MINUTES: CSUC-ICPSR Council Business Meeting, October 21-22, 1976,  
Humboldt State University

Present: Ken Wagner, Ed Nelson, Bruce Hasten, Debbie Dunkle, David George, Jon Ebeling, Glenn Dollar, Ellen Boneparth, Harry Coffet, Richard DeLeon, Charles McCall, Paul 'Strand, Jay Stevens, Phil Gianos, Wayne Martin, Don Dixon, Prank Jewett,

1. Discussion of 1975-76 Annual Report:

Discussed was the 1975-76 Annual Report (dated September 1, 1976) which was prepared by Jim Ross. Wayne :Martin raised questions about what might be changed in the report or added to it the next time it is written. Various Council members offered suggestions, including the following:

\*Many non-ICPSR data sets are used for instruction and research on CSUC campuses. Such usage should be recognized and documented in the Report.

\*Time-series data showing utilization trends should be presented in the next report.

\*More effort should be made to develop measures of impact on social science curricula and on students' learning and skills.

\*Data should be gathered and reported on efforts of Council members to persuade other faculty to use ICPSR data and services in their classrooms and research.

\*More emphasis should be given in the next deport to the Undergraduate Research Conference.

Wayne asked whether all ORs sent a copy of the Annual Report to their campus Presidents. All ORs present said yes. Wayne stressed the importance of communicating with Presidents, keeping them informed. He reminded Council members that CSUS-ICPSR is centrally funded – but funding is on an annual basis only.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Wayne asked whether all ORs | sent a copy of the Annual Report to their campus |

II. Discussion and Debate on Field Institute Proposal:

Frank Jewett (Chancellor's Office) opened his remarks by stating his assumptions (a) that there is substantial potential instructional usage of Field Poll data in the CSUC system, and (b) that the CSUC-ICPSR Council represents users and potential users of such data, Before relating the details of Field Research Corporation's proposal to CSUC2 he gave come historical background on the California Poll, emphasizing the increase in operating costs (now estimated to be $200,000 per year) and the need to explore new funding sources to assure continued operation of the Poll. According to Frank, Mr. Field wants the Poll in a "safe home" separate from the corporation and he would like to see higher education get involved. The Field Institute, a non-profit research organization, was founded partly for the purpose of creating memberships and recovering the costs of the California Poll from membership fees. The California Opinion Research Consortium (CORC) is an association of academic institutions set up as part of the Field Institute. Frank then circulated pamphlets and brochures describing the CORC and its member services. He then reported that CSUC has tentatively agreed to join CORC for $39,000/yr., pointing out that this new membership would in no way threaten

continued funding of CSUC's membership in ICPSR, which the Chancellor still viewed as having the highest priority. [One Council member indicated at this point that his President would approve membership in CHOC if it were a "freebie" but not at the cost of losing membership in the superior ICPSR.] Frank: one idea being considered by campus Presidents is to fund the S39,000 centrally but also to introduce a "charge back" system to recover costs from individual campuses in proportion to usage, He said his personal opinion is that such a system won't work, has too many disincentives, would discourage utilization. Regarding these and other questions, the Council should worry about what to do in January if we become members of CORC. He then spelled out some of the key privileges and services CSUC would receive from a system membership in CORCc. These include:

\*Advance information about study topics and questions that will be asked.

\*Access to all public information on the questionnaires of each study as soon as possible *(e.g,,* immediate access to social issue questions of the California Poll, access immediately following elections to political candidate questions, etc.).

\*For our system these data would be placed on SPSS system file tapes and accompanied by 60 codebooks (3/campus).   
\*Rights to include 12 questions of our own choice spread across the various surveys conducted each year.

\*Eight representatives on the CORC Advisory Questionnaire Committee which meets twice a year.

\*Unlimited access to California Poll archives dating from 1956.

At this point Ed Nelson estimated that it would cost our system about $27,000/yr. to join the Roper organization. He raised the question whether Roper might give CSUC a better deal for the money involved, He wondered whether this possibility had been discussed at the Chancdllor7s office. Frank replied that the Chancellor's office conducted a survey of data base needs in 1973 which concluded that there was system-wide interest in only two data bases—COMPUSTAT and the Field Poll. Ed responded that in fact there is interest in Roper and that it has been discussed in the Chancellor's Office, citing a 1974 letter to the Roper people.

