# 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) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Actuals vs approved dual credit students** | • Significantly below the 2015-16 provincial average of 93%<br>• Program significantly overfilled and no strategy included to address this issue | • At or within 10% of the 2015-16 provincial average of 93%<br>• Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below average | • Above the 2015-16 provincial average of 93%<br><br>• If below the provincial average, program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Dual credit student retention rate** | • Significantly below the 2015-16 provincial average of 89% | • Below the 2015-16 provincial average of 89%<br>• Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where retention rate is significantly below average | • At or above the 2015-16 provincial average of 89%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage<br>• Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where retention rate is below average |
| **Dual credit student success rate** | • Significantly below the 2015-16 provincial average of 91% | • At or within 10% of the 2015-16 provincial average of 91%<br>• Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where success rate is significantly below average | • At or above the 2015-16 provincial average of 91%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage |
| **Team-taught dual credits -- success in college course** | • Significantly below the success rate in secondary school course | • Below or above the success rate in secondary school course | • Aligns with the success rate in secondary school course |
| **Main target group as identified by the RPT** | • Few students were reported as being in any of the three target groups<br>• Most of the students are not in the target group for which the program was designed | • Most of the students were reported as being in one of the three target groups<br>• Rationale is provided if the majority of the students were not in the target group for which the program was designed | • Most of the students were reported as being in the target group for which the program was designed<br>• Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement if the majority of students were not in the target group for which the program was designed |
| **SHSM dual credits -- number of student participants** | • Total number of approved SHSM students is far less than the proposed number of dual | • Total number of approved SHSM students is equal to or greater than the proposed number of | • Number of proposed students is reasonable when compared to approved SHSM students/sector/ |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| (based on approved numbers of SHSM students for participating boards) | credit students | dual credit students | board or region given that not all SHSM students are in the college/ apprenticeship pathway |
| Ages of Students in dual credit programs for adolescents (*2015-16 average not available at the time of approvals) | • Number of students 21 years or older is significantly higher than 5% | • Number of students 21 years or older is slightly higher 5% | • Less than 5% of students 21 years or older, or program has a very low number of students which impacts the % |
| Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms required for proposals to be considered) | • Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form | • Number of students in EDCS does not match number of students by trade on signed form and requires follow-up | • Number of students by trade in EDCS matches number of students on signed form |
| Transportation Funding Requests -- Students | • Significantly above the provincial average<br>• No rationale provided, or rationale does not support higher costs<br>• Does not align with program delivery description (e.g., bus passes provided although students only on campus 8 times) | • Insufficient details provided regarding transportation costing requiring follow-up<br>• Above the provincial average; rationale may support higher costs<br>• Transportation request and program delivery description may require clarification | • At or below the provincial average<br>• If above the provincial average, rationale supports higher costs |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Transportation Funding Requests -- Dual Credit Teacher** | • Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation and parking | • Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation; follow-up required | • No funding for dual credit teacher transportation requested<br>• Funding request and rationale explains extraordinary circumstance |
| **Transportation Funding Requests -- Dual Credit Faculty** | • Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery<br>• Over the provincial approved amount | • Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not fully align with course delivery; follow up required<br>• Possibly over the provincially approved amount | • Funding aligns with course delivery<br>• At the provincially approved amount or rationale justifies higher request |
| **Transportation Funding Expenditures** | • Significantly under spent in previous year | • Under spent in previous year; no rationale required if new request is the same or lower than previous year | • Spent approved amount, or if under spent/ overspent reasonable rationale provided |
| **Miscellaneous Funding Requests** | • Includes numerous unacceptable requests that are not justified in the rationale<br>• Significantly above the provincial average | • Includes unacceptable requests that may or may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up<br>• Above the provincial average | • All requests acceptable<br>• At or below the provincial average<br>• If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed and justifiable rationale provided |
| **Miscellaneous Funding Expenditures** | • Significantly under spent in previous year | • Under spent in previous year and same request made | • Spent approved amount and same request made, or if under spent rationale provided or request reduced to align with actual expenditures |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Night School (see RFP Requirements – rationale for night school delivery required for program to be reviewed)** | • Requirements as set out in the RFP not met<br>• Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students | • Requirements as set out in RFP may be met but proposal requires clarification<br>• Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise | • Requirements as set out in RFP met<br>• For students in primary target group |
| **ELearning (Participating schools must be listed – RFP requirement)** | • Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students<br>• Students have access to face-to-face dual credits<br>• Participating schools not identified | • Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise<br>• Students may have access to face-to-face dual credits<br>• Participating schools identified, but unclear | • For students in primary target group<br>• Students, due to distance, would not be able to access a face-to-face dual credit<br>• Participating schools identified |
| **Summer Dual Credits (SWAC and Single Credit)** | • No indication of reason for summer delivery<br>• Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students<br>• No dual credit teacher for college-delivered courses<br>• At secondary school | • Satisfactory rationale for summer delivery provided<br>• Students likely in primary target group, but this may be unclear<br>• For college-delivered college courses, description of role for dual credit teacher included, but funding not requested or not reasonable given number of students<br>• At secondary school, only due to distance to college campus | • Includes compelling rationale for need for summer delivery<br>• Students clearly in primary target group and program will likely result in more students earning their OSSDs<br>• Description of role for dual credit teacher included; funding request reasonable given number of students<br>• On college campus |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SWAC – Program Requests** | • No plan for students to attempt dual credits<br>• No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses<br>• Not housed on a college campus | • Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal<br>• Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear<br>• Housed on a college campus; students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus | • Every student attempting one or more dual credits as listed on the proposal<br>• Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses<br>• Housed on a college campus, full days |
| **SWAC – Facilities Requests (mean is based on regular school year programs)** | • Significantly over the provincial average | • At or above the provincial average; details may require follow up | • At or below the provincial average |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Board Participation Rate in Dual Credits (OnSIS footprint)** | • Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation rate is above the provincial footprint with 100% of schools participating. No compelling rationale for growth. | • Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation is close to the provincial footprint and 100% of schools participating. Compelling rationale for growth included. | • Increases opportunities for students in underrepresented areas (below the provincial footprint and/or below 100% of schools participating). |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Board Grad Rate** (5 year cohort grad rate and 2014-15 board participation rate in dual credits "footprint" -- OnSIS data) | • High grad rate; high dual credit footprint | • High grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint<br>• Low grad rate; high OnSIS dual credit footprint | • Low grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint |
| **Target Audience** | • Increases opportunities for students who are not part of one of the three target audiences | • Increases opportunities for students in SHSM programs<br>• Increases opportunities for students in Level 1 apprenticeships with SCWI seat purchase | • Increases opportunities for students in primary target group<br>• Increases opportunities for Level 1 apprenticeships with MAESD seat purchase |
| **Number of Credits per Student for Regular Dual Credit Programs** | • Students will complete three or more dual credits | • Students will complete multiple dual credits; follow-up will confirm the number of credits per student is two or fewer | • 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 |

