than the number of qualified graduates. Students who job out or graduate will obtain living wage positions; **OR**Program certificates and degrees demonstrate consistent growth; **OR**Program offers 8 or more non-elective courses that satisfy graduation requirements, IGETC, CSU or UC requirements. Courses are offered regularly. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 1: Q4 Recent EMP Sheets (1 Point)** Program has completed EMP Sheets for the past 3 years. EMP Sheets demonstrate thorough evaluation, discuss progress on short- and long-term planning goals, and are not a cut and paste from previous EMPs.  |  |
| **SECTION TOTAL** |  |
| **WEIGHTED SECTION TOTAL****(x3)** |  |

**Section 2: Faculty Data**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q1 Full-Time to Part-Time Faculty Ratio.** Recommended data source: SBCCD District 75:25 [https://public.tableau.com/profile/sbccd#!/vizhome/Full-TimePart-TimeRatiobySBCCDandCollege/Full-TimePart-TimeRatiobySBCCDandCollege](https://public.tableau.com/profile/sbccd%23%21/vizhome/Full-TimePart-TimeRatiobySBCCDandCollege/Full-TimePart-TimeRatiobySBCCDandCollege) |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric** |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| 40-55% | 56-70% | 71% + |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q2 Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)** Recommended Data source: EMP One-Sheets |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric** |
| **0 Points** | **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 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. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q3 Unfulfilled Needs** Data Source: Past Needs Assessment results. |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q3 Committee Scoring Rubric** |
| **0 Points** | **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Program has hired FT faculty for growth positions in the past 3 years. | Program request has been ranked and unfulfilled for 4 consecutive years. | Program request has been ranked and unfulfilled for past 5-7 consecutive years. | Program request has been ranked and unfulfilled for 8 or more consecutive years. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 2: Q4 Unfilled Existing Positions (1 point)** Program has unfilled replacement position(s).  |  |
| **SECTION TOTAL** |  |
| **WEIGHTED SECTION TOTAL****(x4)** |  |

**Section 3: Campus Impact**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Q1 Request clearly supports campus equity, anti-racism, and anti-hate goals and/or statewide initiatives, such as Guided Pathways or AB 705.** |
| Response:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric**  |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Request aligns with some relevant campus goals and/or statewide initiatives. | Request aligns with most relevant campus goals and/or statewide initiatives. | Request clearly aligns with or exceeds all relevant campus goals and/or statewide initiatives. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Q2: Program request clearly supports SBVC’s mission, vision, and values and campus planning documents (i.e., Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Student Equity Plan, Enrollment Management Plan**  |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric**  |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Request aligns minimally with some combination of SBVC’s mission, vision, values, and/or campus planning documents. | Request aligns with most aspects of SBVC’s mission, vision, values, and/or campus planning documents. | Request clearly aligns with all aspects of SBVC’s mission, vision, values, **AND** relevant campus planning documents. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Q3 Program clearly demonstrates that outcomes are defined, assessed, disaggregated, evaluated, and used to improve teaching and learning.** |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Q3 Committee Scoring Rubric**  |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Program demonstrates that SLOs are established for all courses, certificates, and degrees through the Curriculum process; and program demonstrates that all courses, certificates, and degrees are assessed and reported in the SLOCloud. | Meets 1 Point Criteria **AND** program disaggregates data in two or more categories as evidenced by departmental meetings agendas/minutes, recent program efficacy, SLOCloud reflections, updated syllabi, etc. | Meets 2 Point Criteria **AND** program demonstrates that SLO assessment and evaluation is used for continuous quality improvement in teaching and learning as evidenced by departmental meetings agendas/minutes, recent program efficacy, SLOCloud reflections, updated syllabi, etc. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 3: Q4 Reflective Self-Evaluation (1 point)** Request is the result of self-evaluation with the program’s most recent program efficacy report and EMP.  |  |
| **SECTION TOTAL** |  |
| **WEIGHTED SECTION TOTAL****(x3)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Bonus Points (1 each)** |
| Request has the potential to positively impact students beyond the program/division. |  |
| Request was ranked in the top 3 at the divisional level. |  |
| Program Efficacy reporting is up-to-date. |  |
| Program has a current efficacy rating of continuation, conditional, or is in year 1 of probation. |  |
| Program has received external awards or accolades within the last 2 years. |  |
| **TOTAL BONUS POINTS** |  |

**Final Score**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighted Total Section 1** |  |
| **Weighted Total Section 2** |  |
| **Weighted Total Section 3** |  |
| **Bonus Points** |  |
| **Grand Total** |  |