

FW: Comments and Recommendations re Awards for Innovation in Higher Education

Osmena, Christian

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 9:25 PM

To: Innovation Awards (CA DOF)

From: Constance Carroll [mailto:ccarroll@sdccd.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 3:22 PM

To: Osmena, Christian

Cc: Quasebarth, Mollie; Cohen, Michael

Subject: Comments and Recommendations re Awards for Innovation in Higher Education

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Please post and distribute to committee members.



San Diego Community College District Office of the Chancellor

March 17, 2015

Dear Colleagues:

First and foremost, let me compliment the staff on a thorough and excellent analysis of proposals for the Awards for Innovation in Higher Education program, which was no simple task given that applications spanned a range of both institutions and systems. While applauding this work, I have three topics of concern to share along with recommendations.

Amount of Awards

California's 145 public institutions of higher education include 10 University of California campuses, 23 California State University campuses, and 112 community colleges. These institutions are known for their excellence and all suffered enormous budget losses during the 5 years of California's severe recession. Where quality in applications outlining significant innovation matches need, it is my strong belief that every effort should be made to provide funding. Staff has recommended 14 institutions to receive awards. If the awards are divided equally among these institutions, they would total \$3,571,000 each. If the average award level was dropped to \$2,500,000, the total amount of awards would be only \$35,000,000, leaving \$15,000,000 available to fund additional programs. Given the history, context and need, I strongly recommend funding at the lower level or even at the \$2,000,000 level in order to ensure that all deserving institutions are supported in their innovation.

Balance of Awards

Although ratio and percentages are not the guiding criteria for awards, they will raise questions. Indeed, I have already received calls on this topic. Let me share a brief overview.

Of the total 145 public institutions of higher education, the percentage breakdown follows:

- 10 UC campuses – 7% of the total number of institutions
- 23 CSU campuses – 16% of the total
- 112 community colleges – 77% of the total

There were 58 eligible applications received:

- 8 were submitted by UC campuses (out of 10 total UCs) - 14% of the total number of eligible applications
- 21 were submitted by CSU campuses (out of 23 total CSUs) - 36% of the total
- 29 were submitted by community colleges (out of 112 CCCs)- 50% of the total

If, as staff has recommended, only Groups 1 – 3 in the Recommended Applications will receive awards, the breakdown of the 14 recommended awards would be:

- 1 UC campus – 7% of the total awards
- 7* CSUs – 50% of the total awards (*actually 6 CSU campuses, 7 awards)
- 6 community colleges – 43% of the total awards

Another view would be looking at the impact upon each system of higher education and the proportion of awardees. This would be the following.

- 10% of the UCs would receive awards (1 out of 10 campuses)
- 26% of CSUs would receive awards (6 out of 23 campuses)
- 5% of community colleges would receive awards (6 out of 112 colleges)

Let me reiterate that my intent is not to drive us toward an outcome by percentages, but to underscore how uneven such an outcome will appear to the higher education community and the public especially given the excellence of many proposals not recommended for funding. I recommend that the final range of funded applications exhibit sensitivity to this perception.

Recommendation for Additional Awards

As indicated above, I support the staff's recommendations for the institutions in Groups 1 – 3. However, I believe that Group 4 contains excellent proposals as well. I recommend that Group 4 also be funded, bringing the total number of awards to 26. That would have a salutary impact upon a larger number of deserving institutions with notable innovations.

The breakdown of awards in Groups 1 – 4 would show a more substantial representation overall:

- 3 UC campuses would receive awards (12% of the total)
- 12* CSU campus awards (46% of the total) * 2 CSUs would receive multiple awards
- 11 community colleges would receive awards (42% of the total)

It would also result in the following proportional breakdown *vis-à-vis* the systems of higher education, as follows:

- 30% of the UCs would receive awards (3 out of 10)
- 48% of CSU campus awards would be made (*12 out of 23)* 2 CSUs would receive multiple awards
- 10% of community colleges would receive awards (11 out of 112)

There are two simple ways to accomplish this outcome:

- a) All 26 awardees can be funded through a new averaging of the \$50 million available; or
- b) Institutions in groups 1-3 can be awarded \$2,500,000 for each application funded for a total of \$35,000,000, and the remaining institutions in group 4 would receive an average of \$1,250,000 each for the balance of \$15,000,000.

Again, this recommendation is presented in view of the excellence of the Group 4 applications and what I perceive to be a more substantial and more balanced outcome of the awards.

Alternative Recommendation

If the recommendation above cannot be adopted, I then recommend that the community colleges in Group 4 receive awards. Some of them have done extremely impressive work leading to the innovative goal of the bachelor's degree (Bakersfield College, Santa Monica College). The others have leading programs with high schools and impressive partnerships with universities, all strengthening the baccalaureate pipeline (Grossmont College, Santa Rosa Junior College, Sierra College).

Conclusion

In conclusion, I support the recommended awards to the institutions in Groups 1-3, as recommended by staff. I urge the committee to spend the entire \$50,000,000 in awards. I recommend that the committee also fund the institutions in Group 4 or at least fund the community colleges in that group, using the balance of funding remaining from funding Groups 1-3 or adjusting all of the funding to cover the institutions in Groups 1-4.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to present my views and recommendations.



Dr. Constance M. Carroll
Chancellor
San Diego Community College District
3375 Camino del Rio South
San Diego, CA 92108
Tel. (619) 388-6957
Fax (619) 388-6541
Email ccarroll@sdccd.edu
 [@carrollsdccd](https://twitter.com/carrollsdccd)



**SAN DIEGO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DISTRICT**