

Adult Dual Credit Proposal Review Rubrics SCWI 2018-19 Approvals

Contents:

1. New Programs Rubric

The following adult dual credit pilot programs will not be approved:

- programs not for students of a school board or students in an federally-funded First Nations secondary school
- programs which are not face-to-face and/or delivered on a college campus
- Level 1 programs for which the appropriate, signed form (MTCU 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 Level 1 is proposed that 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;
- 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; and
- programs specifically for adolescents (20 years or younger).

1. Proposals – Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs Rubric

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Program Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few or no details to assist reviewers in understanding the program • Does not meet the requirements of the Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs • Delivery is not face-to-face and on a college campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets requirements of the Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs; but some details may be unclear • Delivery is likely face-to-face and on a college campus but description may need follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly describes program and meets requirements of Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs • Program delivery is clearly face-to-face and on a college campus
Evidence of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program unlikely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal seems to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal clearly

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Input from School or Board Adult and Continuing Education partners	developed in conjunction with school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff	indicate that program may meet the needs of local students as identified by school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff	demonstrates that program will meet the needs of local students as identified by school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff
Proposed Student Numbers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seems realistic but requires follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seems realistic Based on understanding of funding models for staffing at adult day school or con-ed, and funding needs for college or apprenticeship delivery
Number of Credits per Student for Adult Dual Credit College Courses (not Level 1 apprenticeship in-school training)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will complete three or more dual credits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will complete multiple dual credits; likely two or fewer credits per student 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Student Selection Criteria (based on ADC Pilot Programs Requirements Document)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear process for student selection by a school/board team described Students have OSSDs Students planning to continue to the workplace or university Students 20 years of age and younger Students require significant number of credits to earn OSSD or are working towards an Ontario Secondary School Certificate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process for student selection described, but does not include appropriate school/board team Criteria for Student Selection seems to be applied but description may lack clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate school/board team selects students Criteria for Student Selection applied

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
SWAC – Program Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No plan for students to attempt dual credits • No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses • Based on program details, students do not seem to be on a college campus except for during their dual credit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear and requires follow up; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal • Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear • Housed on a college campus, students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every student attempting one or more dual credits; courses are listed in the proposal • Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses • Students attend full days on college campus
Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms required for proposals to be considered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of students by trade in EDCS does not match number of students on signed form and requires follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of students by trade in EDCS matches number of students on signed form

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Transportation Funding Requests – College Delivered Dual Credits -- Adult Dual Credit Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly above the provincial average No rationale provided, or rationale does not support higher costs Does not align with program delivery description 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient details provided regarding transportation costing requiring follow-up Above the provincial average; rationale may support higher costs Transportation request and program delivery description may require clarification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or below the provincial average If above the provincial average, rationale supports higher costs Transportation request aligns with program delivery description
Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation; follow-up required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funding for dual credit teacher transportation requested
Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit College Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery Over the provincial per km approved amount 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery; follow up required Possibly over the provincially approved per km amount 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding aligns with course delivery At the provincially approved per km amount
Miscellaneous Funding Requests (see Annotated Dual Credit Benchmark document)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes numerous unacceptable requests that are not justified in the rationale Significantly above the provincial average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes unacceptable requests that may or may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up Above the provincial average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All requests acceptable At or below the provincial average If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed in the rationale and justifiable