Don Dixon mentioned that Bill Bicker had given the impression that the Cal Poll archives are set up for ready use. Harry replied that most of these archives are on cards and that Bicker intended to charge a fee for access to each poll in the archive. Frank said that the Field Institute is preparing a member's price list covering these and other charges and fees. Bruce wondered why these archives could not be maintained and accessed through DIS. Frank said the Field Institute probably would not release the data to DIS and that in any case DIS doesn't have the time and personnel to do the job. Bruce asked whether that meant each campus on its own would have to prepare and process the data, with the result being duplicated effort, etc. Frank used this possibility to illustrate why CSUC campuses needed to coordinate their efforts.

Frank stated the Chancellor's Office's assumption that interest in the Field Institute started in the Council. The Chancellor's Office plans to go ahead with negotiations. At this point Wayne Martin gave some historical background on these negotiations. He, Bill Bicker, DeVere Pentony and others had received invitations to participate in early negotiations with Field Corporation. Wayne observed that the Council probaby is the best liaison—user group, but the Council did not start the idea of contracting with Field. Jay Stevens said that after the data base survey in 1974 the impetus for a contract with Field came from Bicker. There had been conversations involving Bicker, Charles :McCall and others. The Vice—Chancellor sent a memo to Jay inquiring about interest in the Field Poll. Jay had replied there was interest but that he had reservations aboutthe quality of the questions on the polls their non—academic orientation, etc. Later the Field Institute was created. Since then a number of advantages have appeared to Jay that make the idea worth pursuing.

\*The Field Poll and archives provide a unique body of data on California politics.

\*With the right to contribute 12 questions the Poll now is a vehicle for coordinating organized academic research.

\*The Field Institute gives the opportunity to develop an internship program for students and faculty.

Someone made the point that Field Poll data are available through Roper--but without any input of original survey questions, internship possibilities, etc. Discussion centered on this point for awhile, one conclusion being that the availability of Field Poll data per se was not the key advantage of membership Frank pointed out that the Field Institute would provide codebooks; with Roper you supply your own or pay extra for them. Frank went on to say that CSUC does not have to participate in the Field Institute as an instructional membe but could join as a member of the California Policy Research group. There is support in the Chancellor's Office however, for instructional involvement not merely administrative. Regarding the possibility of internships, faculty fellowships, etc., Frank reported that Field Institute people were receptive but no commitments had been made yet and that first priority was to find a safe home for the California Poll.

Discussion moved once again to comparisons with Roper. Ellen and others wondered whether a contact with Field Institute was fore-ordained. Frank stated that the Council should compare Field and Roper. Jay reiterated that one condition for a continued Council interest in Field was development of more academic content, more control. Dave George and others expressed dissatisfaction with "superficial" questions found in typical California Poll,

Don Dixon attempted to crystallize the issue re: Field vs. Roper by asking whether the Chancellor's Office would fund the Council's choice between the two. Prank replied that the odds were good in the long run that a contract with Roper might be approved but that he Chancellor's Office was much further along in dealing with Field. He inquired whether anyone present knew more about Roper services and made reference again to the survey showing no interest in the Roper data. He concluded that perhaps there was a communication problem between the Council and the Chancellor’s Office. Glenn Dollar said there is a correspondence between the Chancellor's office and Roper, and that he has copies of it. Bruce asked whether Field Institute could survive without CSUC membership. Frank responded that efforts would be made to "fly It" one or two years even without CSUC membership but that CSUC would lose its chance to shape the structure and direction of the Institute.

There followed more discussion on the technical details of what, concretely, CSUC would get from membership in CROC. Frank and Harry added some new information to what was said earlier. The right to 12 questions was the maximum total over 4 polls per year (6 polls during presidential election years). For each current poll a raw data tape would be developed by the Field people as an SPSS system file. (Harry said the first save file tape received did not run.) Responding to a question by Wayne, Harry estimated it would take :CIS 2 man-weeks per year to develop SPSS save files for tapes of current polls if the original tapes are good. Frank gave more details on the types of codebooks promised by Field Institute. Three styles: (1) for student users, (2) users plus supplement (actual questions on the polls, etc), and (3) all of the above plus technical supplement (list file information, etc.). Sixty full sets of each of the 3 types would be provided. With the idea in mind of developing SETUPS—type materials, discussion arose about reproduction rights. Frank said this issue was not clear now, it was being explored.

Receiving rather heated discussion was the matter of the fee to be charged for accessing historical archives. The consensus was that CSUC should have such access free of charge in view of what we would be paying for membership. ICPSR- does not charge extra for the same service. Frank said the exact fee to be charged was not settled right now. At this point Wayne suggested that these matters should-be clarified and limits should be set in any talks with Field. Frank wondered whether there was as much academic interest in the archives as in the current polls. Response from Council members was generally affirmative.

