October 28, 1996

TO: SSRIC

FROM: Elliott Barkan

RE: MINUTES OF SSRIC MEETING, SAN LUIS OBISPO, OCTOBER 17, 1996

Ultimately Present: Jim Ross; Rodney Kingsworth; Jae Emenhiser; Ben

Smith; Allan Risley; Gene Turner; Richard Shaffer; David Tabb; John Korey; Elliott Barkan; Nan Chico; Ed Nelson; Don Dixon; Larry Giventer; Richard Taketa; Stuart Wugalter; and Frank Young.

Meeting was called to order by the Chair, Nan Chico, at about 9:30 AM.

Minutes of Spring meeting were distributed but, in the sweep of events, were not voted on.

Membership list was circulated for updating, including addition of URLs. Several members indicated they had created home pages, particularly Chico, Tabb, Emenhiser, Kingsworthy, and Shaffer.

Under the Chair's report, several matters were taken up, including where to relocate Penny Crane's SSRIC papers, which Korey - with his inimitable organizational skills - agreed to take and inventory in order to see that we possess a full record for these 25 yrs. He will e-mail the Council regarding any missing items. There was also discussion of how to preserve these materials, such as by scanning or putting up on the Web.

In response to Kingsworthy's inquiry, various members reported on how they disseminate information about the SSRIC and the challenge of keeping Chairs informed about what is available, such as through SSDBA and how many are using the resources on respective campuses.

This, in turn, led to a broader discussion of how we wish to   
continue to define ourselves, the SSRIC, and whether that   
definition ought to be broader than an association with a

relatively narrow band of data bases, that is essentially providing data sets. For example, should we begin to place more emphasis on the Institution and Research aspects in our name and more systematically provide skills workshops and work closer with our Teaching Resource Centers, as well as promote ways to link our materials and approaches to issues of critical thinking? Included in this are the problems of making access to SSDBA more user friendly.

[It should be noted that the discussion was so thoughtful and engrossing that no one - names omitted - was even reading a newspaper!]

Regarding the Field issues, Nelson spoke about the announcements sent out on e-mail and it was agreed that the existing Field Subcommittee would continue: Nelson, Barkan, and Giventer. With respect to putting Field Reports on the Web, issues of copyright and Field's resistance were noted. [see more below on this]

Nelson also distributed a list of research-oriented faculty on each campus and asked us to review and revise where needed as well as to seek additional interested colleagues to add to the list.

Nelson also noted the problem we have been having of getting applicants for the various Field programs, deadline now Jan. 15, 1997, and the need for the SSRIC to consider a fallback action if none are forthcoming.

Nelson reported on another successful summer workshop, this one on SPSS for Windows, and he passed around the mss for the manual which he, Korey, Chico, Shaffer, and Ross are completing for McGraw Hill. Nelson has also developed a home page and a reflector list of participants. Discussions of minimum sales, use on the web, and copyrighted raw data sets were also discussed.

Nelson also reported on his involvement with ICPSR as one of its more distinguished Board members. Because federal agencies are putting their data directly on line and less and less to ICPSR, and it probably will not get the Census 2000 data (which will be made all accessible), ICPSR - for that and other reasons - has been having to cut its budget and revise federation fees, particularly the underpaying which CSU has apparently been doing for some time. On July 1, 1997 a 3.1% general hike in fees will begin. He also discussed efforts to curb the role of the federations in the ICPSR, perhaps by breaking them up, and an AD-Hoc Federation Group Statement was prepared earlier in the month on the merits of the federations within the ICPSR. The question of how much the discount will fall is uncertain, but we have been paying $53,000, versus $116,000 if we were separated (55% discount). However, this year, the CSU fee will be near $70,000. Ed also pointed out that one reason for the development re the federation is that undergraduate instruction is not a major concern of the ICPSR.

In addition, the ICPSR Guide will no longer be distributed in

print copies after this year; hereafter it will be on the Web.

Ebeling went to the Summer 1996 program in Ann Arbor and reported back, indirectly, that the focus was on complex data for very specialized uses and with limited applications (for classroom use). While Ebeling will continue to coordinate the Summer program applications, it is uncertain, reports Nelson, if subsidies will any longer be available.

