

Adolescent Dual Credit Proposal Review Rubrics SCWI 2018-19 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 as described in the Requirements document 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 (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 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly below the 2016-17 provincial average of 94% • Program significantly overfilled and no strategy included to address this issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At or within 10% of the 2016-17 provincial average of 94% • Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above the 2016-17 provincial average of 94% • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly below the 2016-17 provincial average of 88% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below the 2016-17 provincial average of 88% Proposal includes strategies for improvement where retention rate is significantly below average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or above the 2016-17 provincial average of 88%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where retention rate is below average
Dual credit student success rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly below the 2016-17 provincial average of 91% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or within 10% of the 2016-17 provincial average of 91% Proposal includes strategies for improvement where success rate is significantly below average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or above the 2016-17 provincial average of 91%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where success rate is below average
Team-taught dual credits -- success in college course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly below the success rate in secondary school course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below or above the success rate in secondary school course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with the success rate in secondary school course, if not, explanation for the difference is provided and strategies for improvement included
Main target group as identified by the RPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few students were reported as being in any of the three target groups Most of the students are not in the target group for which the program was designed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the students were reported as being in one of the three target groups Rationale is provided if the majority of the students were not in the target group for which the program was designed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the students were reported as being in the target group for which the program was designed Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement if the majority of students were not in the target

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
			group for which the program was designed
SHSM dual credits -- number of student participants (based on approved numbers of SHSM students for participating boards)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of approved SHSM students is far less than the proposed number of dual credit students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of approved SHSM students is equal to or greater than the proposed number of dual credit students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of proposed students is reasonable when compared to approved SHSM students/sector/board or region given that not all SHSM students are in the college/apprenticeship pathway
Ages of Students in dual credit programs for adolescents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students 21 years or older is significantly higher than 5% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students 21 years or older is slightly higher 5% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 5% of students 21 years or older, or program has a very low number of students which impacts the percentage
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 in EDCS does not match number of students by trade 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
Transportation Funding Requests -- 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 (e.g., bus passes provided although students only on campus 8 times) 	<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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Transportation Funding Requests -- Dual Credit Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation and parking 	<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 Funding request and rationale explains extraordinary circumstance
Transportation Funding Requests -- Dual Credit Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery Over the provincial approved amount 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not fully align with course delivery; follow up required Possibly over the provincially approved amount 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding aligns with course delivery At the provincially approved amount or rationale justifies higher request
Transportation Funding Expenditures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly under spent/ overspent spent in previous year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under spent in previous year; request is the same. No rationale or rationale does not explain need to maintain funding level Overspent in previous year; request is the same. No rationale, or rationale does not address how a lower amount will fully fund transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spent approved amount, or if under spent/ overspent reasonable rationale provided
Miscellaneous Funding Requests	<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 and justifiable rationale provided

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Miscellaneous Funding Expenditures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly under spent or overspent in previous year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under spent or overspent in previous year and same request made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spent approved amount and same request made, if under spent, sound rationale provided for request at the same level, or request reduced to align with actual expenditures if overspent, sound rationale provided regarding increased request
Night School (see RFP Requirements – rationale for night school delivery required for program to be reviewed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements as set out in the RFP not met Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements as set out in RFP may be met but proposal requires clarification Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements as set out in RFP met For students in primary target group
ELearning (Participating schools must be listed – RFP requirement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students Students have access to face-to-face dual credits Participating schools not identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise Students may have access to face-to-face dual credits Participating schools identified, but unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For students in primary target group Students, due to distance, would not be able to access a face-to-face dual credit Participating schools identified
Summer Dual Credits (SWAC and Single Credit) (see RFP Requirements – rationale for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No indication of reason for summer delivery Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory rationale for summer delivery provided Students likely in primary target group, but this may be unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes compelling rationale for need for summer delivery Students clearly in primary target group and program will likely result in more

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
summer school delivery required for program to be reviewed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dual credit teacher for college-delivered courses At secondary school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For college-delivered college courses, description of role for dual credit teacher included, but funding not requested or not reasonable given number of students At secondary school, only due to distance to college campus 	<p>students earning their OSSDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of role for dual credit teacher included; funding request reasonable given number of students On college campus
SWAC – Program Requests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plan for students to attempt dual credits No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses Not housed on a college campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear; 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 as listed on the proposal Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses Housed on a college campus, full days
SWAC – Facilities Requests (mean is based on regular school year programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly over the provincial average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or above the provincial average; details may require follow up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 MTCU 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation rate is above the provincial footprint with 100% of schools participating. No compelling rationale for growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation is close to the provincial footprint and 100% of schools participating. Compelling rationale for growth included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students in underrepresented areas (below the provincial footprint and/or below 100% of schools participating).
Board Grad Rate (5 year cohort grad rate and 2015-16 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High grad rate; high dual credit footprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint Low grad rate; high OnSIS dual credit footprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint
Target Audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students who are not part of one of the three target audiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students in SHSM programs Increases opportunities for students in Level 1 apprenticeships with SCWI seat purchase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students in primary target group Increases opportunities for Level 1 apprenticeships with MTCU seat purchase
Number of Credits per Student for Regular Dual Credit Programs	<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; follow-up will confirm the number of credits per student is two or fewer 	<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

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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher than the provincial average with 100% of schools participating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or below the provincial with approximately 100% of schools participating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2015-16 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High grad rate; high dual credit footprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint Low grad rate; high OnSIS dual credit footprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low grad rate; low OnSIS dual credit footprint
Program Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few or no details to assist reviewers in understanding the program Does not meet the mandate of the Dual Credit program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets mandate of the Dual Credit program; but some details about the program may be unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly describes program and meets mandate of the Dual Credit program
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 at secondary school and funding needs for college or apprenticeship delivery
Number of Credits per Student, for Regular Dual Credit Programs	<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 credits per student is two or fewer 	<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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Student Selection Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear process for student selection by a school/board team described Students self-select for program Not geared to one of the target groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process described, but does not include Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team Criteria for Student Selection applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team Criteria for Student Selection applied Focus on at risk student populations May be part of a local re-engagement strategy (12/12+)
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
Transportation Funding Requests – College Delivered Dual Credits -- 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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit 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	<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
SWAC – Program Requests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plan for students to attempt dual credits No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses Not housed on a college campus 	<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 face-to-face dual credit; courses are listed on the proposal Every student attempting one or more Ontario curriculum courses Housed on a college campus, full days
SWAC – Facilities Requests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly over the provincial mean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or above the provincial mean; details may require follow up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or below the provincial mean

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