**Minutes – Meeting of February 21, 2003, at   
California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo**

Present: Rich Taketa (SJ), Elliott Barkan (SB), Jim Ross (BA), Ed Nelson (FR), Ted Anagnoson (LA), Dick Shaffer (SLO), John Korey (PO), Randy MacIntosh (SA), Gene Turner (NO), Nan Chico (HA), Richard Serpe (SM), Kanghu Hsu (DH)

Meeting called to order at 9:15 a.m.

1.      **Approval of the minutes.** Approved as submitted.

2.      **Introductions**.

3.      **Additions/Corrections to the agenda.** None.

**4.      Update on the SSDBA and funding for the social science data bases.**

1. **Report from the SSDBA.** No report.
2. **Report from the Chancellor’s Office (Zweier) – see below.**

        Discussion of the present state and future of the SSDBA.

        Tony Hernandez has become the acting director of the campus institutional research office, which is within the office of the Provost/VPAA.

        The SSDBA is being handled – we think – by Colin Campbell, who handled it before Tony, and who is within the office of the VP for Information Resource Management.

        Items promised for August, 2002 – a new web page and new indexing system – have still not been installed.

        Alternatives to the SSDBA were discussed.

        Should SSDBA fail to continue to function, the following data was targeted as important to save:

        Preferably everything.

        High priority – the Field surveys and codebooks.

        Barkan mentioned INS data that was specially purchased. Other data may have been specially purchased.

        Ideal activities for a data center such as SSDBA would be to:

        Provide workshops

        Provide materials for data analysis

        Indexing of data bases

        Help desk

        Putting up Field, ICPSR, Roper, other data

* **Next steps:**

        It was m/s/p for Ted Anagnoson to investigate whether the SSDBA is still functioning at his campus. This activity is to be done within one week.

        It was m/s/p for Dick Shaffer to call Gerry Hanley to investigate the possibility of an audit of the SSDBA funds and who might be the responsible party at CSULA for the SSDBA. If Ted does not receive an answer, it was decided to move formally with a request for an audit of the SSDBA funds received in the last two years (01-02 and the current year, 02-03).

**1.      Field Institute – report from the Field Committee of Ed Nelson, Dick Shaffer, Nan Chico.**

1. **Five proposals for question credits and/or the faculty fellow were received**. Three were clearly not as good quality as the other two. It was m/s/p to recommend:

(1)   Prof. Alexandra Cole of CSU Northridge for the Field Institute Faculty Fellowship for her questions and proposal on post-materialist values.

(2)   Prof. Sandra Emerson of CPSU Pomona for the Field Institute question credits based on her proposal on corruption and questionable behavior.

(3)   We recommend that Field use the unused questions from the faculty fellowship on the question credit proposal.

1. **Ross to place on the Teaching Resource Depository www site** information on how to access questions through the SSDBA.
2. **No requests were received for the student internship.** Discussion ensued on the reasons for this state of affairs, which is outside the control of the SSRIC.

**2.      ICPSR Biennial Meeting.**

1. **The rotation list submitted by the chair with the agenda was approved.**
2. **Proposed bylaw change.** The bylaw change submitted by John Korey was approved as submitted. The amended bylaw section follows:

Article VII: Attendance At Biennial ICPSR Meeting In Ann Arbor

According to the terms of the agreement with ICPSR in Ann Arbor, CSU is entitled to send up to ten participants to the Meeting of Official Representatives of ICPSR. Selection will be as follows:

1. The CSU, SSRIC Chair at the time of the ICPSR Meeting shall be one of the CSU, SSRIC representatives attending the ICPSR meeting. If the Council Chair or other designated attendees are unable to attend, the campus next in line on the rotating list will be designated.

2. The Council will select the other campuses on a rotating basis at the Spring Council meeting prior to the ICPSR meeting. If a campus entitled to send a representative cannot do so, the campus will not lose its position on the rotating list.

3. As many participants will be funded to attend the ICPSR meeting as can be fully supported by ICPSR or Non-ICPSR funds.

4. If any campus is not represented at a minimum of one SSRIC meeting during the academic year prior to the ICPSR meeting, that campus will be moved to the bottom of the rotation list.

Rationale: The intent of this proposed change is to allow campuses to send someone other than the OR to the biennial meetings of the ICPSR. The ICPSR already permits this. A number of CSU campuses now have alternates on the SSRIC. Jim Gerber, although he is the sole SDSU representative on the SSRIC, is not the ICPSR OR. Last time, there was a request from Bakersfield to send someone other than the OR. Though she ended up not going, the request was approved. However, since no one else had wanted to go, I doubt that this would have procedural value.

(An updated version of the SSRIC By- Laws will be attached to the emailed version of the minutes, and posted on the SSDBA web site.)

1. **Discussion of inactive representatives.** Shaffer to call Long Beach and Monterey Bay regarding alternative representatives and other campuses as appropriate.

3**.      ICPSR Summer Information.** No report.

4**.      California Social Survey.**

1. John Korey, Richard Serpe, and Ed Nelson discussed the proposed survey. A proposal draft was submitted for comments.
2. Discussion of partnering with UCB.
3. Potential issues of questionnaire and house effects on the data.
4. Need for an instructional component.
5. With a project of this size, it is good to have relationships with other research teams.
6. National Advisory Board – use NORC GSS researchers to help with questionnaire design.
7. Cost – perhaps $200K for a 45 minute questionnaire in English and Spanish with 3,000 randomly selected adults in California.
8. Split questionnaire – difficult to implement here because common questions need to be in the same place on the questionnaire or “house effects” and “questionnaire effects” will result.
9. It was M/S/P that the SSRIC supports the development of a California Social  
   Survey as proposed by Korey, Nelson and Lascher, and that the polling  
   proposed be divided evenly between UC-Berkeley, CSU-Fresno, and CSU-San Marcos.

**5.      Phone Call with Lou Zweier.**

1. Two processes are ongoing –

        At least one campus submitted a data acquisition request through the Provosts, who responded to a call for interesting and innovative best practices in the Fall of 2002.

        The other process is the ongoing – with campus visits taking place in February, 2003 – CSU Academic Technology Planning Project, which published its Final Draft Initiatives, January 20, 2002? (document states 2002, but may be 2003).

o       Representatives should ask for an initiative to retain data acquisition that is ongoing but threatened because of budget cuts as well as submitting the activity as a project under Initiatives 1 (“Transform the dynamic of learning environments”), 2 (“Promote pedagogically sound and innovative applications of academic technology”), and 3 (“Enable faculty, staff, and students to develop skills and knowledge for successful teaching and learning”).

6.      **New SSRIC Chair.** Randy Macintosh of CSU, Sacramento was unanimously and enthusiastically elected as the 2003-2004 Chair of the Social Sciences Research and Instructional Council.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Ted Anagnoson, LA.
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