



Date: July 6, 2020

To: Marta Meana, Ph.D., Interim President  
CC: Chris Heavey, Ph.D., Interim Provost  
Via: Juanita P. Fain, Ph.D., Vice President for Student Affairs  
From: Stephen J. McKellips, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Enrollment & Student Services  
Re: Executive Summary UNLV CARES Act Funding Disbursement Strategy **REVISED**

---

*Please accept this revised version of our CARES Act plans. Notable contributions in this revision include updates and actual procedures, outcomes and adjustments, and finally strategies for bringing conclusion to the CARES Act process.*

### **I. Group 1: Actual Process and Outcomes**

Under the 70/20/10 proposed split, approved in advance (\$1000 and \$500). The committee operated on the assumption that any model for semi-autonomous awarding could be refined, so it built its rubric before the decision on how much to award was even finished.

thenisol17 (pt)2 (i)2 (o)1 o( be)10 (f a)6 (n)y2 (s)1o (uc)3a (ubr)7 (iab)6 (le7 (d w)16 (as)d14 (he)10 (m)e3

one's level of need is compounded by many things.

- C. The group decided to define the "Greatest Need" among the students would be determined jointly

entical; however, for

- iii. Group 1 used Unmet COA to determine the students' overall need level and ranked them in the order of their identified need – greatest need (highest amount of out-of-pocket to pay with the lowest Expected Family Contribution to the lowest out-of-pocket to pay with the highest Expected Family Contribution) order.
- iv. The group decided to use both variables jointly rather than weighting one variable more than another as we wanted to avoid scenarios with very low EFC's who had their entire COA already met, or students with very high unmet COA that also appeared to have greater resources as determined by a very high EFC.
- v.

To keep the weight of the two variables (EFC and COA

- b. This alternative need 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.
- c. Review-process for Group 2:
  - i. Students must submit either a FAFSA or the Alternative Need Determination Form by May 31, 2020.
  - ii. All review decisions assess the student's responses to the open-ended questions that were available on the Request Form.
  - iii. All personally identifiable information from the students will be removed leaving only an ID and the responses to the open-ended questions.
  - iv. The scoring results of the open-ended questions will be combined with the data results from the rest of the Request Form to manufacture an aggregate

c. The first non-0 EFC is decile 4, and that decile now

1. 100 points for the 3 deciles containing zero values, 90 points for the next decile, 80 points for the next, until the last decile receives 30 points rather than the 10 points due to the combined zero EFC group
- ii. Quantitative survey
  1. The survey is based on a scale from 1 -



**E. Scoring Rubric for Open Ended Questions:**

- a. Review committee members are looking to evaluate the students' responses to determine a need score for the responses provided.
- b. Students are not graded by syntax, sentence structure, essay-writing skills, or ansay-fEay







### **III. Group 3: Actual Process and Outcomes**

Under the 70/20/10 proposed split, the 10% portion of funds available for those who complete the institutional request forms submitted by UNLV personnel was initially tagged at \$1,184,265 in federal CARES Act funding.

- A. Distributed at the same time as the Request Form went out to students, the internal UNLV staff nomination form was distributed to all UNLV faculty and staff through the UNLV Official email list serve. This nomination form invited faculty and staff to identify students who they know to have been impacted by COVID as a direct result of their participation with the university in some programmatic or participatory way during the Spring 2020.
  - a. A review rubric was created to evaluate the nominations using a fair and consistent methodology.

i.

- i. Individual staff members would be able to still submit for students with whom they come into contact with moving forward.
- b. *The dollar value of the awards would need to become flexible*
  - i. The initial awards of \$1000 and \$500 were helpful, but in many cases the challenges of COVID can be far greater than those amounts
  - ii. I recommend expanding the potential award to reflect the federal limits – up to the value of PELL (which is capped at \$6,195 per person).
  - iii. The nominator would need to vet the candidate to determine how much money is needed/requested and complete the form accordingly.
  - iv. The committee (or subsection of the committee) would then vet the request and award accordingly.
- c. *Eliminate the restriction on stacking or collecting multiple awards*
  - i. Nearly 85% of all FAFSA filing students have already received their award, and there is still \$1.4M unclaimed or unawarded. There is no way to award the remaining students the remaining balance without recognizing that these students are not the ones with the greatest need.
  - ii. The limitation on PELL eligibility would exist, but it could mean additional money for those who need it the most.

#### ***IV. Recommending Group 4 – a new addition to the plan***

Under the 70/20/10 proposed split, the totality of the award money was not fully distributed. In fact, there remains \$1.4M in unspent federal CARES Act funds, though approximately \$1M of that total was distributed and unclaimed. This Group 4 recommendation represents an additional strategy to distribute any remaining federal money to students in compliance with the initial provisions from the Department of Education.

##### A. Award Title IV-

- b. The population to be eligible for the Group 4 distribution would include:**
  - i. Students who h**