



# ACCOUNTABILITY. TRANSPARENCY. SIMPLICITY.

## South Central Coast Regional Consortium (SCCRC)

### REGIONAL K12 STRONG WORKFORCE PROGRAM SELECTION COMMITTEE 2020/2021

#### **Final Decision**

All 14 applications met the 75-point threshold and were considered for funding and 8 were chosen for funding. After deliberating various points of consideration while following the agreed upon terms of the *Selection Committee Agreements*, the Selection Committee chose to fund the highest scoring application from each LEA based on the average of all of the 5 or 6 of reviewers that submitted. Each application was funded using the same percentage applied to the amount requested (87.5%).

*Note: For all K12 SWP applications within NOVA, the selection of the outlier functionality for scoring the 2020 applications was incorrectly applied by NOVA; therefore, the average score in NOVA is incorrect. This was immediately reported to NOVA and the CCCCCO, who are working to resolve the error. This calculation error did not impact the process and deliberation of the selection committee.*

#### **Process Used to Determine Funding**

Selection Committee (SC) members participated in mandatory onboarding/training and deliberation which consisted of three three-hour committed times. A makeup session was available for each session with the prerequisite of viewing the recorded missed onboarding/training. The onboarding and calibration were facilitated in large part with WestEd.

During the first onboarding/training, the selection committee chairs were voted and approved by majority vote during the first onboarding session. A Co-chair was nominated and approved as well. The elected Chair excused himself from being a reader to avoid any perception of conflict as he was listed as a partner within one of the applications. At the conclusion of the first onboarding/training session, selection committee members were directed to a survey to vote for approving additional terms to the working agreement and filling SC vacancies by moving alternates into said SC vacancies. Only those who attended the onboarding/training could vote, per SCCRC Selection Committee guidelines.

SC reviewers read applications outside of their represented sub-region and the reading of applications was done independently. The Selection Committee Chair, Co-Chair, Technical Assistance Provider, and Regional Chairs made themselves available to SC reviewers for support as the applications were read.

Over the dates of independent reading, one application needed a sixth reader due to a variance in scoring of more than 30 points (required as per Selection Committee “Additional Considerations”). A sixth reader completed and scored the application within the deadline. Scores were then locked by the selection committee chairs.

#### **Deliberation meeting**

The deliberation process was led by the Selection Committee Chairs with a PowerPoint guiding the process. Selection Committee members were advised that all 14 applications met the threshold and were eligible for funding. Because the asking amount exceeded the amount available, the Selection Committee’s goal was to use the agreed-upon *Round 3: Additional Considerations* to guide the parameters of funding.





## ACCOUNTABILITY. TRANSPARENCY. SIMPLICITY.

# South Central Coast Regional Consortium (SCCRC)

### Round 3: Additional Considerations

1. Consider past performance of grantees: Completion of Round 1 Interim Measures Survey. (all past funded applications are available in NOVA, spreadsheet is shared into the Region's Google Folder K12 SWP SCCRC Selection Committee 2020.
2. Previously awarded funds for the same or very similar work. Subsequent funding requests are not to sustain programs, rather, are intended to create one or more new CTE programs that feed into community college programs; phase in, augment, or improve the sequence of course or pathway; or to scale to a larger number of students of previously funded as a K12 SWP project.
3. Ensure a portfolio of awards meets the needs of the region's economy and the intent of the legislation.
4. Ensure fair and equal distribution of funds to all parts of the region and all size LEAs.
5. SC Chairs will call in an additional reviewer where the variance is larger than 30 Points

After the presentation of the PowerPoint by the SC Chair and Co-chair, the deliberation of possible parameters of funding were listed as "Scenarios/Options to Consider." Using the *Additional Considerations* of the committee to guide the SC members, the "Scenarios/Options to Consider" were displayed on a single document and subsequently voted on by majority via zoom poll and messaging. Additional suggestions were brought forth for voting by SC members and were voted on as well. Deductive reasoning was applied in selecting the parameters of funding as each consideration was voted on with a "yes" or "no" with the remaining suggestions then being combined. Each SC member had the opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" for each option.

### Scenarios/Options to Consider

1. Fully fund the top scoring applications until all of the funds are fully expended. List those applicants that met the minimum score of 75 but not funded identified as "Eligible but not funded". **eliminated**
2. Base funding on ADA or consider it as a factor to be considered. Be mindful that ADA may not be representative of the number of CTE students impacted. **eliminated**
3. Fully fund the smaller grants and partially fund the larger ones until the funding is expended. Do need to be mindful of reducing the funding to less than 75% of what was requested as it would more than likely impact their ability to implement the work plan that was scored. **eliminated**
4. Give priority consideration to applications in priority sectors in the region and that have not been previously funded. **YES**
5. Consider each sub-region, seek to look for equity in funding across the sub-regions while considering the top scoring applications. **YES**
6. Consider funding 1 application per LEA. **YES**
7. Consider an equal percentage to all (57.9%). **eliminated**
8. Consider funding the top 12 of 14 applications at 72%. **eliminated**

With the parameters agreed upon by majority vote, the funding amount was then deliberated. Based on the outcome of voting, the Selection Committee agreed to fund the highest scoring application from each LEA based on the average of all the 5 or 6 of reviewers that submitted. Each application was funded using the same percentage applied to the amount requested (87.5%). These parameters honored all scores of the SC members and afforded funding for each LEA represented in Round 3.

