MINUTES OF SSRIC MEETING. FRESNO, OCT. 11-12, 1990

Present: P. Hass; B. Haston; R. DeLeon; J. Korey; C. McCall; J. Johnson; R. Hofstadter; E. Barkan: T. Anagnason: J. Ross; T. Dunn; F. Gossett; J. Hightower; H. Nelson: D. Graves; G. Turner; R. Shaffer: L. Giventer; D. Dixon; C. Barnes: and T. West.

Absent [but not in spirit]: Serpe; Blue; Ebeling

Convened at 10:18 AM

1. Ted, as Chair, provided the group with a superlative, lightning fast 10 minute summary of recent events re the Autumn Massacre at CCR as part of the efforts to "downsize" the CO [before the new Chancellor is appointed?], including McCune's letter, the meeting at SWRL, the letter to the presidents, the establishment of the two task forces to review the proposed changes [on both of which SSRIC will sit], the decision to extend the use of the 960 until June 1991. and the prospects regarding the reallocation of funds to campuses for academic computing, etc. Mention was made of the RFP from West. on Oct. 4 re the 960 and the Fullerton proposal, including, the move of Jeff Johnson to there along with the social sciences data bases.
2. A spirited but short debate took place to decide how to approach Tom West. who was due at 11 AM, particularly the concern that. within the CO the moves were viewed as fait accompli and the contention that the issue had now to be taken beyond the existing level in order to gain support for academic computing, such as to the legislature, CFA. Academic Senate, the press, etc. A major concern centered on the reliability of funding, especially because no controls would be actually placed on the disbursement of funds shifted to the campuses. A second principal concern was the availability of support services following decentralization. A third concern was regarding the reliability and durability of whatever replaces the current arrangement.
3. West arrived at 11:02 AM. He acknowledged that the decisions had already been made by him to move operations and services to the campuses, with the options of a lead campus, consortium, or individual campus operation. Factors of cost effectiveness. budget cuts. shifts in management philosophy, the presidents' desire to place more decision making at campus levels, and the criticisms of the CO that focused on the CCR [because it has held one-third of CO staff] were all behind his actions. While accepting responsibility for the shifts, West acknowledged that the reallocations would be without any strings: with no security that academic computing would actually receive those funds.

Questions to West concerned the cost effectiveness; the timetable; the failure to consult with those directly affected [i.e., the faculty]; the shift to administrative computing concerns within the CSU; the threat posed to the CSU teaching mission, to the national model provided by CSU in this realm as well as to the SSRIC itself; the inefficiencies elsewhere [such as at Stanford]; the problems of small vs large campuses and providing workshops.

modules, networking, funds for innovative projects, and adequate and available support staff; and the problems of central record keeping [i.e., for ICPSR], of who will .judge the proposed revisions, and of meeting the needs for research, instruction, recruitment, and retention.

West addressed some of these concerns and kept repeating that the burden is on us to prove - to quantify the fact - that more time is needed before the shifts are made for the momentum was to "migrate to a new model" quickly. We must prove that the Cyber is being effectively used for instructional purposes [somewhat evading the problem of how one fully documents the direct and indirect uses and the qualitative vs quantitative factors in any assessment of its full role in the system]. West did acknowledge that one "sacred" thing was that central funding would continue for systemwide licensing and key memberships, such as in ICPSR. Field, and Roper. He spoke of three funding models: off-the-top; charge back, and stewardship - leadership by one campus, but with ultimate charge backs.

Adjourned for lunch at 1:10 PM and resumed at 2:25PM.

1. Korey presented copies of his supplement for his research methods courses, and Dean Peter Klausner greeted the group. This was followed by a continuation of the discussion of West's appearance and the issue of how to view the Cyber Question: as murder or as euthanasia [so-to speak: premature or inevitable]. Among the many points was Haston's suggestion of an audit to see just where CCR's funds have gone between administrative and academic computing and his question as to why academic computing has not been under the V.C. for Academic Affairs.

The decision was made to draft a letter to all who might help, emphasizing the need for off-the-top funding, adequate staff, training, special programs, and explicit protection of the Field. ICPSR, Roper and other such arrangements as well as our response to the Fullerton proposal and the issue of centralized vs an on-campus arrangement for the central facilities.

1. Gene Dippel and Rich Serpe, of Fullerton, then came through on a conference call to discuss the Fullerton proposal. Questions were raised re funds, staff, chargeback procedures, storage of tapes, fragmentation between campuses, the 830 vs the 960, the acquisition of software, Jeff Johnson's role [already described as Godlike], etc.

Adjourned at 5 PM, exhausted!!
Reconvened Friday at 9:13 AM.

1. Other items were discussed, including the as yet unreceived annual report from Graves for 89-90, summer programs, ICPSR [but Ebeling was absent], and the Field poll positions and announcements for this year. Barnes also noted that her Institute for Social

Research had begun operations at Sac.

A draft letter prepared by Barkan was discussed. Dixon noted that four realities were emerging: that the full range of academic services be continued: that, wherever situated, the facilities should be multidisciplinary; that that location have the capacity for faculty development and training; and that we have the opportunity for continued development of curriculum materials. Given the response to the draft letter [it perhaps expressed the sentiments of the council "too well" to be publicly distributed] and Dixon's and others' observations, Barnes drafted a new, shorter letter that was adopted by the Council.

1. Barkan noted that the SSIMs modules had received $924, of which some $370 was earmarked for SSRIC use. The funds are in a trust account at San Bernardino.
2. Nelson discussed his SSIMs dissemination grant last year and the presentations done at San Jose, San Francisco, Bakersfield, Fresno, Stanislaus, and Fullerton.
3. The next student conference will be held on May 9, 1991 at CSU Hayward.
4. Korey suggested arranging the future Fall meetings to coincide with the Field Institute meetings and that was approved.
5. Finally, it was approved that a letter be sent by the Chair to Fullerton stating our concerns re its proposal and our support if those concerns could be met.

Adjourned at 11:50 AM.

Respectfully submitted by

Elliott R. Barkan