

Adolescent and Adult Dual Credit Proposal Review Rubrics SCWI 2020-21 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 for adolescents or adults:

- programs not for students of a school board or students in a federally funded First Nations secondary school;
- new SHSM programs that are not replacing existing programs – student numbers must remain constant;
- Level 1 programs for which the appropriate, signed form (MLTSD In-Class Training Funding, SCWI In-Class Training Funding, College Oversight Attestation) is not received;
- only part of the Level 1 In-Class 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);

In addition, the following dual credit programs will not be approved for **adolescents**:

- 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);
- team-taught programs delivered exclusively by a secondary school teacher.

In addition, the following dual credit programs will not be approved for **adults**:

- programs which are not face-to-face and/or delivered on a college campus;
- programs specifically for adolescents (20 years or younger).

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 provincial average of 94% Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below or above average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above the 2018-189 provincial average of 94% If below the provincial average, program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage
Dual credit student retention rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly below the 2018-19 provincial average of 88% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below the 2018-19 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 2018-19 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 2018-19 provincial average of 91% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At or within 10% of the 2018-19 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 2018-19 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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Main target group as identified by the RPT – Adolescent Dual Credits	<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 group for which the program was designed
Student Selection Criteria – Adult Dual Credits (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
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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Ages of students in Dual Credit programs for adolescents. (Students must be in reach of graduation and should have completed most compulsory credits)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant number of students 16 years or whose age is identified as “unknown” Number of students 21 years or older is significantly higher than 5% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students 16 years or whose age is identified as “unknown” Number of students 21 years or older is slightly higher than 5% Rationale provided to explain inclusion of students who are too young/old 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students of appropriate age, or program has a very low number of students which impacts the acceptable percentage
Ages of students in Dual Credit programs for adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant number of students 20 years or younger or whose age is identified as “unknown” No rationale provided for inclusion of students not eligible for participation due to their ages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students 20 years or younger whose age is identified as “unknown” Rationale provided to explain inclusion of students who are too young 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students of appropriate age Strong rationale provided for inclusion of students 20 years of age or younger
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 Transportation request aligns with program delivery description

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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not fully align with course delivery; follow up required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding aligns with course delivery
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 and include detailed costing (e.g., per student amounts) At or below the provincial average If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed and justifiable rationale provided
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. Rationale does not justify request. 	<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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 summer school delivery required for program to be reviewed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No indication of reason for summer delivery Participant selection does not indicate students will be within 1-2 credits of graduation. Previous students not within reach of graduation. 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 Students may graduate at end of summer dual credit, but this is unclear. Most students in previous summer programs likely to have graduated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes compelling rationale for need for summer delivery Students clearly in primary target group Students requiring 1-2 credits in order to earn their OSSD will be selected Description of role for dual credit teacher included; funding request reasonable given number of students On college campus

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
	<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 	
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 – Student Selection (see Dual Credit Policy Document, Appendix)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of student selection based on policy document criteria Previous data indicates that students unlikely to be within reach of graduation at the end of the SWAC program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants may be selected based on policy document criteria, but this requires clarification Previous data indicates most students appropriately selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants are within reach of graduation, have completed most compulsory credits and meet other criteria as set out in policy Previous data indicates student selection appropriate

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
SWAC – Facilities Requests (average 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 MLTSD In-Class Training funding, Adult Dual Credits (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 Adolescent 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 - Adolescent Dual Credits (5-year cohort grad rate and 2017-18 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High grad rate; high OnSIS 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for students in primary target group Increases opportunities for

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
		students in Level 1 apprenticeships with SCWI In-Class Training funding	Level 1 apprenticeships with MLTSD In-Class Training funding
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 needed to 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 2017-18 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High grad rate; high OnSIS 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
Adolescent Dual Credit Program Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few or no details to assist reviewers in understanding the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the goals 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 the goals of the Dual Credit program

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet the goals of the Dual Credit program 		
Adult Dual Credit 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 Input from School or Board Adult and Continuing Education Partners – Adult Dual Credit Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program unlikely developed in conjunction with school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff Type of school not identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal seems to indicate that program may meet the needs of local students as identified by school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff Type of school identified, but follow-up required to confirm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal clearly demonstrates that program will meet the needs of local students as identified by school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff Type of school identified (adult day school or continuing education)
Proposed Student Numbers – Adolescent Dual Credit Programs	<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
Proposed Student Numbers – Adult Dual Credit Programs	<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 	<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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
	team-taught to run the course)		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
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
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

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 and costing provided (e.g., per student, month, class) 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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
SWAC – Student Selection (see Dual Credit Policy Document, Appendix)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of student selection based on policy document criteria Previous data indicates that students unlikely to be within reach of graduation at the end of the SWAC program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants may be selected based on policy document criteria, but this requires clarification Previous data indicates most students appropriately selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants are within reach of graduation, have completed most compulsory credits and meet other criteria as set out in policy Previous data indicates student selection appropriate
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
Summer Dual Credits (SWAC and Single Credit) (see RFP Requirements – rationale for summer school delivery required for program to be reviewed)	<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