

EXPLANATION OF REVISED FINAL RESULTS:

Subsequent to the end of the competition, and after additional examination of all technical review forms, the Department discovered a discrepancy in the peer reviewers' scoring of seven applications as they related to competitive preference priority 3 (CPP 3) and selection criterion (E)(1). These States are Hawaii, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, and Wisconsin. In this competition, CPP 3 could be met in one of two ways: by the reviewer indicating that all elements in Status Table (A)(1)-(12) were met, or by receiving a score of at least 70% of available points on criterion (E)(1). The scoring of CPP 3 was on an all or nothing basis. That is, if a majority of the reviewers concluded that CPP 3 was met, an applicant received 10 points. If a majority of reviewers concluded that CPP 3 was not met, the applicant received 0 points.

In each case in which a discrepancy was found, at least one reviewer's vote as to whether to award 10 points for CPP 3 was not consistent with the number of points that reviewer awarded under criterion (E)(1). For example, in a few instances, a reviewer gave the applicant less than 70% of the points under criterion (E)(1), but that reviewer voted "yes" in favor of giving the 10 priority points.

After a close review of the technical review forms with scoring discrepancies and consultation with the reviewers, the Department determined that the scores of five States were incorrect and needed to be revised. In particular, the Department has revised the scores for the following States as follows:

STATE	ORIGINAL SCORE	REVISED SCORE
Hawaii	135.2	125.2
Kentucky	208.4	207.2
Massachusetts	267	257
New Mexico	236	236.2
Wisconsin	234	224

With respect to Hawaii, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, the Department concluded that these States should not have received 10 points for CPP 3, because a reviewer had mistakenly voted "yes" on CPP 3. When these votes were corrected, a majority of the reviewers for each of these States voted "no" on CPP 3 and the State therefore should not have received the 10 points for that priority. The scores for Kentucky and New Mexico were revised slightly to reflect minor corrections of the scores for criterion (E)(1). Corrections to Nevada and New York did not result in any changes in their overall scores, because even with those corrections the majority votes on CPP 3 remained the same.

As a result of these scoring revisions, there are corresponding changes in the rank order, but because only the top nine applicants were funded in this competition, these corrections do not have any impact on the funding of any application for Fiscal Year 2011. In particular, the top nine funded

States remain the same under the Revised Final Results. Massachusetts is now ranked fifth rather than second, but remains in funding range (i.e., the top nine). All the States that were not within the funding range for Fiscal Year 2011 under the original rank order remain outside of the funding range for Fiscal Year 2011 under the Revised Final Results.