Members Present: Arlene Kahn, Guido Krickx (Chair), Mark Nickerson, Robert Phelps, Steve Philibosian, John Primus.
Members Absent: Andrea Laird, Richard Vrmeer
Guests: Barbara Hudler, Robert Peyton Joan Sieber.

Note: Modification of Agenda: Emily Stoper (item 5) will not be able to attend this meeting, but wishes to be added to the agenda in the future.

1. Approval of the minutes of the Meeting of November 13: Approval of the minutes was slightly delayed until everyone had a chance to read the minutes. The minutes were approved. The Secretary was asked to include Robert Peyton among the guests.

2. Report of the Director: Mark Nickerson provided members of the Committee copies of enrollment comparisons between this Fall and Fall Quarter 1999. Of major note was that the University was down 70 FTE but showed an increase in headcount of 38. Mark has noted at previous meetings that both SFSU and SJSU have showed declines in FTE, especially in continuing seniors. All Bay Area CSUs are aggressively targeting recruitment.
We have revived an educational television project in Contra Costa County due to the re-negotiation of cable rights with a new vendor, via the Contra Costa Cable Television Consortium. Our goal is to have available a 24-7 educational cable channel for possible home based learning for CCC students.

We are still assuming that the Eagle Peak Montessori School will locate on our campus in the near future. The Department of Teacher Education of CSUH, spearheaded by Joan Davenport, is currently negotiating an agreement with the Mount Diablo School District. Supporters of the school are anxious to locate here since there is a scarcity of other sites in the county. Grades represented will ultimately span k-6 with between 150 and 180 students. The Eagle Peak Montessori School will become a supervision site and laboratory for the University. Teacher Education curriculum will be adapted to embrace opportunities presented by this onsite school.

Mark Nickerson attended a meeting last week, the purpose of which was to establish a Center for Citizenship and Community Leadership on the CCC Campus. We have a promising opportunity to use the Public Administration Department as a launching pad for a Policy Institute for Planning. 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. The Lesher Foundation might be approached to assist us in putting this together. Robert Phelps noted in an aside that the History Department is planning to start a Urban Studies program.

Mark again requested that the Committee refer possible candidates for our upcoming Distinguished Lecturer Series. There was some discussion about how to encourage students, staff and faculty to attend the lectures.

3. Report of the Chair: Guido Krickx has recently met with Emily Stoper, Chair of the Academic Senate and has had fruitful discussions with her regarding the role of the CCAC vis-a-vis the Senate. Emily had hoped to attend today's meeting but had scheduling conflicts. She hopes to meet with us next year. She is most anxious to reestablish regular communication between the CCAC and the Senate and has suggested that we might consider making regular appearances at Senate meetings, where our proposals would be considered and our agenda brought to the attention of the senators. Mark Nickerson commented that many in the Senate do not realize that
CCAC is now a standing committee of the Senate and no longer strictly an advisory body to the [Contra Costa Campus] Director. On the other hand, we are most fortunate in having Joan Davenport, formerly on ExComm, now in the Senate at large. Joan has always been a very strong supporter of the CCC. We are and have been hampered by the lack of permanent resident faculty on the CCC campus. These could be a stronger voice in the Senate promoting CCC programs. Permanent resident faculty would also provide a stronger presence when we recruit transfer students from the community colleges. We need to consider that tenured senior faculty are a better bet, since junior, tenure track faculty need to establish a presence on the main campus.

4. Presentation by Professor Joan Sieber, Psychology: Joan has been teaching a section of Psychology 4804 (Social and Personality Lab) here at CCC this Fall Quarter, which contains a component on conducting Focus Groups. Since the CCAC is planning several focus group sessions to get input from various "stakeholder groups" in the community it was felt that Joan's experience, advice and assistance would be invaluable to the committee. Joan divided her remarks into the following two categories: 1) How to improve services to our constituents (students) and 2) How to improve the visibility and attractiveness of our programs to local businesses. In discussing category one: Joan has learned much in candid focus group sessions with her own students about attitudes toward our campus, experiences which she recounted. She suggests that we advertise our website to students, to the extent of providing machines with logon information in our Academic Services and Library lobby areas. We need also to determine what students mean by "advising." Is it specifically programmatic advising or do we need to consider career planning; specifically the fit between our programs and the needs of local businesses. In the matter of communicating with students, Robert Phelps suggested creating a campus listserv to keep students informed of campus events, news and services.

Category two involved the fit between our programs and the needs of local businesses. Sometimes there is a disconnect between what students view as the credentials needed to secure a job in today's market and the specific skills employers desire. Specifically, employers are more desirous of the so-called "soft skills" which are in many ways generalist in nature: oral and written communication, analytical ability, self confidence and assertiveness, etc. These cross disciplinary skills are often sadly lacking in students who otherwise have demonstrated accomplishment in their degree program. Discussion ensued, including suggesting establishing an internship program at the CCC to aid students in learning certain skills in a job atmosphere. However CCC students being older and already employed full-time, this may not be practical.

Joan described the focus group session as a matter of getting the interviewees to feel comfortable enough to get below the surface issues to a level that they might not achieve on their own, to bring up issues as well as address already existing ones, often with some passion. For maximum results the focus group needs to be small in size; no more that 12. A larger number of invitations usually need to be sent out to achieve the desirable number. Incentives such as hors d'oeuvres or dinner could be provided. Transportation and or modest compensation could be provided. A "gatekeeper" comfortable to the group is essential. Status hierarchies need to be minimized to make the participants as comfortable as possible. The committee asked Joan to conduct our focus groups planned for late January. She would do this with one or more of her students as note takers. She asked the Committee what it wished to know from the focus groups. Mark Nickerson suggested the following: "what are the key problems or impediments to sending your students to us?", "what are the key requirements for students to transfer?", and "what are the key reasons to send students here and the key reasons not to send students here?"

The rest of Joan's presentation was taken up with planning for our series of focus groups. Would we approach all stake holder groups, given the committee's commitment to assisting with the mandate of the Chancellor's Office Feasibility Study? It was felt by the quorum remaining (Krickx, Nickerson, Phelps, Philibosian) that it would be unrealistic given the short timelines necessitated by the Feasibility Study, to survey more than one stake holder group. Mindful that Senator Torlakson had also requested a January progress report on the Feasibility Study and that the final report was due to CPEC at the beginning of May, it was decided to survey only the Community College stakeholder group in January and February of 2001. Mark Nickerson made the following motion: "The Committee agrees to undertake, in the context of Concurrent Resolution 179, a study of the needs of the community colleges in our service area. This study will consist of several focus groups of community college counselors and division chairs representing different disciplines; and that furthermore the committee will conclude its work within the timeframe of the ACR 170 Feasibility Study." (Nickerson/Phelps(?)) to approve. It was expected that Joan Sieber would be asked to coordinate dates for the
focus groups which, as noted above would begin in late January. An invitation letter would be prepared and sent out in the first or second week of January. Hopefully analysis of the interviews and a report could be prepared in February. There would need to be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Stakeholder Survey Logistics on December 5, but not a meeting of the whole.

5. Discussion of the Presentation by Dr. Gary Hammerstrom, CSU Asst. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and its implications for this Committee: This will be deferred until the next meeting

6. Report of the Subcommittee on Stakeholder Survey Questions: This will be deferred until the next meeting

7. Report from the Subcommittee on Stakeholder Survey Logistics: This will be deferred until the next meeting.

8. Other business: Guido Krickx will not be available to chair the next meeting on January 10, 2001

9. Adjournment: 4:45 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Steve Philibosian, Secretary