



### Scoring Rubric

## Baccalaureate Degree Program 2023 Cycle 2 Applications

Rubric Sections	Points
I. Policy and Compliance	Not scored (Verified by Chancellor’s Office)
II. Institutional Financial Stability	15 (Researched and scored by Chancellor’s Office)
III. Equitable Student Outcomes for Proposed Degree	10 (Researched and scored by Chancellor’s Office)
<b>TOTAL INTERNAL SCORE</b>	<b>25</b>
IV. Program Planning/Workforce Need	25
V. Institutional Capacity	30
VI. Program and Curriculum Design	25
VII. Intersegmental Alignment/Non-Duplication	20
<b>TOTAL READER SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>125</b>



**Section I. Policy and Compliance (Verified by Chancellor’s Office)**

Item #	Description	Yes/No
1	Applicant currently offers an associate degree program in the same academic subject from which this baccalaureate program is proposed (Per Education Code section 78042(j)(1), a college district must continue to offer an associate degree program in the same academic subject). <b>(Question #6)</b>	
2	Applicant provided the corresponding program TOP and CIP/SOC codes. <b>(Questions #3, 4, and 5)</b>	
3	Applicant has a system in place to maintain separate records AND to separately report upper-division courses. <b>(Questions #8 and #9)</b>	
4	Applicant provided evidence of their written policy that requires all potential students to submit either a Free Application for Federal Student Aid or a California Dream Act application in lieu of the California Promise Grant. (Ed. Code section 78042(c)). <b>(Question #10)</b>	
5	Applicant provided evidence that they have been approved to offer baccalaureate degree programs through ACCJC. (Ed. Code section 78042(a).) <b>(Question #13)</b>	
6	The proposed baccalaureate degree program fits into the mission, curriculum, and master planning of the college and higher education in California. <b>(Question #17)</b>	
7	All elements of the application have been completed.	



**Section II. Institutional Financial Stability (Researched and Scored by the Chancellor’s Office)**

Item #	<i>The district has no outstanding financial, compliance, or audit reports due to the Chancellor’s Office including:</i>	
1	CCFS-311 Annual Budget and Financial Report and CCFS-311Q Quarterly Financial Status Updates.	
2	Annual district financial audit reports.	
3	The district maintains unrestricted general fund reserves sufficient to cover at least two months of total general fund operating expenditures.	
<b>Total Score – Institutional Financial Stability</b>		<b>___/15 points</b>

**Section III. Equitable Student Outcomes for Proposed Baccalaureate Degree (Researched and Scored by the Chancellor’s Office)**

Item #	Description	
1	Change in enrollment in the discipline over the past 5 years	
2	College’s average time to associate degree completion (years)	
3	College’s student retention from fall to spring	
4	College’s average number of units for all degrees (all, AA/AS/ADT)	
5	College’s percentage of students who complete transfer-level math and English within one year of their first enrollment in the discipline (AB 705)	
<b>Total Score – Equitable Student Outcomes</b>		<b>___/10 points</b>



**Section IV. Program Planning/Workforce Need**

Strong (4-5 points)	Moderate (2-3 points)	Weak (0-1 point)
The application provides evidence that demonstrates workforce need, job openings, a bachelor’s degree or higher educational requirement, and high-wage opportunities. Strong and reliable labor market and economic data to support program, along with regional employer support. Robust written justification for the proposed program that matches data provided.	Written statement may be missing or inadequate. Some data provided to inform decision-making process. Labor market demand and wage gains are somewhat lacking. The need for the proposed program is unclear or evidence of higher wages is unclear. May be lacking evidence of employer support.	Anecdotal justification not supported by evidence. Lacks clarity. Several components are missing or unclear. High living wage not supported.

**Evidence of labor market need may include: statistical projections of growth in specific jobs by county (or labor market area) from the EDD LMI system; recent employer surveys; industry studies; regional economic studies; job advertisements for positions in the college's service area; newspaper or magazine articles on industry or employment trends; studies or data from licensing agencies or professional associations.**

**Evidence must support the need for the proposed baccalaureate degree program**

Item #	Description	Rating
1	<b>Application Question #15:</b> Applicant provided a written statement supporting the necessity of a four-year degree for the proposal. Within this written justification, is an analysis and discussion of statewide and regional workforce data and unmet workforce needs. (Ed. Code section 78042(f)(5)).	_____
2	<b>Application Question #15(a)(b):</b> employers are having difficulty filling positions that require a baccalaureate degree AND evidence that employers are willing to pay baccalaureate degree holders more.	_____



3	<b>Application Question #15(c)(d):</b> employers prefer candidates with the proposed baccalaureate degree AND evidence of job placement and/or promotion opportunities for candidates with a baccalaureate degree.	
4	<b>Application Question #15(e):</b> the occupation/field the proposed baccalaureate degree is in will provide for higher-wage job opportunities.	
5	<b>Application Question #16:</b> Applicant provided evidence that the district consulted with regional employers and/or regional workforce development boards. (Ed. Code section 78042(f)(5)(A).) Evidence may include letters of support from employers or minutes of industry advisory committee meetings and/or regional consortia approval.	
<b>Total Score – Program Planning/Workforce Needs</b>		<b>___/25 points</b>

### Section V. Institutional Capacity

		Strong (4-5 points)	Moderate (2-3 points)	Weak (0-1 point)
		Strong evidence of student interest with compelling projections. Detailed Administrative Plan with identified facilities, resources, services, and qualified faculty. Funding Plan is thoughtful and clear with estimated costs. Plans demonstrate college has the resources to maintain the program. ZTC and/or OER opportunities are available.	Adequate response and/or minimal evidence, but some components are missing or unclear. The Administrative Plan or Funding Plan are minimal or incomplete. Available facilities, resources and/or qualified faculty are somewhat unclear.	Lacks clarity. Several components are missing or unclear, or the evidence does not justify the response.
Item #	Description	Rating		
1	<b>Application Question #18:</b> Evidence of substantial <b>student interest</b> to offer a quality baccalaureate degree in the chosen field of study (Ed. Code section 78042(d)(3)) with clear and compelling enrollment and completer projections for the proposed baccalaureate degree program. If a survey is used, it should identify the number of students surveyed and the response rate.			



