

CARES Act Request Form Evaluation Rubric for Group 2 Request Forms

Prepared by: CARES Act Review Committee

May 15, 2020

Preparing the Population for Review:

1. Separate the population of CARES Act-eligible students (those with a FAFSA on file)
2. Add a column to the student record with the EFC score (NOT the actual EFC)
 - a. Those who are not CARES Act-eligible will be eligible for limited institutional dollars as long as the student submits the Alternative Need Determination Form before the May 31, 2020, deadline to complete the grant-awarding process. This form produces a quasi-EFC that can be used to identify a students' family need position from this population. It is important to know that limited resources suggest that not all the eligible students will be able to receive a grant, regardless of whether they submitted the FAFSA or the Alternative Need Determination Form.
 - b. Not eligible for either funding source.
 - i. In order to be eligible for either source of funding (CARES Act or institutional dollars), students must submit either a FAFSA or the Alternative Need Determination Form.
 - ii. No FAFSA data or Alternative Need Determination Form data will be made available to the committee who are reading files.
 - iii. All review decisions will assess the student's responses to the open-ended questions that were available on the Request Form.
 - iv. All personally identifiable information from the students will be removed leaving only an ID and the responses to the open-ended questions.
 - v. The scoring results of the open-ended questions will be blended with the data results from the rest of the Request Form to manufacture an aggregated score on the student's request. The weighting method for these final scores will be outlined later.

Data Separation:

1. Separate each pool of eligible candidates into 10 decile thresholds (10 even-sized groups) separated by EFC levels
 - a. Each eligible pool of candidates (those who have submitted either the FAFSA or the Alternative Need Determination Form) will be divided into these 10 groups.
 - b. The 10 groups will be scored in inverted numerical order. The score per range is calculated in a base-10 format,
 - i. **The lowest EFC decile will score 100 points.**
 1. Lowest EFC scores the highest points.
 - ii. **The 2nd lowest EFC decile will score 90 points.**
 - iii. **The 3rd lowest EFC decile will score 80 points.**
 - iv. That pattern continues...
 - v. **The 9th lowest EFC decile will score 20 points.**
 - vi. **The 10th lowest EFC decile will score 10 points.**

1. Highest EFC scores the lowest points.

Reviewing/Scoring Open-Ended Responses:

1. Review committee members will evaluate both lists of eligible students (one for CARES Act resources and one for institutional resources) using the same rubric.
2. Relationship between the Likert questions (quantitative) results in the Request Form and the open-ended questions (qualitative).
 - a. Review committee members will not see any quantitative data results from the Request Form. They will only review the qualitative data for scoring.
 - b. Quantitative results are calculated by the Request Form results of the students selected in the Qualtrics survey such that the quantitative results are pulled into the review process already scored.
 - i. These results are intentionally left off the reports the review committee considers when scoring the contents.
3. Each reviewer reviews the open-ended contents within an Excel document. Each reviewer will enter their score for these responses in the same Excel document for each candidate.
 - i. The data will be collected and aggregated after reviews are completed.
4. Each candidate's open-ended responses will be reviewed independently by 2 different members of the review committee to maintain consistency in the scoring and reduce any unintended bias.
 - a. Each response is graded individually by each committee member
 - i. Each reviewer will receive a list of candidates to review.
 1. The review will be the initial reviewer on half of the responses and the second reviewer on the other half.
 2. No reviewer is aware if they are the first or second reviewer of the record.
 3. No reviewer can see the outcomes of any of the other reviewers findings on the open-ended questions.
5. The score results will be aggregated by an internal data analyst who was not reading any of the submissions to remove bias.
 - a. The two scores are averaged together, and a single score is included on the student's Request Form.
 - b. In cases where the two scoring outcomes are greater than 3 points apart, the data analyst will seek out a new, 3rd, reviewer who had not previously reviewed the same responses in question.
 - i. The 3rd reviewer scores the responses independently, and the 3rd reviewer's results are averaged with the higher of the two scores initially received (the lower score is thrown out and other two results are averaged instead).
 1. If the results continue to show a 3 point margin, a 4th reviewer is consulted, and the process is repeated until there are 2 scores within a 3-point range to average.

