

# Walla Walla Community College

## Budget Development Rubric

### FY 2025-2026 Planning Cycle

#### GUIDING PRINCIPLES

---

- We acknowledge that budget requests have impacts on the College as a whole. Resources are limited and the budget is our collective resource and responsibility.
- We are all responsible for helping reach & meet the outcomes of the [2023-2028 Strategic Plan](#), and our resources will be used to support actions aligned with these strategic performance indicators, goals, and objectives.
- We recognize that as we endeavor toward greater transparency, collaboration, and data-informed outcomes, there are flaws and nimble changes needed in the existing budget. We will work toward continuous improvement with grace and understanding

#### BUDGET DECISION-MAKING

---

The WWCC Budget Council will use the following criteria to score discretionary budget requests to make funding recommendations to the President and the Executive Leadership Team.

This rubric ensures that budget requests are evaluated consistently and transparently - in alignment with the College's strategic goals and values - on sound, well-considered evidence. Budget lines considered unavoidable costs will be funded first and are not subject to evaluation using the rubric. Budget Council will review each discretionary request, assign a score for each criterion, then total the scores for each item. Budget Council will review the scores with relevant stakeholders and adjust as necessary to reflect institutional priorities. Rubric scores will be considered as Budget Council reviews and ranks budget requests.

## BUDGET DECISION-MAKING RUBRIC

**Strategic Alignment.** To what degree does the request align with the college’s strategic plan and/or other master or council plans (e.g., facilities master plan, strategic enrollment management plan)?

High Degree of Alignment (5 Points)	Moderate Degree of Alignment (3 Points)	Minimal Degree of Alignment (1 Point)
The request directly supports a high-priority strategic goal with clear, strong rationale.	The request supports a strategic goal but with moderate impact or less clear rationale.	The request has minimal or unclear alignment with strategic goals.

**Impact on Student Success.** What is the benefit to students?

High Degree of Benefit (5 Points)	Moderate Degree of Benefit (3 Points)	Minimal Degree of Benefit (1 Point)
The request directly enhances student learning, retention, or completion rates.	The request moderately enhances student success metrics.	The request has minimal or unclear impact on student success.

**Impact on Employee Success.** What is the benefit to college employees? Does this help the college become an employer of choice?

High Degree of Benefit (5 Points)	Moderate Degree of Benefit (3 Points)	Minimal Degree of Benefit (1 Point)
The request directly enhances employee satisfaction, wellbeing, and/or ability to perform their jobs.	The request moderately enhances employee success.	The request has minimal or unclear impact on employee success.

**Feasibility and Sustainability.** How easily will the effort supported by the request succeed and be maintained?

High Feasibility (5 Points)	Moderate Feasibility (3 Points)	Minimal Feasibility (1 Point)
The request is highly feasible with a clear, sustainable plan for implementation and ongoing support.	The request is feasible but with some challenges or moderate sustainability concerns.	The request is unfeasible or has significant sustainability concerns.

**Cost-Benefit Analysis.** What is the return on investment?

High ROI (5 Points)	Moderate ROI (3 Points)	Minimal ROI (1 Point)
The request has a high benefit relative to cost, with clear evidence of cost-effectiveness.	The request has a moderate benefit relative to cost.	The request has a minimal benefit relative to cost or unclear cost-effectiveness.

**Improvement and Innovation.** To what extent does the request improve existing college programs, processes or outcomes and/or support new programs, services, or approaches to serving the college’s needs?

High Improvement (5 Points)	Moderate Improvement (3 Points)	Minimal Improvement (1 Point)
The request relies on positively tested methods to greatly improve existing programs, processes or outcomes and/or is highly innovative, introducing new methods or technologies that significantly improve processes or outcomes.	The request shows some promise of improvement to existing processes or outcomes.	The request shows minimal innovation or improvement.

**Equity and Inclusion.** To what degree does the request promote equity and inclusion efforts, benefiting those most in need?

Highly Equitable (5 Points)	Moderately Equitable (3 Points)	Minimally Equitable (1 Point)
The request strongly promotes equity and inclusion, benefiting underrepresented or disadvantaged groups.	The request moderately promotes equity and inclusion.	The request has minimal or unclear effect on equity and inclusion.

**Compliance and Risk Management.** To what degree is the request compliant with federal, state, SBCTC, and college regulations, policies and procedures? Have all risks been anticipated and planned for?

Fully Compliant (5 Points)	Mostly Compliant (3 Points)	Minimal or No Compliance (1 Point)
The request is fully compliant with regulations and effectively manages risks.	The request is mostly compliant with some risk management.	The request is only minimally compliant or has significant risk concerns.

**Evidence.** How do you know this will work?

Strong Support (5 Points)	Moderate Support (3 Points)	Minimal or No Support (1 Point)
The request is highly logical, based on a large body of evidence from relevant literature or an established body of best practices, and includes meaningful measurements, models, etc.	The request makes sense and is informed by some research or best practices.	The request doesn’t always make sense and/or is based on intuition without objective support.