2	<b>Application Question #19:</b> Application provides a detailed Administrative Plan for the baccalaureate degree program, including the Funding Plan (Ed. Code section 78042(f)(2)). The Funding Plan includes estimated costs to students and the college/district, including funding for faculty, facilities, equipment, and other resources.	
3	<b>Application Question #19(a)(d):</b> The Plans demonstrate sufficient program facilities and equipment (program-specific, including supplies and materials), with library and learning resources (quality, currency, variety, quantity, and depth)	
4	<b>Application Question 19(b):</b> The Plans demonstrate adequate human administrative support (e.g., faculty, support staff, counselors, and student services such as DSPS)	
5	<b>Application Question #20:</b> Program faculty are qualified to teach upper-division courses and continuously improve the curriculum. Evidence of faculty qualifications should be in the form of CVs, Biosketch, and/or industry certifications and may include educational and related industry experience.	
6	<b>Application Question #21:</b> Applicant has provided a statement and/or evidence that at least half of the program will be offered with Zero Textbook Costs (ZTC) and/or incorporates Open Educational Resources (OER) to reduce the overall cost of the program.	
<b>Total Score – Institutional Capacity</b>		<b>___/30 points</b>

### Section VI. Program Quality and Design

<b>Strong (4-5 points)</b>		<b>Moderate (2-3 points)</b>	<b>Weak (0-1 point)</b>
Strong catalog description with well-defined program goals. Curriculum and achievement outcomes are certain, and pathways are clear with semester breakdown of courses and units. Articulation and alignment are addressed.		Adequately clear, but some components are missing and/or evidence is minimal or vague. Unclear if program is built off current AA/AS. Need is questionable or the curriculum and pathways unclear.	Response or evidence provided does not align. Lacks clarity. Several components are missing or unclear or the evidence does not justify the response.
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1	<b>Application Question #22:</b> The application includes a clear catalog description, program requirements, prerequisite skills or enrollment limitations, student learning outcomes, and program goals.		



2	<b>Application Question #22:</b> The learning journey, scaffolded from associate’s to baccalaureate degree, is clearly defined, including lower-division, upper-division, and general education courses, as well as the calculations used to reach the degree total. Applicant provides a clear explanation of how the proposed program fits into the college’s existing program inventory.	
3	<b>Application Question #23:</b> The applicant describes how the program is aligned with external industry standards (e.g., American Association for Respiratory Care; National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence) and is in good standing with any programmatic accreditation.	
4	<b>Application Question #24:</b> Applicant describes their curriculum development and approval process for upper-division courses.	
5	<b>Application Question #27:</b> Applicant discusses how lower-division and upper-division coursework articulate to comparable programs.	
<b>Total Score – Program Quality and Design</b>		<b>___/25 points</b>

**Section VII. Intersegmental Alignment/Non-Duplication**

<b>Strong (15-20 points)</b>		<b>Moderate (8-14 points)</b>	<b>Weak (0-6 points)</b>
Clear evidence of consultation with CSU/UC and/or AICCU. Substantiation that program does not duplicate existing CSU or UC programs. Detailed Duplication Analysis form attached for all upper and lower-division courses.		Minimal evidence that program does not duplicate existing CSU or UC programs or minimal attempts to consult with CSU or UC; may just list their website for you to search. Duplication Analysis form missing some content.	Insufficient evidence that program does not duplicate existing CSU or UC programs. No evidence of consultation with CSU or UC. Incomplete or missing Duplication Analysis form.
<b>Item #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
1	<b>Application Question #25 and #26:</b> Applicant provided evidence of consultation with the CSU, UC, and AICCU. Evidence demonstrates the proposed program or program curricula is not already offered by the CSU or UC. Documentation may include administrative or faculty letters of support from CSU or UC, emails, an assessment or statement of why and how the proposed BDP is not duplicative, a side-by-side comparison of courses with course descriptions, and/or a comparison of student-level learning outcomes or overall program objectives. Applicant also submitted a complete and detailed Duplication Analysis Form for all upper and lower-division courses.		
<b>Total Score – Intersegmental Alignment/Non-Duplication</b>			<b>___/20 points</b>



<b>TOTAL COMBINED READER SCORE</b> (Add Sections IV through VII)	____ / 100 <b>points</b>	
<b>Total Application Score</b>		____/125 <b>points</b>





## BDP Application Approval Types

Full Approval	Conditional Approval	Provisional Approval	Resubmission
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy compliant</li><li>• Passing program quality score</li><li>• Intersegmental agreement</li><li>• ACCJC approval</li><li>• BOG approval</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy compliant</li><li>• Passing program quality score</li><li>• Intersegmental agreement</li><li>• ACCJC approval</li><li>• Pending:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• BOG Approval</li></ul></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy compliant</li><li>• Passing program quality score</li><li>• Pending:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ACCJC approval &amp;/or intersegmental agreement; and BOG approval</li></ul></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is not policy compliant</li><li>• Does not have a passing program quality score</li></ul>