Members Present: Arlene Kahn, Andrea Laird, Mark Nickerson, Steve Philibosian, John Primus, Richard Vrmeer

Members Absent: Guido Krickx, Robert Phelps

Guests: Barbara Hudler, Robert Peyton, Sue Schaefer

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 27, 2000: Section 2 paragraph 3, third sentence should be amended to read: "There could be orientation programs for newly elected officials and community leaders with outreach to local high schools so that students could learn about government service." Section 3 paragraph one, fourth sentence should be amended to read: "Mark Nickerson commented that many in the Senate might not realize that the CCAC is now a standing committee of the Senate and no longer strictly an advisory body to the director." Section 5: Mr. Gary Hammerstrom should be changed to Dr. Gary Hammerstrom. There were some other minor changes requested.

2. Report of the Director/Acting Chair: Guido Krickx was unable to attend the meeting. Mark Nickerson served as Acting Chair. Mark reported that our Winter Quarter 2001 FTE was virtually the same as that of Winter Quarter 2000. He also mentioned that there has been a new hire in the Extension Division, Richard Caramella, who will work closely with us here at the CCC. He has had extensive experience with business programs.

3. Review of the questions for community college counselors and division chairs: Andrea Laird, Mark Nickerson and Robert Phelps served on the subcommittee developing the questions. Joan Sieber, Psychology, has agreed to conduct the focus group sessions in February with the initial sessions directed toward the community college counselors. Professor Sieber has suggested that it would be useful to follow up the focus group, while members were still there, with a brief survey or questionnaire that would provide each attendee an opportunity to register an opinion on each question. This survey could be structured as a Likert scale (scale of 1-5 or 1-7). Discussion centered on the group questions themselves and suggestions for questions on the follow-up questionnaire. Suggestions for amending the focus group questions included having the question "do you differentiate between the two campuses (Hayward and CCC) when advising?" follow question #1 ("What is your general perception of CSU Hayward and its Contra Costa Campus"). It was also felt that question #4 "What appear to be the perceptions of your student advisees with respect to CSUH and its Contra Costa Campus" should be put into two subclasses, one for each campus. It was also felt that questions #7 (Is there a need for more frequent interactions between CSUH . . .) should be
changed to “Do you feel a need for more…” and #8 (Are there impediments that interfere with your college’s use of the CSUH Contra Costa Campus resources, services or facilities?) should be changed to “Have you found that there are impediments….”. It was also suggested that in the exit survey community college counselors could be asked if they wished to be kept posted as to new programs and other developments at the CCC. Andrea Laird agreed to work on the questionnaire that would immediately follow the group sessions. Mark Nickerson agreed to provide modified versions of the focus group questions.

4. Review of the work plan for the CSU Feasibility Study (ACR 179): The Committee is aware of the deadline of May 1, 2001 for the Feasibility Study. The component parts of the work plan are the following: 1) the CSU Chancellor’s Office Demographic survey, to be conducted by Gary Hammerstrom 2) *The programmatic analysis*, of which part a, the community college focus Group Survey would be conducted by CCAC, and part b, focus groups of key government, industry and non-political organizations, would be conducted by an independent contractor. When this work has been completed, the CCAC should report to the CSUH Academic Senate and other constituencies. This important step, would take place between the middle of February and March. Robert Peyton reported that a prospective outside contractor had been selected to survey selected key stakeholders in industry, government and not-for-profit groups (section 2b of the workplan). Four potential stakeholder focus groups would consist of approximately five individuals each for a total of 20 participants. It was suggested that additional information might be obtained from the planning documents of local community colleges. These might give us additional focus on employment, commute and other trends in CCC’s service area.

5. Refine the CCAC’s work plan to coincide with the Feasibility Study: It appears that if CCAC’s community college focus groups and the industry/community community focus groups conducted by the outside consultant are completed by the end of February, we should be able to coordinate with Gary Hammerstrom’s study in time for a report to be completed by May 15.

6. Other Business: Barbara Hudler reported that the schedule for the community college focus groups was set for the beginning of February. She has not been able to finalize community college division chairs participation as yet. There was concern that we may not be able to survey them in February.

7. Adjournment: 5:15

Respectfully

Submitted,

Steve Philibosian