### 3. Proposals – New Programs Rubric

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Board Participation Rate in Dual Credits (OnSIS footprint)** | • Higher than the provincial average with 100% of schools participating | • At or below the provincial with approximately 100% of schools participating | • 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 |
| **Board Grad Rate (5 year cohort grad rate and 2014-15 board participation rate in dual credits "footprint" -- OnSIS data)** | • High grad rate; high dual credit footprint | • High grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint<br>• Low grad rate; high OnSIS dual credit footprint | • Low grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint |
| **Program Description** | • Few or no details to assist reviewers in understanding the program<br>• Does not meet the mandate of the Dual Credit program | • Meets mandate of the Dual Credit program; but some details may be unclear | • Clearly describes program and meets mandate of the Dual Credit program |
| **Proposed Student Numbers** | • 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) | • Seems realistic but requires follow-up | • Seems realistic<br>• Based on understanding of funding models at secondary school and funding needs for college or apprenticeship delivery |
| **Number of Credits per Student, for Regular Dual Credit Programs** | • Students will complete three or more dual credits | • Students will complete multiple dual credits likely credits per student is two or fewer | • 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 |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Student Selection Process** | • No clear process for student selection by a school/board team described<br>• Students self-select for program<br>• Not geared to one of the target groups | • Process described, but does not include Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team<br>• Criteria for Student Selection applied | • Includes Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team<br>• Criteria for Student Selection applied<br>• Focus on at risk student populations<br>• May be part of a local re-engagement strategy (12/12+) |
| **Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms required for proposals to be considered)** | • Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form | • Number of students by trade in EDCS does not match number of students on signed form and requires follow-up | • Number of students by trade in EDCS matches number of students on signed form |
| **Transportation Funding Requests – College Delivered Dual Credits -- Students** | • Significantly above the provincial average<br>• No rationale provided, or rationale does not support higher costs<br>• Does not align with program delivery description | • Insufficient details provided regarding transportation costing requiring follow-up<br>• Above the provincial average; rationale may support higher costs<br>• Transportation request and program delivery description may require clarification | • At or below the provincial average<br>• If above the provincial average, rationale supports higher costs<br>• Transportation request aligns with program delivery description |
| **Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit Teacher** | • Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation | • Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation; follow-up required | • No funding for dual credit teacher transportation requested |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit Faculty** | • Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery <br> • Over the provincial per km approved amount | • Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery; follow up required <br> • Possibly over the provincially approved per km amount | • Funding aligns with course delivery <br> • At the provincially approved per km amount |
| **Miscellaneous Funding Requests** | • Includes numerous unacceptable requests that are not justified in the rationale <br> • Significantly above the provincial average | • Includes unacceptable requests that may or may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up <br> • Above the provincial average | • All requests acceptable <br> • At or below the provincial average <br> • If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed in the rationale and justifiable |
| **SWAC – Program Requests** | • No plan for students to attempt dual credits <br> • No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses <br> • Not housed on a college campus | • Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear and requires follow up; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal <br> • Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear <br> • Housed on a college campus, students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus | • Every student attempting one or more dual credits; courses are listed on the proposal <br> • Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses <br> • Housed on a college campus, full days |
| **SWAC – Facilities Requests** | • Significantly over the provincial mean | • At or above the provincial mean; details may require follow up | • At or below the provincial mean |

| Criteria | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up | Strong (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Summer Dual Credits (SWAC and Single Credit)** | • No indication of reason for summer delivery<br>• Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students<br>• No dual credit teacher for college-delivered courses<br>• At secondary school | • Rationale for summer delivery provided, but not compelling<br>• Students likely in primary target group, but may be unclear<br>• Description of role for college-delivered dual credit teacher included, but funding not requested or not reasonable given number of students<br>• At secondary school only due to distance to college campus | • Includes compelling rationale for need for summer delivery<br>• Students clearly in primary target group and program will likely result in more students earning their OSSDs<br>• Description of role for dual credit teacher included; funding request reasonable given number of students<br>• On college campus |