Dual Credit Proposal Review Rubrics
SCWI 2015-16 Approvals

Contents:

1. Proposals – Existing Program Re-approvals Rubric
2. Proposals – Existing Program – Requesting Growth Rubric
3. New Programs Rubric

1. Proposals - Existing Program Re-approvals Rubric

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Actuals vs approved dual credit students	• Significantly below the 2013-14 provincial average of 92% • Program significantly overfilled and no strategy included to address this issue	• At or within 10% of the 2013-14 provincial average of 92% • Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below average	• Above the provincial average of 92% • Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where actual vs approved number is below average
Dual credit student retention rate	• Significantly below the 2013-14 provincial average of 87.5%	• Below the 2013-14 provincial average of 87.5% • Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where retention rate is significantly below average	• At or above the provincial average of 87.5%, 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	• Significantly below the 2013-14 provincial average of 88%	• At or within 5% of the 2013-14 provincial average of 88% • Proposal includes sound strategies for improvement where success rate is significantly below average	• At or above the provincial average of 88%, 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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Team-taught dual credits -- success in college course	• Significantly below the success rate in secondary school course	• Below the success rate in secondary school course	• Aligns with the success rate in secondary school course
Main target group as identified by the RPT	• Few students were reported as being in any of the three target groups • Most of the students are not in the target group for which the program was designed	• Most of the students were reported as being in one of the three target groups • Rationale is provided if the majority of the students were not in the target group for which the program was designed	• Most of the students were reported as being in the target group for which the program was designed
SHSM dual credits -- number of student participants (based on approved numbers of SHSM students for participating boards)	• Total number of approved SHSM students is far less than the proposed number of dual credit students • There is no related approved SHSM in the RPT's boards	• Total number of approved SHSM students is equal to or greater than the proposed number of dual credit students • Related SHSM sector not identified	• 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 • Related SHSM identified in proposal
Ages of Students	• Number of students 21 years or older is significantly higher than the 2013-2014 provincial average of 5.3%	• Number of students 21 years or older is slightly higher than the 2013-2014 provincial average of 5.3%	• Number of students 21 years or older is at or below the 2013-2014 provincial average of 5.3% or program has a very low number of students which impacts the %
Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms were required for proposals to be considered)	• Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form	• Number of students in EDCS does not match number of students on signed form and requires follow-up	• Number of students in EDCS matches number of students on signed form

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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
	justified in the rationale • Significantly above the provincial average	may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up • Above the provincial average	provincial average • If above the per student provincial average, clearly detailed and justifiable rationale provided
Miscellaneous Funding Expenditures	• Significantly under spent in previous year	• Under spent in previous year and same request made	• Spent approved amount and same request made, or if under spent rationale provided or request reduced to align with actual expenditures
Night School (see RFP Requirements)	• No rationale provided • Program designed for OYAP or SHSM students	• Required rationale provided, but requires follow-up • Primary target group flagged as group for whom the program designed, but program descriptions may indicate otherwise	• Required rationale provided and reasonable • For students in primary target group
ELearning (see RFP Requirements)	• No rationale provided • Requirements as set out in the RFP not met	• Required rationale provided, but requires follow-up • Requirements as set out in RFP may be met but requires clarification	• Required rationale provided and reasonable • Requirements as set out in RFP met • For students in primary target group
SWAC – Program Requests	• No plan for students to attempt dual credits • No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses • Not housed on a college campus	• Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear and requires follow up; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal • Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear and requires follow up	• 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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
		• Housed on a college campus, students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus	
SWAC – Facilities Requests (mean is based on regular school year programs)	• Significantly over the provincial mean of $2,100/ month/ room	• At or above the provincial mean of $2,100/ month/ room ; details may require follow up	• At or below the provincial mean of $2,100/ month/room

2. Proposals – Existing Program – Requesting Growth Rubric
Aligns with SCWI priorities: SWACs, programs for primary target audience, programs with TCU 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	• Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation rate is above the provincial footprint with 100% of schools participating. No compelling rationale for growth. • No evidence that RPT is working to address prior dual credit footprint imbalances between boards within the RPT	• Increases opportunities for students in areas where participation is close to the provincial footprint and 100% of schools participating. Compelling rationale for growth included. • Some evidence that RPT is working to address prior dual credit footprint imbalances between boards within the RPT	• Increases opportunities for students in underrepresented areas (the provincial footprint and/or below 100% of schools participating). • Evidence that RPT is working to address prior dual credit footprint imbalances between boards within the RPT

