Meeting Minutes April 27, 2002  
Student Union Board Room  
CSU San Bernardino

**Present**: Elliott Barkan (Chair), Chris Bettinger, Nan Chico, Don Dixon, Jon Ebeling, Jae Emenhiser, Jim Gerber, Phil Gianos, Kanghu Hsu, Jon Korey, Ed Nelson, Paul O'Brien, Jim Ross, Richard Serpe, Dick Shaffer, Rich Taketa, Gene Turner, Tony Hernandez (SSDBA), Mike McLean (Chancelor's Office)

Meeting called to order at 9:30. A membership list was distributed for updates and several number changes were noted for the next update.

**MSP** to approve minutes of winter meeting.

**1. Review of Spring Student Conference**

Student Award Winners:

Betty Nesvold Grad paper: Kathy Stephens, CSUSB;  
Charles McCall Undergrad paper: Jill Messing, CSUSB

Barkan said there were 17 participants and that ten came from San Bernardino. Ebeling asked that if posters were being allowed, how would they be judged relative to orally presented papers. Barkan noted that only one poster was submitted this time and the student made an oral presentation on the topic as well.

Nelson noted there were no papers qualified for the Rummell's Award and so no winner. Barkan replied that there has been an overall decline in quantitative papers, and so we might want to try to change this trend. Perhaps we could place a comment in our conference brochures that submissions of papers derived from quantitative data analysis are encouraged. Ross commented that he has always had the best response by personally contacting professors teaching methods classes. It might be helpful to compile a list of such people and contact them in advance of our student conference. Ebeling said he has always heard very positive feedback from students after they have presented papers at the conference. We could have past presenters talk to students back on their campuses or we could put some student commentary on our web site to encourage future participants. We also might distribute a SSRIC newsletter featuring the conference next fall. Nelson added that we might contact other groups such as BICC, the GIS specialty center, and student social science groups to increase awareness.

Another issue is the last-minute commitment of students to attend the conference. While students now seem to not want to commit to anything and many say they are too busy to participate in the conference, there are some other issues including the CSU student competition a week later than ours and the costs of attending. While there are funds for student support through campus student associations and from deans, access and award of these monies requires considerable advance planning.

Overall the Council felt that this Spring Student Conference was a success and Elliott Barkan was congratulated for his hard work.

**2. ICPSR Summer Program**

Ebeling distributed a memo outlining requests for funding from two people to attend this summer's conference. The first was from Dr. Diane Schmidt, professor of political science at CSU Chico. She requested funding to attend a five-day course on network analysis and a second five-day course on categorical data analysis. The second applicant was Dr. Elliott Barkan who requested support to attend a weeklong course on Census 2000. Applicants for this course are subject to approval and Dr. Barkan has not been notified that he will be accepted.

Ebeling recommended that Dr. Schmidt be awarded $1800 and that Dr. Barkan be awarded $1200.

**MSP** to provide the funds as requested with the provision that all funds go to Dr. Schmidt should Dr. Barkan not be selected to attend the Census 2000 class.

**3. Update on ICPSR Dues Structure**

Korey said ICPSR has created a committee to review the membership fee structure and that the committee should meet next month and a recommendation is expected before this July.

An important issue from our perspective is that while some major research universities will remain members regardless of the cost, many other institutions consider the membership optional. These might feel the membership is not worth the added cost. Korey felt that ICPSR understood this. He also felt that an alternative idea of a fee-for-service option had no real support at ICPSR. Last year the CSU paid a little over $81,000 for membership. Nelson suggested that we should focus on both the cost issue and the benefits that federation membership provides for its members. He recommended the Chair writes a letter to ICPSR expressing our concerns and that we contact other federations to do the same. These could go to Chuck Humphry and Martinez in Florida.

Barkan said he would draft a letter and discuss it with Dick Shaffer, SSRIC Chair-elect.

**4. Review of Priority List for Attending the Biennial ICPSR Meeting**

Korey distributed a priority list of campuses for the 2003 ICPSR meeting. There was some discussion about where we should put new institutions such as the Maritime Academy and Channel Islands. These would be added to the bottom of the list at the time an OR joins the SSRIC.

**MSP** to add the Maritime Academy to the bottom of the list.

Barkan reported that George Baldwin (CSUMB) displayed little interest in attending the SSRIC and is not usre that there is interest at this time in Monterey Bay being a member of the SSRIC. Shaffer said he would contact the campus (dean) about joining and someone else attending since Baldwin is chair of his department.

Gerber said he would like to send a staff person as an alternate to the ICPSR meeting. Since this person is not an OR, Korey felt that a By-Law change might be needed for it to happen. Gerber said he would look into this and report back at the next meeting.