Scoring Rubric for Open Ended Questions:

1. Review committee members are looking to evaluate the students' responses to determine a need score for the responses provided.
 - a. Students are not graded by syntax, sentence structure, essay-writing skills, or any other *academic focus*.
 - b. Students were asked to describe their levels of need, so this evaluation is to determine a score for the candidate's level of need as it was explained.
2. Review committee members will score the two open-ended responses into a singular score value 1-10 where 10 is the highest score.
 - a. The highest score is loosely translated as the highest level of need.
 - b. Students are not evaluated against other students, so multiple students can receive the same need score by the same reviewer.
 - c. Each review committee member should feel comfortable to use the entire 10-point scale to ensure differentiation among the candidates.
 - i. The calculation of value for each score is listed below:
 1. Scores of 9-10 suggest student need is worthy of the largest award
 2. Scores of 7-8 suggest student need is definitely worthy of the smallest award, and possibly the largest
 3. Scores of 5-6 suggest the student need is possibly worth the smallest award.
 4. Scores of 3-4 suggest the student need is only worth the smallest award if there are sufficient funds available.
 5. Scores of 1-2 suggest the student need is not worth the recommendation of funding.

Need-Score Weighting (a 5x Multiplier):

1. Because there are so many candidates, there is a need to value the scoring of a candidate's need to sufficiently create candidate separation.
2. There are limited dollars to award, so separation among the pool is necessary to determine potential differentiation among the candidates.
3. The Need-Score Weighting metric is as follows:
 - a. Scores of 9-10 feature a multiplier of 25 to create a final qualitative score value.
 - b. Scores of 7-8 feature a multiplier of 20 to create a final qualitative score value.
 - c. Scores of 5-6 feature a multiplier of 15 to create a final qualitative score value.
 - d. Scores of 3-4 feature a multiplier of 10 to create a final qualitative score value.
 - e. Scores of 1-2 feature a multiplier of 5 to create a final qualitative score value.

Combining the Quantitative and the Qualitative Results for a Total Request Form Score:

1. The quantitative results offer candidates an opportunity to answer more questions with very defined results. The maximum score possible on the Request Form for the Likert questions is 121.

- a. To eliminate potential bias, the review committee agreed that the quantitative was to be worth approximately 66% of the total Request Form scoring for each student.
 - b. The qualitative, open-ended responses were to be weighted at approximately 33% of the total score.
2. The quantitative score is weighted an additional 4.15x to aggregate the Request Form total to maximum of 750 points, where 500 (actually 502 - but nobody scored the actual maximum) points is the maximum for the quantitative (Likert) questions and 250 is the maximum for the qualitative (open-ended) questions.

Combine the Request Form Score with the EFC Score to Create a Calculated Need Score:

1. The Calculated Need Score represents the combination of the Request Form Score with the EFC score from the initial decile data separation.
 - a. To eliminate potential bias, the review committee agreed that the Request Form was to be worth approximately 66% of the Calculated Need Scoring for each student. That calculation makes the maximum Request Form Score equal to 750.
 - b. The EFC scoring was to be worth approximately 33% of the Calculated Need Scoring for each student. That calculation makes the maximum EFC Score equal to 375.
 - c. The maximum Calculated Need Score (Request Form total + EFC Score total) is equal to 1,125 points.
 - i. Any student who scores 1,125 would demonstrate the Greatest Need in this equation.
 - ii. All students would be calculated in the order of the Calculated Need, and the awarding will be distributed in descending order of the Calculated Need until such time that the funds are exhausted.

When will Grant Decisions be Made and Funds Awarded to the Students:

1. As soon as decisions are made, the grant funds will be assigned to students.
 - a. Students will receive an email notification that indicates they have been awarded a grant.
 - b. Students will need to log into their MyUNLV account, click on the Financial Aid tile, and follow the instructions to accept the grant funds.
 - c. The grant funds will be distributed to students following either the direct deposit procedures the student has designated to the university or via a check distributed in the mail.
2. Students who are scored, but for whom the FAFSA is not-yet received or the Alternative Need Determination Form is not-yet received, will be considered until May 31, 2020. The review committee will return to the scoring roster of candidates to see if any new FAFSAs or Alternative Need Determination Forms are received twice per week until May 31. As of June 1, no new FAFSAs or Alternative Need Determination Forms will be

received, and students who were not awarded funding will be sent an email announcing that the Group 2 distribution window for CARES Act funding has closed.

3. As of June 1, all federal CARES Act money (as well as the institutional funding) will have been distributed and the process will be declared complete.

Value of the Grant Awarded to Students:

1. The CARES Act and institutional dollars are awarded in increments of \$1000 and/or \$500.
2. The review committee will determine which students will receive awards at each level.
 - a. In an effort to distribute the remaining resources as far as possible, it is necessary that all students not receive exactly the same amount.
 - b. The distinction between which students get which values will be determined by the review committee.
 - c. The review committee decisions are final and not open to appeal.