**Needs Assessment Request  
Non-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/Department Data**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Q1 Provide an analysis and evaluation of program/department data over the past three years. How does the data support the request?** Recommended data points might include number of students served, number of transactions, hours of service, unmet needs, etc. |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric—*For Committee Use Only.*** | | | |
| **1 Point** | **3 Points** | **5 Points** | **Score** |
| Request is minimally supported by data or moderately supported by 1 point of data. | Request is supported by 2 points of data. | Request is supported by 3 or more points of data. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Q2 Provide an analysis and evaluation of the request’s impact, directly or indirectly, on student success and/or satisfaction. How does the data support the request?** Recommended data points might include campus climate surveys, success/retention of population served compared to general population, student feedback, etc. |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric—*For Committee Use Only.*** | | | |
| **1 Point** | **3 Points** | **5 Points** | **Score** |
| Request is minimally supported by data or moderately supported by 1 point of data. | Request is supported by 2 points of data. | Request is supported by 3 or more points of data. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SECTION TOTAL** |  |
| **WEIGHTED SECTION TOTAL**  **(x3)** |  |

**Section 2: Staffing Data**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: 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](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I3C0A67A0D48411DEBC02831C6D6C108E&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)), external accrediting bodies, and/or other reliable authorities. |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 2: Q1 Committee Scoring Rubric—*For Committee Use Only.*** | | | | | |
| **0 Points** | **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **4 Points** | **Score** |
| Current staffing is on par with recommended staffing metrics. | Current staffing is 15% or less under recommended staffing metric. | Current staffing is between 16% and 40% under recommended staffing metric. | Current staffing is between 40% and 59% under recommended staffing metric. | Current staffing more than 60% under recommended staffing metric. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Q2 Section 2: Q2 Unfulfilled Needs**  Data Source: Past Needs Assessment results. |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 2: Q2 Committee Scoring Rubric** | | | | | |
| **0 Points** | **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **4 Points** | **Score** |
| Program has hired classified staff 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 8-10 consecutive years. | Program request has been ranked and unfulfilled for 10 or more consecutive years. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 2: Q3 (1 Point)** Program has unfilled replacement positions. |  |
| **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—*For Committee Use Only.*** | | | |
| **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—*For Committee Use Only.*** | | | |
| **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/department clearly demonstrates that outcomes are defined, assessed, evaluated, and used to improve operations.** |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 3: Q3 Committee Scoring Rubric—*For Committee Use Only.*** | | | |
| **1 Point** | **2 Points** | **3 Points** | **Score** |
| Program demonstrates that outcomes are established and assessed. | Meets 1 Point Criteria **AND** program evaluates and reflects upon outcome/efficacy data as evidenced by departmental meetings agendas/minutes, recent program efficacy, etc. | Meets 2 Point Criteria **AND** program demonstrates that outcome assessment and evaluation is used for continuous quality improvement as evidenced by departmental meetings agendas/minutes, recent program/departmental changes, program efficacy, 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. |  |
| **TOTAL BONUS POINTS** |  |

**Final Score**

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