For the October 1997 ICPSR meeting in Ann Arbor, the following are the primary eligible campuses to attend, along with Nelson:

Chico

SLO

San Jose

Long Beach

San Bernardino

The next order of eligible campuses is:

Pomona

Fullerton

Bakersfield

San Marcos

Sacramento

Humboldt

Fresno

San Diego

Northridge

San Francisco

Stanislaus

Hayward

Los Angeles

Dominguez Hills

Sonoma

The Academic Information Resource Center will be meeting in Cupertino, Nov 15. It is part of the reorganization that has followed decentralization.

Stu Wugalter reported, to our dismay, that Don Carder is retiring from CSULA at the end of December 1996. He also noted the plans to scan Field Reports and put them on CD-Roms if they are at least one year old, but possibly sooner. He noted meetings he attended with Colin Campbell and their efforts to develop more instructional models, plus their interest in finding more sites to do presentations. Stu also noted other work in progress, such as updating the data set inventory, shifting from the Jukebox to disc

array, and placing order forms on the Web.

Wugalter also spoke at length about issues surrounding his appropriate role because he both works on SSDBA and is SPSS Site Coordinator, and faculty should be working through their SPSS campus coordinators and not relying on him for first hand assistance respecting SPSS. The issue is murky and confused but relates to which campuses had paid for tech support and were, therefore, entitled to the assistance. Frank Young said he would check on which campuses had paid as of 9-1-96.

Regarding Roper data and what we can get from them, a subcommittee was formed of Emenhiser, Korey, Tabb, and Nelson to explore this further. The Roper catalogue is now on the Web.

Frank Young then reported on the new mega program from the Chancellor's Office, Integrated Technology Strategy, which will ultimately involve extensive funding of programs (some $400m) to develop faculty and student technological skills. While each campus is now getting $50,000 for faculty development, there will be a second phase with RFPs soon to be issued. However, most of the money will really be going to upgrade the telecommunications infrastructure to provide 24 hour access for students and faculty to various computer systems. One aspect that 13 campuses have already implemented is the ONE CARD system for paying fees, library borrowing, making calls, and as an ID, etc.

This led to a protracted discussion, with much concern about how all this would be translated into the classroom and how the process would affect students and faculty, particularly the issue of

allotting sufficient time for training, institutional support and followup, and assessment of changes. Frank emphasized that proposals for teams to create instructional tools would need to be multi-campus ones that could demonstrate ("value added service") that what they propose would make a real difference: "scalable models[?]" - replicable, I presume.

With that in mind, Barkan proposed a mega committee to explore submitting a mammoth multi-campus proposal to tap into this coming behemoth, given the SSRIC's track record (which Young felt made us ideal for this). Along with Barkan, Taketa, Chico, Nelson,

Giventer, Turner, Tabb, and Shaffer [?] indicated an interest in

being on a planning committee that might meet to explore a proposal development.

Panting, exhausted, agitated, troubled, and confused, we adjourned at 5:05 PM. Some issues were left undecided, such as the date for the Student Competition.

On Friday we met and spent the morning exploring the Web.

P. S. AFTER DISCUSSING WITH HAROLD GOLDWHITE, NEW HEAD OF ITL, THE YOUNG REPORT AND OUR DESIRE FOR MODEST FUNDS TO GET THE SUBCOMMITTEE TOGETHER, I LEARNED THAT THEY HAVE NO GUIDELINES YET FOR THE NEW PROPOSALS AND THAT A PLANNING MEETING WOULD BE HELD IN JANUARY OR FEBRUARY AND WE WOULD BE KEPT INFORMED. HOWEVER, HE URGED US TO CONTACT OUR ACADEMIC VPs TO INDICATE OUR INTEREST IN REPRESENTING OUR CAMPUSES TO ANY SUCH PLANNING MEETINGS AT THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE. CONTACT YOUR VP TO LEARN WHEN THE MEETING IS ANNOUNCED. THUS, NO PRELIMINARY PLANNING MEETING CAN BE HELD BY US SINCE THERE IS NOTHING CONCRETE AROUND WHICH TO PLAN!!