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Target Audience	• Increases opportunities for students who are not part of one of the three target audiences	• Increases opportunities for students in SHSM programs • Increases opportunities for students in Level 1 apprenticeships with SCWI seat purchase	• Increases opportunities for students in primary target group • Increases opportunities for Level 1 apprenticeships with TCU seat purchase
Number of Credits per Student, for Regular Dual Credit Programs	• Students will complete three or more dual credits	• Students will complete multiple dual credits; follow-up will confirm the number of credits per student is two or fewer	• Dual credit program clearly indicates students will complete one or two dual credits; if more credits per student are requested a compelling rationale is provided
SWAC – Program Requests	• No plan for students to attempt dual credits • No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses • Not housed on a college campus	• Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear and requires follow up; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal • Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear and requires follow up • Housed on a college campus, students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus	• Every student attempting one or more dual credits as listed on the proposal • 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)	• Significantly over the provincial mean of $2,100/ month/ room	• At or above the provincial mean of $2,100/ month/ room ; details may require follow up	• At or below the provincial mean of $2,100/ month/room

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Level 1 Apprenticeship Dual Credits (Signed forms were required for proposals to be considered)	• Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form	• Number of students in EDCS does not match number of students on signed form and requires follow-up	• Number of students in EDCS matches number of students on signed form

3. Proposals – New Programs Rubric

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Board Participation Rate in Dual Credits	• Higher than the provincial average with 100% of schools participating	• At or below the provincial with approximately 100% of schools participating	• Below the provincial average with less than 100% of schools participating; if at or above the provincial average, there is a compelling reason to approve
Program Description	• Few or no details to assist reviewers in understanding the program • Does not meet the mandate of the Student Success initiative	• Meets mandate of the Student Success initiative; but details require follow up	• Clearly describes program and meets mandate of the Student Success initiative
Proposed Student Numbers	• Unreasonable (i.e., will not generate sufficient funds for the college to operate the class, secondary school class size too small in the case of team-taught to run the course)	• Seems realistic but requires follow-up	• Seems realistic • Based on understanding of funding models at secondary school and funding needs for college or apprenticeship delivery

Criteria	Unacceptable (1)	Acceptable (2), but possibly requiring follow up	Strong (3)
Number of Credits per Student, for Regular Dual Credit Programs	• Students will complete three or more dual credits	• Students will complete multiple dual credits; follow-up will confirm the number of credits per student is two or fewer	• Dual credit program clearly indicates students will complete one or two dual credits; if more credits per student are requested a compelling rationale is provided
Student Selection Process	• No clear process for student selection by a school/board team described • Students self-select for program • Not geared to one of target groups	• Process described, but does not include Student Success Team or other appropriate school/board team • Criteria for Student Selection applied	• 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 were required for proposals to be considered)	• Level 1 apprenticeship identified in EDCS does not match Level 1 apprenticeship on signed form	• Number of students in EDCS does not match number of students on signed form and requires follow-up	• Number of students in EDCS matches number of students on signed form
Transportation Funding Requests – College Delivered Dual Credits -- Students	• Significantly above the provincial average • No rationale provided, or rationale does not support higher costs • Does not align with program delivery description	• 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	• 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 Teacher	• Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation	• Funding requested for dual credit teacher transportation; follow-up required	• No funding for dual credit teacher transportation requested
Transportation Funding Requests – Dual Credit Faculty	• Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery • Over the provincial per km approved amount	• Funding for dual credit faculty transportation does not align with course delivery; follow up required • Possibly over the provincially approved per km amount	• Funding aligns with course delivery • At the provincially approved per km amount
Miscellaneous Funding Requests	• Includes numerous unacceptable requests that are not justified in the rationale • Significantly above the provincial average	• Includes unacceptable requests that may or may not be explained in the rationale and may require follow-up • Above the provincial average	• 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	• No plan for students to attempt dual credits • No plan for students to attempt Ontario Curriculum courses • Not housed on a college campus	• Indication that students will attempt dual credits unclear and requires follow up; dual credit courses are listed on the proposal • Indication that students will attempt Ontario Curriculum courses unclear and requires follow up • Housed on a college campus, students may be participating in cooperative education placements off campus	• Every student attempting one or more dual credits; courses are listed on the proposal • 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 – Facilities Requests	• Significantly over the provincial mean	• At or above the provincial mean; details may require follow up	• At or below the provincial mean

The following dual credit programs will not be approved:

- Level 1 programs for which the appropriate, signed form (TCU Seat Purchase, SCWI Seat Purchase, College Oversight) was 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 were not identified;
- Programs where the necessary current college course and associated college course code were not identified as needed (e.g., "various" inserted in lieu of college course).
- Team-taught programs delivered exclusively by a secondary school teacher; and
- Programs specifically for adults (21 years and older).