

## Adolescent Dual Credit Proposal Review Rubrics SCWI 2017-18 Approvals

### Contents:

1. Proposals – Existing Program Re-Approvals Rubric
2. Proposals – Existing Program – Requesting Growth Rubric
3. New Programs Rubric

#### The following dual credit programs will not be approved:

- new SHSM programs that are not replacing existing programs – student numbers must remain constant;
- summer, eLearning and night school programs where the required rationales are not provided in the proposal;
- delivered at a secondary school with no planned trips to the college (neither funding request nor rationale as to why no trips to the college);
- Level 1 programs for which the appropriate, signed form (MAESD Seat Purchase, SCWI Seat Purchase, College Oversight Attestation) is not received;
- only part of the Level 1 in-school training is included in the dual credit program or the proposed Level 1 extends for more than one school year. EA, CDP, DSW, CYW may continue to be delivered using a modular approach; the entire Level 1 program does not need to be included for these programs;
- programs where partners are not identified;
- programs where the necessary current college course and associated college course code are not identified (e.g., “various” inserted in lieu of college course);
- team-taught programs delivered exclusively by a secondary school teacher.

### 1. Proposals - Existing Program Re-Approvals Rubric

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Actuals vs approved dual credit students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly below the 2015-16 provincial average of 93%</li> <li>• Program significantly overfilled and no strategy included to address this issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At or within 10% of the 2015-16 provincial average of 93%</li> <li>• Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above the 2015-16 provincial average of 93%</li> <li>• If below the provincial average, program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Dual credit student retention rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly below the 2015-16 provincial average of 89%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Below the 2015-16 provincial average of 89%</li> <li>Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where retention rate is significantly below average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or above the 2015-16 provincial average of 89%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage</li> <li>Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where retention rate is below average</li> </ul>
<b>Dual credit student success rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly below the 2015-16 provincial average of 91%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or within 10% of the 2015-16 provincial average of 91%</li> <li>Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where success rate is significantly below average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or above the 2015-16 provincial average of 91%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage</li> </ul>
<b>Team-taught dual credits -- success in college course</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly below the success rate in secondary school course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Below or above the success rate in secondary school course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligns with the success rate in secondary school course</li> </ul>
<b>Main target group as identified by the RPT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few students were reported as being in any of the three target groups</li> <li>Most of the students are not in the target group for which the program was designed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the students were reported as being in one of the three target groups</li> <li>Rationale is provided if the majority of the students were not in the target group for which the program was designed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the students were reported as being in the target group for which the program was designed</li> <li>Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement if the majority of students were not in the target group for which the program was designed</li> </ul>
<b>SHSM dual credits -- number of student participants</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total number of approved SHSM students is far less than the proposed number of dual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total number of approved SHSM students is equal to or greater than the proposed number of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of proposed students is reasonable when compared to approved SHSM students/sector/</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>(based on approved numbers of SHSM students for participating boards)</b>	credit students	dual credit students	board or region given that not all SHSM students are in the college/ apprenticeship pathway
<b>Ages of Students in dual credit programs for adolescents (*2015-16 average not available at the time of approvals)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students 21 years or older is significantly higher than 5%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students 21 years or older is slightly higher 5%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 5% of students 21 years or older, or program has a very low number of students which impacts the %</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms required for proposals to be considered)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students in EDCS does not match number of students by trade on signed form and requires follow-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students by trade in EDCS matches number of students on signed form</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Funding Requests -- Students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly above the provincial average</li> <li>No rationale provided, or rationale does not support higher costs</li> <li>Does not align with program delivery description (e.g., bus passes provided although students only on campus 8 times)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient details provided regarding transportation costing requiring follow-up</li> <li>Above the provincial average; rationale may support higher costs</li> <li>Transportation request and program delivery description may require clarification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or below the provincial average</li> <li>If above the provincial average, rationale supports higher costs</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Transportation Funding Requests -- Dual Credit Teacher</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation and parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation; follow-up required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No funding for dual credit teacher transportation requested</li> <li>Funding request and rationale explains extraordinary circumstance</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Funding Requests -- Dual Credit Faculty</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery</li> <li>Over the provincial approved amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not fully align with course delivery; follow up required</li> <li>Possibly over the provincially approved amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding aligns with course delivery</li> <li>At the provincially approved amount or rationale justifies higher request</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Funding Expenditures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly under spent in previous year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under spent in previous year; no rationale required if new request is the same or lower than previous year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spent approved amount, or if under spent/ overspent reasonable rationale provided</li> </ul>
<b>Miscellaneous Funding Requests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes numerous unacceptable requests that are not justified in the rationale</li> <li>Significantly above the provincial average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes unacceptable requests that may or may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up</li> <li>Above the provincial average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All requests acceptable</li> <li>At or below the provincial average</li> <li>If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed and justifiable rationale provided</li> </ul>
<b>Miscellaneous Funding Expenditures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly under spent in previous year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under spent in previous year and same request made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spent approved amount and same request made, or if under spent rationale provided or request reduced to align with actual expenditures</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Night School (see RFP Requirements – rationale for night school delivery required for program to be reviewed)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements as set out in the RFP not met</li> <li>Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements as set out in RFP may be met but proposal requires clarification</li> <li>Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements as set out in RFP met</li> <li>For students in primary target group</li> </ul>
<b>ELearning (Participating schools must be listed – RFP requirement)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students</li> <li>Students have access to face-to-face dual credits</li> <li>Participating schools not identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise</li> <li>Students may have access to face-to-face dual credits</li> <li>Participating schools identified, but unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For students in primary target group</li> <li>Students, due to distance, would not be able to access a face-to-face dual credit</li> <li>Participating schools identified</li> </ul>
<b>Summer Dual Credits (SWAC and Single Credit)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No indication of reason for summer delivery</li> <li>Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students</li> <li>No dual credit teacher for college-delivered courses</li> <li>At secondary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfactory rationale for summer delivery provided</li> <li>Students likely in primary target group, but this may be unclear</li> <li>For college-delivered college courses, description of role for dual credit teacher included, but funding not requested or not reasonable given number of students</li> <li>At secondary school, only due to distance to college campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes compelling rationale for need for summer delivery</li> <li>Students clearly in primary target group and program will likely result in more students earning their OSSDs</li> <li>Description of role for dual credit teacher included; funding request reasonable given number of students</li> <li>On college campus</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>SWAC – Program Requests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plan for students to attempt dual credits</li> <li>No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses</li> <li>Not housed on a college campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal</li> <li>Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear</li> <li>Housed on a college campus; students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every student attempting one or more dual credits as listed on the proposal</li> <li>Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses</li> <li>Housed on a college campus, full days</li> </ul>
<b>SWAC – Facilities Requests (mean is based on regular school year programs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly over the provincial average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or above the provincial average; details may require follow up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or below the provincial average</li> </ul>