Wayne asked whether the Chancellor's Office was seeking some kind of statement from the Council re: what the Council wanted from an agreement with Field. He inquired what the Chancellors Office's "negotiating position" was at this point.

Frank pointed out that CSUC has a subscription to an archive with ICPSR; with Field Institute, subscription would be primarily to current polls, secondarily to archives. He also said that 1976-77 Field Institute membership dues would not be assessed campus budgets, indicating that enrollment shortfalls had produced a "savings" as a funding source.

Don raised a question about possible access to data on certain "special" surveys (e.g., question on nuclear initiative, market surveys, etc.). Frank said that the possible inclusion of these in the deal has not been discussed yet with Field Institute.

':Wayne raised questions about the potential costs to DIS, about the possibility t hat acquisition of Field Poll data could diminish DIS service to other data sets. Harry responded that DIS now did not have manpower to absorb any more work but said that probably in the long haul DIS would grow to support an increased demand for service. Wayne asked whether this meant that, after the first year of service, DIS could deal with the added burden plus serve existing needs. Harry responded yes, no real problem.

Ed then brought the discussion back to Roper again. He outlined various substantive research interests in Roper data, data which he said were very good for trend analyses and cohort analyses and which contained wide-ranging surveys conducted in many different countries on a variety of topics of interest to scholars in many different social science disciplines. He also said Roper has a good index system for pulling out questions.

Don asked whether the Council had to make a recommendation and whether there was time to make a comparison of Field and Roper. Frank responded that the Chancellor's Office was really working on Field's schedule, wanted to get going this fiscal year. But if the Council wanted to wait, it could wait, perhaps until February when the next Council meeting would be held. Don proposed that a subcommittee of the Council be formed to compare Field and Roper services and to prepare a report soon (within 45 days).

Ed spoke again in behalf of the advantages of Roper. By comparison with Field arid ICPSR, Roper services cover a greater variety of topics. Roper has extensive cross-national data (about 70 countries). Roper has substantial data of many different kinds of political topics. The Roper archives cover a long-time period allowing trend-cohort analyses. The Roper archives contain Field data plus all other major poll data except the Harris poll. He was not sure how recent these data are. Questions were raised by Council members re: Roper's codebook services, finances, fees, etc. Ed outlined the procedure by which Roper's members receive so many "units" which are used in the purchase of data, processing time, codebook reproduction, etc, He mentioned that discounts are available for system memberships. He estimated that the discounted membership fee for CSUC would be about S27,000/Yr. Jay pointed out that this fee would cover purchase of a fixed amount of units but beyond that amount the system would have to pay extra.

More discussion ensued about the actual) value of rights to 12 questions on the Field poll, Someone pointed out that at X500 per question (the approximate current price), these rights would be worth about $6,000. This sum is significantly smaller than the $39,000 CSUC was about to pay out. What are we getting for the remaining 33,000? Bruce wanted clarification about internships with Field Institute, indicating his own concern not just about financial assistance (stipends, etc.) but also for access and technical assistance on the part of the Field Institute. He wanted some agreement on this specified in writing.

Don suggested that the Council should explore possibilities of an arrangement with Roper if in fact it offered more in the way of appeal to a broader range of academic disciplines. John proposed that members ask carpus BSS departments about the desirability of subscriptions to various archive services and data sets, including Roper. Don moved that the Council constitute a subcommittee under the direction of the Council chair to be charged with making a comparison of the memberships in Roper and Field organizations and to re port back to Council members with the results of the comparison. (Vote: passed. unanimously.)

Frank mentioned that, if approved, membership with Field would start in January 1977. Starting in June 1977, annual membership would be on a fiscal dear basis. Someone asked whether the January-June 1977 period would be pro-rated. Frank replied that it would not, that the January-June membership would cost the full $39,000, that this periods however, would provide the most interesting polls in this election year.

Judy (San Diego State) raised questions about potential CSUC impacts on duality control (re: questionnaire construction, sample designs field interviewing, etc.) She asked: if we go with Field, what are we getting as a research organization? Frank replied that CSUC representation on the Advisory Committee would provide a vehicle for input on the questionnaire, but that Field Institute was responsible for other aspects of the operation. He admitted that he really lacks detailed knowledge regarding the technical competence of the Field organization, and he expressed the wish that this meeting had been conducted earlier, particularly now that momentum was building in the Chancellor's office for a contract with Field. Rich reported substantial interest in the Field poll data within his own department and school but wondered about the overall costs of the membership and expressed interest in learning more about what Roper had to offer. He wondered whether the issue was moot, whether in fact a decision had already been reached in the Chancellor's office.

