

## Adolescent and Adult Dual Credit Proposal Review Rubrics SCWI 2019-20 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 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);

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)
<b>Actuals vs approved dual credit students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly below the 2017-18 provincial average of 94%</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 2017-18 provincial average of 94%</li> <li>Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below or above average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Above the 2017-18 provincial average of 94%</li> <li>If below the provincial average, program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage</li> </ul>
<b>Dual credit student retention rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly below the 2017-18 provincial average of 88%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Below the 2017-18 provincial average of 88%</li> <li>Proposal includes strategies for improvement where retention rate is significantly below average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or above the 2017-18 provincial average of 88%, 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 2017-18 provincial average of 91%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or within 10% of the 2017-18 provincial average of 91%</li> <li>Proposal includes strategies for improvement where success rate is significantly below average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At or above the 2017-18 provincial average of 91%, or program has a very low number of students, which impacts the percentage</li> <li>Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where success rate is below average</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. If not, explanation for the difference is provided and strategies for improvement included</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Main target group as identified by the RPT – Adolescent Dual Credits</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>Student Selection Criteria – Adult Dual Credits (based on ADC Pilot Programs Requirements Document)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear process for student selection by a school/board team described</li> <li>Students have OSSDs</li> <li>Students planning to continue to the workplace or university</li> <li>Students 20 years of age and younger</li> <li>Students require significant number of credits to earn OSSD or are working towards an Ontario Secondary School Certificate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process for student selection described, but does not include appropriate school/board team</li> <li>Criteria for Student Selection seems to be applied but description may lack clarity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate school/board team selects students</li> <li>Criteria for Student Selection applied</li> </ul>
<b>SHSM dual credits -- number of student participants (based on approved numbers of SHSM students for participating boards)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total number of approved SHSM students is far less than the proposed number of dual credit students</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 dual credit students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Ages of students in Dual Credit programs for adolescents. (Students must be in reach of graduation and should have completed most compulsory credits)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant number of students 16 years or whose age is identified as “unknown”</li> <li>Number of students 21 years or older is significantly higher than 5%</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students 16 years or whose age is identified as “unknown”</li> <li>Number of students 21 years or older is slightly higher than 5%</li> <li>Rationale provided to explain inclusion of students who are too young/old</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students of appropriate age, or program has a very low number of students which impacts the acceptable percentage – 5%</li> </ul>
<b>Ages of students in Dual Credit programs for adults.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant number of students 20 years or younger or whose age is identified as “unknown”</li> <li>No rationale provided for inclusion of students not eligible for participation due to their ages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of students 20 years or younger whose age is identified as “unknown”</li> <li>Rationale provided to explain inclusion of students who are too young</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students of appropriate age</li> <li>Strong rationale provided for inclusion of students 20 years of age or younger</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> <li>Transportation request aligns with program delivery description</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> </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> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding aligns with course delivery</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Funding Expenditures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly under spent/ overspent spent in previous year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under spent in previous year; request is the same. No rationale or rationale does not explain need to maintain funding level</li> <li>Overspent in previous year; request is the same. No rationale, or rationale does not address how a lower amount will fully fund transportation</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 and include detailed costing (e.g., per student amounts)</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 or overspent in previous year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under spent or overspent in previous year and same request made. Rationale does not justify request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spent approved amount and same request made,</li> <li>If under spent, sound rationale provided for request at the same level, or request reduced to align with actual expenditures</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>if overspent, sound rationale provided regarding increased request</li> </ul>
<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) (see RFP Requirements – rationale for summer school delivery required for program to be reviewed)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No indication of reason for summer delivery</li> <li>Participant selection does not indicate students will be within 1-2 credits of graduation.</li> <li>Previous students not within reach of graduation.</li> <li>Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students</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>Students may graduate at end of summer dual credit, but this is unclear.</li> <li>Most students in previous summer programs likely to have graduated.</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</li> <li>Students requiring 1-2 credits in order to earn their OSSD will be selected</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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No dual credit teacher for college-delivered courses</li> <li>At secondary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	
<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 – Student Selection (see Dual Credit Policy Document, Appendix)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of student selection based on policy document criteria</li> <li>Previous data indicates that students unlikely to be within reach of graduation at the end of the SWAC program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants may be selected based on policy document criteria, but this requires clarification</li> <li>Previous data indicates most students appropriately selected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants are within reach of graduation, have completed most compulsory credits and meet other criteria as set out in policy</li> <li>Previous data indicates student selection appropriate</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>SWAC – Facilities Requests (average 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 MTCU Seat Purchase, 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)
<b>Board Participation Rate in Adolescent 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>
<b>Board Grad Rate - Adolescent Dual Credits (5-year cohort grad rate and 2016-17 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)</b>	<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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases opportunities for students in primary target group</li> <li>Increases opportunities for</li> </ul>



Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
		students in Level 1 apprenticeships with SCWI seat purchase	Level 1 apprenticeships with MTCU seat purchase
<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 needed to 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 (5-year cohort grad rate and 2016-17 board participation rate in dual credits “footprint” -- OnSIS data)</b>	<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>Adolescent Dual Credit 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 goals of the Dual Credit program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets the goals of the Dual Credit program; but some details about the program may be unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly describes program and meets the goals of the Dual Credit program</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Adult Dual Credit 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 requirements of the Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs</li> <li>Delivery is not face-to-face and on a college campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets requirements of the Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs; but some details may be unclear</li> <li>Delivery is likely face-to-face and on a college campus but description may need follow-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly describes program and meets requirements of Adult Dual Credit Pilot Programs</li> <li>Program delivery is clearly face-to-face and on a college campus</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence of Input from School or Board Adult and Continuing Education Partners – Adult Dual Credit Programs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program unlikely developed in conjunction with school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff</li> <li>Type of school not identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal seems to indicate that program may meet the needs of local students as identified by school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff</li> <li>Type of school identified, but follow-up required to confirm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal clearly demonstrates that program will meet the needs of local students as identified by school or board Adult and Continuing Education staff</li> <li>Type of school identified (adult day school or continuing education)</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed Student Numbers – Adolescent Dual Credit Programs</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>Proposed Student Numbers – Adult Dual Credit Programs</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 for staffing at adult day school or con-ed, and funding needs for college or apprenticeship delivery</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<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>
<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> </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</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding aligns with course delivery</li> </ul>

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
<b>Requests – Dual Credit Faculty</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not align with course delivery</li> <li>Over the provincial per km approved amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>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 and costing provided (e.g., per student, month, class)</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 face-to-face dual credit; 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>

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