## 2. Proposals – Existing Program – Requesting Growth Rubric

Aligns with SCWI priorities: SWACs, programs for primary target audience, programs with MAESD Seat Purchase

(Rates a level 3 on the previous rubric to be considered for growth)

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Board Participation Rate in Dual Credits (OnSIS footprint)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation rate is above the provincial footprint with 100% of schools participating. No compelling rationale for growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation is close to the provincial footprint and 100% of schools participating. Compelling rationale for growth included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students in underrepresented areas (below the provincial footprint and/or below 100% of schools participating).</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Board Grad Rate</b> (5 year cohort grad rate and 2014-15 board participation rate in dual credits "footprint" -- OnSIS data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High grad rate; high dual credit footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint</li> <li>Low grad rate; high OnSIS dual credit footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint</li> </ul>
<b>Target Audience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students who are not part of one of the three target audiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students in SHSM programs</li> <li>Increases opportunities for students in Level 1 apprenticeships with SCWI seat purchase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students in primary target group</li> <li>Increases opportunities for Level 1 apprenticeships with MAESD seat purchase</li> </ul>
<b>Number of Credits per Student for Regular Dual Credit Programs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will complete three or more dual credits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will complete multiple dual credits; follow-up will confirm the number of credits per student is two or fewer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dual credit program clearly indicates students will complete one or two dual credits; if more credits per student are requested a compelling rationale is provided</li> </ul>