**PRIORITY LIST FOR 2003 OR MEETING**

1. San Jose 8. Los Angeles 15. Northridge

2. San Bernardino 9. Sonoma 16. Hayward

3. Bakersfield 10. SLO 17. Chico

4. Humboldt 11. Pomona 18. Stanislaus

5. Fresno 12. Fullerton 19. Monterey Bay

6. San Diego 13. Long Beach 20. San Marcos

7. San Francisco 14. Sacramento 21. Dominguez Hills

22. Maritime Academy

**5. Field Institute Meeting**

Gianos asked if anyone had knowledge of the process Field used in selecting questions since he has regularly been running a similar type of survey out of his institution. No one did.

Barkan said that because of elections the Field Institute meeting has been postponed to September. We could choose either the 20th or 27th of September. The Council voted to request the meeting be held on September 20th.

Hernandez reported that all the 2001 Field Surveys and the first from 2002 have been put up on the server. The 2001 surveys areavailable over the web and in SDA format.

**6. 2003-2003 SSRIC Meeting Locations and Dates**

Fall: Oct. 25-26 CSU Sonoma

Winter: Feb. 21-22 CSU SLO

Spring: Apr. 26-26 San Francisco State U. (Tentative, but should be OK)

**7. Database Funding and Negotiations with Committee of Library Directors**

Mike McLean from the Chancellor’s Office reported that the social science databases will be funded next year. However, he added that in the future they will need to have an interface that meets COLD’s standards of access. He added that recently a lot of IT funding has gone into infrastructure improvement, but the attention now is beginning to be focused on upgrading academic technology. Databases are part of this area and they should be supported.

McLean could not guarantee that future funding would be assured due to expected cutbacks in the State Budget this summer. He noted that the business databases were in the same situation. Funding sources for the data could come from EAR, COLD, Academic Technology, and the campuses. While in the past EAR and COLD had funding control, they now have become advisory to a vice-chancellor who allocates funding.

He briefly reviewed a model being pushed by Gerry Hanley that is called the CSU On-Line Faculty Resource Center. This involved six areas of access including:

1. Text bibliography  
2. Image databases  
3. Language and learning labs  
4. Alphanumeric data bases  
5. Pedagogical data bases (Merlot Project)  
6. CATS Simulations

Barkan reported that the COLD wanted an open-access system similar to what the library now uses. While Tony Hernandez will be working on this, the question arose of whether this had to happen before acceptance by the COLD.

Nelson said the type of response expected from us is not clear. The review of the SSDBA last winter by COLD and EAR was vague in terms of what was expected and we are unsure of just who will decide if SSDBA is acceptable. Is it COLD or EAR? Whom do we report to? We must have an itemized list of specific requirements so that someone does not come back with a list of additional changes when we seek approval.

Korey said many campuses have a data librarian and perhaps SSDBA might go that way. Barkan said the bottom line for COLD is that funding not come out of their current budget. McLean noted that faculty need is important at the Chancellor's Office and that use of the data sets is shown. The SSRIC needs to talk to deans, campus presidents, and other officials to keep this issue visible.

It was suggested that an email correspondence with Gerry Hanley would be the most effective way to iron out these issues. Elliott and Dick will be drafting a letter to Gerry to identify what we will be doing in order to determine the time line and what else COLD/EAR may want before giving the SSDBA and data sets their blessing.

**8. ICPSR Direct**

Hernandez reported that lawyers are reviewing the policy of providing CSU campuses with accounts for direct access to ICPSR databases. A list of campus server addresses will be provided to ICPSR so that this can happen once all legal issues are satisfied.

He asked if the campus liaisons can be listed as the point of contact with ICPSR. Some felt that this person may not be able to handle many questions. The OR could be that person, but this was not resolved.

Serpe expressed frustration with attempting to get campus support for the SSDBA. A number of faculty had acquired ICPSR data from outside sources and had come to his institute for assistance which he provided. He had argued with his administration that this was the same service that SSDBA provided and that it cost more than if he paid for SSDBA membership. However, the administration refused to allow him to do this even if it did cost more. They seemed interested in subscribing to ICPSR Direct rather than going through SSDBA. Hernandez reminded everyone that ICPSR Direct does not provide help in preparing or analyzing the data.

Serpe also expressed reservation about the appropriateness of faculty using the ICPSR data when his campus did not subscribe to SSDBA. However, Shaffer recalled that all campuses have a right to use the ICPSR as part of the central agreement. They just will not receive assistance from the SSDBA.

**9. Old Business -** None

**10. New Business**

Ed Nelson thanked everyone for the GPS gift and suggested a vote of thanks to Elliott Barkan for serving as chair in a difficult year.

Hernandez asked if some ICPSR data could be made publicly available at CSU Long Beach as part of a federal grant. While this could be done on the SSDBA web site, it was felt that that is what ICPSR is for. Korey suggested ICPSR would be the best place for access to the data. Perhaps SSDBA could link to that.

Minutes  
Gene Turner