members present: Arlene Kahn, Guido Krickx (Chair), Andrea Laird, Mark Nickerson, Robert Phelps, Steve Philibosian, John Primus, Richard Vrmeer

Guests: Herb Eder, Gary Hammerstrom, Barbara Hudler, Sue Schaefer

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of October 2, 2000: MSP Nickerson/Primus to approve.

2. Report of Director Mark Nickerson: Mark deferred his report until after Mr. Gary Hammerstrom's presentation.

3. Presentation by Mr. Gary Hammerstrom, CSU Asst. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Mark Nickerson introduced Mr. Hammerstrom to members and guests. Mr. Hammerstrom, who comes to the Chancellor's Office by way of San Francisco State University, has extensive experience planning for off campus sites in Southern California, notably the new CSU Channel Islands. He has been assigned the task of coordinating a feasibility study of the programs and services of the Contra Costa Campus, as mandated by Assembly Concurrent Resolution no. 179 (Torlakson, 11th District). This feasibility study will be conducted in two parts. Phase One would consist of a macro analysis of demographic data such as high school graduate participation rates, community college attendance, workforce statistics (employment needs, etc.) in our area. It will be conducted by the Chancellors Office staff. If the data revealed in Phase One showed a "critical mass" of demand Phase two would normally be contracted out and would consist of evaluating and projecting how that demand could impact our existing services. There will be a progress report provided to Assemblyman (now Senator) Torlakson and his staff in January, 2001. The Post Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) will receive the final results of this study by May of 2001. The results of this feasibility study would also need to be scrutinized by the staff and faculty at both the Contra Costa and Hayward campuses and any final decisions would be ours to make. Senator Torlakson, it must be noted, has been very supportive of CSUH in this process.

There was much discussion of previous and other upcoming feasibility surveys conducted in the San Diego State University and Los Angeles Basin service areas as they very heavily impacted. Existing CSU campuses at San Diego and San Marcos will be augmented by several additional off-campus centers, which would be located nearby to handle overflow. Some of these will engage in innovative collaboration with local community colleges, for example at Otay Mesa (on the campus of Southwestern Community College). Mr Hammerstrom pointed out that "Tidal Wave II" demand for CSU services is currently much higher in Southern California than in the Bay Area. However it is important to point out that we do not anticipate building additional campuses to handle this situation, but to explore, as noted above, the use of off-campus centers, as well as non-prime time use of existing campuses and distance education, to handle this situation. Note: it is important to determine whether demand for certain programs will evaporate after an initial cohort of students passes through the program or whether the addition of certain programs will merely siphon off existing students from other majors but add no net gain in FTE.
In the discussion that ensued, Mr. Hammerstrom asked the Committee to respond to his remarks. Mark Nickerson began by mentioning our ongoing project of focus group sessions to assess needs in three different stakeholder groups in the county. There is a need to engage in this dialogue with the community colleges at the faculty level. He would provide Mr. Hammerstrom with a copy of the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey. Dick Vrmeer brought up the "multiple campus" idea where coequal parts of the same campus were located convenient to students homes or businesses. It was noted that many CCC students worked in areas distant from their homes and that they might attend class on the way home from their job sites (Mark Nickerson, Robert Phelps) (i.e. from the East Bay or San Francisco to East Contra Costa County). Andrea Laird suggested that campus amenities and special programs might be a factor in attracting new students. There was also some agreement among the Committee membership that collaboration might include offering CSUH courses on community college campuses (such as the Contra Costa College Campus in San Pablo). Mr. Hammerstrom pointed out that it is apparent that in the case of San Diego State, the home campus had a very clear idea of programmatic needs. In our own situation we are still assessing programmatic needs in Contra Costa County.

Mark Nickerson cautioned that offering programs solely on the basis of price point may overlook the fact that many companies subsidize courses for their employees; thus making convenience more of a selling point than price.

4. Report of the Subcommittee on Stakeholder Survey Questions (Laird, Nickerson, Krickx and Phelps: Subcommittee member Andrea Laird has not prepared a formal report as yet. However the following questions are proposed:

   1. What do you know about the Contra Costa Campus
   2. Do you require both "hard" and "soft" skills of your employees?
   3. What do you feel is the advantage of having a university graduate as an employee?

   There will be another four questions for a total of seven.

5. Report from the Subcommittee on Stakeholder Survey Logistics (Laird, Kahn Primus and Hudler): Barbara Hudler reported for the Subcommittee. Minutes from this Subcommittee's meeting of October 13, 2000 were passed out to the Committee. Attached was a sample invitation letter. Since the preliminary version of the invitation letter was not ready at this time, committee members were asked to study this sample. Dick Vrmeer suggested that the composition of focus group 2 (business, local government, local businesses, nonprofit organizations and chambers of commerce) take into consideration some 80% of local businesses in the county are quite small, unlike the names on the list of 15 "Key Employers". How would we be able to reach these smaller employers? Possibly see who participates in the Chamber of Commerce. There was some discussion as to whether the Focus Group 1 (Community College Counselors and Dept. Chairs (still to be researched by Andrea Laird) needs to be expanded to the Community College faculty at large, high school faculty or even faculty at local private high schools (e.g. De la Salle). There was some concern that the busy schedules of Community College faculty might necessitate our attending faculty meetings or other events on the home campus to produce a quorum for our focus groups. There was also some consideration whether we should include Las Positas College (Livermore). Was the Tri Valley area (580/680 Corridor) part of our service area? The Community College focus groups might be scheduled in the latter half of January when the College Counselors are less busy.

Mark Nickerson noted that Joan Sieber remains available as a resource for conducting the focus group sessions. Mark passed out Joan's 5 page guide on focus groups to assist the committee in its work. She might also be available to assist in conducting the focus groups.
6. **Report of the Contra Costa Campus Director** (Mark Nickerson) deferred from above: Mark mentioned that we will be having in addition to our music concert series in 2001, a distinguished lecturer series. Currently scheduled is Prof. Mike Orkin (Statistics), who will speak on his popular subject of gambling odds; and Richard Orsi (History) who will discuss railroads in California (as yet unconfirmed). Other invitees might include George Miller (Anthropology), Scott Stine, (Geography), Phil Storrer (Accounting) and Theodore Roszak (History).

7. **Meeting Schedule for CCAC during Winter 2001**: Our next meeting is November 27\textsuperscript{th}. Committee members now know their teaching schedules. Due to scheduling difficulties in the Winter Quarter the Committee will meet on the following Wednesdays from 3 PM to 5:30 PM in Winter Quarter 2001:

   - January 10, 2001 3:00 PM to 5:30 PM
   - February 7, 2001 3:00 PM to 5:30 PM
   - March 7, 2001 3:00 PM to 5:30 PM

As the Committee members did not know their teaching schedules for Spring Quarter, 2001, further scheduling was deferred till later

8. **Adjournment** 3:50 PM

   Respectfully Submitted

   Steve Philibosian, Secretary