### 3. Proposals – **New Programs Rubric**

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Board Participation Rate in Dual Credits (OnSIS footprint)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher than the provincial average with 100% of schools participating</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or below the provincial with approximately 100% of schools participating</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Below the provincial average with less than 100% of schools participating; if at or above the provincial average, there is a compelling reason to approve</li> </ul>
<b>Board Grad Rate</b> (5 year cohort grad rate and 2014-15 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High grad rate; high dual credit footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint</li> <li>Low grad rate; high OnSIS dual credit footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint</li> </ul>
<b>Program Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few or no details to assist reviewers in understanding the program</li> <li>Does not meet the mandate of the Dual Credit program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets mandate of the Dual Credit program; but some details may be unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly describes program and meets mandate of the Dual Credit program</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed Student Numbers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unreasonable (i.e., will not generate sufficient funds for the college to operate the class, secondary school class size too small in the case of team-taught to run the course)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seems realistic but requires follow-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seems realistic</li> <li>Based on understanding of funding models at secondary school and funding needs for college or apprenticeship delivery</li> </ul>
<b>Number of Credits per Student, for Regular Dual Credit Programs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will complete three or more dual credits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will complete multiple dual credits likely credits per student is two or fewer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dual credit program clearly indicates students will complete one or two dual credits; if more credits per student are requested a compelling rationale is provided</li> </ul>



Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Student Selection Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear process for student selection by a school/board team described</li> <li>Students self-select for program</li> <li>Not geared to one of the target groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process described, but does not include Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team</li> <li>Criteria for Student Selection applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team</li> <li>Criteria for Student Selection applied</li> <li>Focus on at risk student populations</li> <li>May be part of a local re-engagement strategy (12/12+)</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms required for proposals to be considered)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students by trade in EDCS does not match number of students on signed form and requires follow-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students by trade in EDCS matches number of students on signed form</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Funding Requests – College Delivered Dual Credits -- Students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly above the provincial average</li> <li>No rationale provided, or rationale does not support higher costs</li> <li>Does not align with program delivery description</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient details provided regarding transportation costing requiring follow-up</li> <li>Above the provincial average; rationale may support higher costs</li> <li>Transportation request and program delivery description may require clarification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or below the provincial average</li> <li>If above the provincial average, rationale supports higher costs</li> <li>Transportation request aligns with program delivery description</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit Teacher</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation; follow-up required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No funding for dual credit teacher transportation requested</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit Faculty</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery</li> <li>Over the provincial per km approved amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery; follow up required</li> <li>Possibly over the provincially approved per km amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding aligns with course delivery</li> <li>At the provincially approved per km amount</li> </ul>
<b>Miscellaneous Funding Requests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes numerous unacceptable requests that are not justified in the rationale</li> <li>Significantly above the provincial average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes unacceptable requests that may or may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up</li> <li>Above the provincial average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All requests acceptable</li> <li>At or below the provincial average</li> <li>If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed in the rationale and justifiable</li> </ul>
<b>SWAC – Program Requests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plan for students to attempt dual credits</li> <li>No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses</li> <li>Not housed on a college campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear and requires follow up; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal</li> <li>Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear</li> <li>Housed on a college campus, students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every student attempting one or more dual credits; courses are listed on the proposal</li> <li>Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses</li> <li>Housed on a college campus, full days</li> </ul>
<b>SWAC – Facilities Requests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly over the provincial mean</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or above the provincial mean; details may require follow up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or below the provincial mean</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Summer Dual Credits (SWAC and Single Credit)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No indication of reason for summer delivery</li> <li>• Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students</li> <li>• No dual credit teacher for college-delivered courses</li> <li>• At secondary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rationale for summer delivery provided, but not compelling</li> <li>• Students likely in primary target group, but may be unclear</li> <li>• Description of role for college-delivered dual credit teacher included, but funding not requested or not reasonable given number of students</li> <li>• At secondary school only due to distance to college campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes compelling rationale for need for summer delivery</li> <li>• Students clearly in primary target group and program will likely result in more students earning their OSSDs</li> <li>• Description of role for dual credit teacher included; funding request reasonable given number of students</li> <li>• On college campus</li> </ul>