Wayne stressed that there has at no time been formal representation of the Council in negotiations with Field. Frank agreed but indicated that there had been rather extensive informal involvement which had led him and others to assume wide support for a contract with Field. Answering a question by Don Dixon, Frank said that the 30-45 days spent by the newly formed subcommittee would not jeopardize negotiations with Field. He said that similar negotiations with Roper could begin at the earliest in 1977-78. Bruce pointed out that utilization of ICPSR data has shown the research and instructional value of such involvement, that utilization of Field roll data would probably do likewise, and the result would support a good case later for subscription to Roper services.

With the unanimous consent of the Council, Wayne appointed Ed, Debbie, and Phil as the three members of the subcommittee and directed them to report back to the Council within 30 days.

III. Acquisition of non-ICPSR Data:

Debbie Durikle announced that one of her colleagues at San Diego State, Richard Hofstetter, is glad to donate raw data tapes used in his content analysis of politics and media. Three data sets are involved and are fairly small. Data are not now processed as a save file :nad no codebooks are available for distribution. By next meeting Debbie will see that members of the Council receive a codebook,

Wayne requested that Council members conduct a survey on their campuses regarding (a) development and use of (full or partial) save files of ICPSR data, and (b) development of data sets used in original research which might be archived or shared through SUDC.

Announcement was made that a new batch system for SUDC and campuses will replace the existing ones over the next two years. DIS needs information from campuses providing measures of computer-related instructional workloads (local and SUDC), and some projection of trends in future workloads, and possible special requirements (e.g., software needs, etc.). Wayne said he would develop and circulate a questionnaire on these matters to Council members. He suggested that such information might be useful to include in the next annual report.

OCTOBER 22

IV Further Discussion of Field Institute, Etc.

Phil queried Council members about what specifically his subcommittee should emphasize in its work. He also asked what the Chancellor’s Office has arranged/negotiated with Field. Frank replied that in late July of this year Field discussed possible CSUC membership in the Institute with the Chancellor's Office. A briefing paper was prepared for CSUC campus presidents, Discussions were conducted in August with Wayne, Jay and others. In September the Council of Presidents agreed to inform Field of CSUC's interest in joining the Institute. On September 20 the Chancellor's Office sent a letter to Field° This letter was not a legally-binding contract to join unconditionally but rather a "statement of intent." A legal contract would be conditional on satisfactory negotiations and determination of funding arrangements. The Chancellor's Office now is conducting a feasibility study and is developing terms for a contract. On October 14 these matters were discussed in a meeting between the Chancellor and Field. The Council of Presidents would receive a progress report in November.

Following Frank's remarks, discussion ensued among Council membersand produced varying degrees of consensus on the following points:

\*If the Chancellor's Office goes with Field, it is clear that the CSUC-ICPSR Council should serve as the liaison group representing the system in the Institute.

\*The Council as a group is interested in exploring an arrange­ment with the Field Institute,

\*The Council's priority is to improve instructional capacities on individual campuses and views the Field Institute's proposal in that light,

\*In their negotiations with Field, Frank and the Chancellor's Office should push hard for agreement on the various "fringe benefits" of Field's proposal--possible faculty and student internships, archival services at no cost, etc. A number of Council members viewed these types of benefits as the only features of Field's proposal which CSUC could not receive at less cost from Roper,

A motion was then moved, seconded and passed that the charge to the subcommittee be changed to investigate and report to this Council on alternative data base subscriptions including Roper. It was further moved, seconded and that the Chancellor's Office be advised that in principle the CSUC-ICPSR Council favors membership in the Field Institute’s California Opinion Research Consortium if a suitable contract can be negotiated with Field, to provide feedback to this Council and uo advise on the acceptability of the final contract from an instructional perspective

Wayne's appointment of Jay as chair of the new subcommittee was approved unanimously by the Council.

V. Name Change.

Wayne raised the question whether the status and activities of the Council had changed so much recently as to warrant a change in the Council's official name. He pointed out that the Council now involved itself in a growing number of non-ICPSR data bases. The Council conducted its own workshops and conferences. It sponsors and conducts the annual undergraduate research conference, So should not the Council's name be changed to reflect more accurately what the Council is actually doing? Such a name change would require an amendment to the Council's constitution,

Don proposed the idea of creating standing committees in the Council to specialize in the Council's new functions (curriculum development, etc.), Rich DeLeon supported Don's proposals arguing that a system of standing committees would allow the Council to organize and conduct its business meetings more effectively and expeditiously.

