Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR)
2011
(formerly "Balanced Scorecard")

Committee Member:

RAP Identification:

RAP Department:

Total Amount Requested:

Funding Method:

⦿ One Time

◯ On Going

◯ Both

Scoring Area	Related Components	Scoring Rubric	Score
Program Review	• Program Review (PR)/Annual Program Assessment (APA) • Student Learning Outcomes • Department Learning Outcomes • Goals Linked to SLO/DLO/AUO • Administrative Unit Outcomes • Unit/Division Plan	**Max 20 points:** **0 pts** – No demonstrated need supported by PR or APA **10 pts** – Demonstrates need from PR/APA and Unit/Division Plan **20 pts** – Demonstrates need from PR/APA, Unit/Division Plan with project goals linked to SLO/DLO/AUO	
Alignment with Annual Institutional Goals	• 2010-11 Institutional Goals	**Max 25 points:** *Sum points for all Institutional Goals for which the RAP explicitly supports* **7 pts** - Student Success **6 pts** - Fiscally Sound Position **5 pts** - Systematic Planning and Assessment **4 pts** - Institutional Pride and Organizational Culture **3 pts** - Community Partnerships and Service	
Alignment with Institutional Plans	• Educational Master Plan (AY 2009-2016) • Annual Institutional Goals • Project Goals (RAP)	**Max 20 points:** **0 pts** – Demonstrates no support of Annual Institutional Goals or Educational Master Plan **5 pts** – Demonstrates support of Annual Institutional Goals *or* Educational Master Plan **15 pts** – Demonstrates support of Annual Institutional Goals *and* Educational Master Plan **20 pts** -- Demonstrates support of Annual Institutional Goals *and* Educational Master Plan *with* stated project goals	
Measureable Assessment Outcomes	• Project Goals (RAP) • Project Outcomes (RAP) • Student Learning Outcome • Department Learning Outcome • Administrative Unit Outcomes • Key Indicators	**Max 20 points:** **0 pts** – No outcomes **5 pts** – Documented measureable outcome(s) **10 pts** – Documented measureable outcome(s) tied to SLO/DLO/AUO *or* Key Indicators **20 pts** – Documented measurable outcome(s) tied to SLO/DLO/AUO *and* Key Indicators	
Implementation Plan	• Implementation Plan	**15 points** Demonstrates an implementation plan which outlines the steps needed to accomplish the specific proposal.	
		Points (Max 100):	
		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	85—100	
Good	70—85	
Satisfactory	55—70	
Not So Much	<55	

A subgroup of the Institutional Planning and Budget Committees 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 an Institutional Planning Committee 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 IPC/Budget there will be feedback sent to the Dean who will then give feedback to the department or service are that submitted it.