In the discussion that followed it became clear that there was no great interest at this time in making a name change. One Council member pointed out that it has taken him *years* just to get the name "ICPR" recognized by his campus president, Others concurred on the need for continuity. The standing committee idea would be reviewed at a future Council meeting,

VI, Proposal for NSF Funding for Development of Teaching Modules:

Jay distributed an abstract of a proposal to NSF for "a three year project in which two waves of scholars, each representing different disciplines, will be supported in writing interdisciplinary, data-based classroom materials," The proposal is for $200,000 to be funded over three years, starting in summer or Fall 1977. According to Jay, an initial proposal along the same lines had failed. Responding to critiques, he and Betty Nesvold rewrote that proposal to put more emphasis on local needs and to limit the scope of participation to scholars within the CSUC system rather than nationwide. As stated in the current proposal, the Council would give overall direction to the project. Jay then identified two problems: (1) NSF requires extensive evaluation on campuses. Presidents must "sign off" that the NSF proposal meets campus needs. Jay mentioned that he was considering trying to seek group approval from the Council of Presidents rather than approaching each president individually. (2) There is a problem of selecting the best funding arrangement for rewarding participation in project activities. The two main options being considered were summer stipends and regular released time. Jay then asked Council members for advice re: (1) Council sponsorship of the proposal, (2) how best to reward faculty participation, (3) how to secure local review and approval of the proposal, (4) possible topics and suggested names of those who might want to work on the project.

Responding to questions, Jay mentioned that full funding probably would support at least 15 faculty working in two waves. Most of the requested money would be used for faculty compensation. The project would emphasize an interdisciplinary perspective.

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously that the Council endorses and agrees to sponsor the proposal.

A straw vote yielded a strong preference among Council members for the summer stipend vis-a-vis released time,

VII. Spring Undergraduate Research Conference

Wayne. commented that by all accounts the last undergraduate research conference went well. He proposed that it be an annual event. We should start now with selecting a location, making arrangements, program brochures, etc. Don proposed that Sonoma State be selected as the location of the next conference. This proposal was moved, seconded and passed, and Don was appointed as Program and Arrangements Chair of the Conference„ The Council then decided that the Conference will be held on Friday, May 6, 1977. The Council will conduct its business meeting an Thursday, May5. Regarding format for the Conference, it was moved, seconded and passed that (a) each campus could be represented at the Conference by a maximum of two undergraduate students and one graduate student; (b) the panels would be segregated into graduate and undergraduate sections; (c) the designated theme of the Conference will be "Student Perspectives on Social and Political Research," (d) student papers should be a maximum of 10 pages in length and accompanied by an abstract 1-5 pages in length including tables, etc.

VIII. Winter Meeting:

The Council’s Winter meeting will be held February 10 and 11, at California State Fullerton. One day will be devoted to a business meeting, the other day to possible further discussion of the Field proposal and/or our own teaching experiences using instructional data packages and CAI techniques.

IX. Other Concerns:,

Glenn Dollar (DIS) announced (1) that "prime time' at SUDC is now 8-5, (2) that as of November 1 only those jobs requiring no more than 5 minutes to run would be processed during prime time (the previous policy had been 10 minutes). It is possible that the prime time limit could go to 3 minutes. Glenn reported estimates that 80% of all SUDC jobs take less than 3 minutes to run , 95% less than 5 minutes. The change in prime time policy is designed to ensure that SUDC can keep its promise of 2-hour turnaround.

In the discussion that followed much anger was expressed about the Council not having been consulted in advance of the policy chance. Some Council members pointed out that data base analyses are more time-consuming than typical programming runs and that the impact of the policy change would be hardest an data base-oriented BSS users. Glenn responded that Council members should wait to see what the actual effects of the new policy will be.

It was then moved, seconded and passed unanimously that the Chancellor’s Office and DIS be advised of the Council’s opposition to going below 10 minutes in establishing priority for prime time processing, at SUDC.

Wayne said.he would write a letter conveying the Council’s reaction to the policy chance. He also asked Council members for information on time requirements for processing data sets now in use.

Glenn also announced that he intends to purge all files on disk (including data sets) which have been there past their expiration dates. He will try to warn all owners who can be so identified that he intends to purge their files, Glenn said he needs information an usage of data sets on tape or disk at SUDC—especially those on tape He also wants to learn from Council members what data bases should be put on CYBER. No policy decisions have been made yet and input regarding main data bases should be directed to Hightower. Most Council members agreed that the various SETUPS should go on CYDER. David George will write a letter conveying the Council’s input on this matter

"MEETING WAS ADJOURNED.

Minutes prepared by Rich DeLeon.