Council Minutes --- June 12-14, 1998

**Council participants:** Margo Anderson, Charles Betsey, Kenneth Bollen, Diane Geraci, Kent Jennings, Paula McClain, Edward Nelson, Huey Perry, Carole Shammas, Elizabeth Stephenson, Wendy Watkins, Halliman Winsborough.

**Council not able to participate:** Heinz Eulau, Stephen Fienberg, Gary King, Norval Glenn, Warren Miller.

**ICPSR staff participants:** Zack Allen, Erik Austin, Chris Dunn, Peter Granda, John Gray, Hank Heitowit, Michelle Humphres, Peter Joftis, JoAnne McFarland, Mary Morris, Richard Rockwell, Mary Vardigan, Janet Vavra.

**Additional participants:** Simon Musgrave, Acting Director of the Essex Archive in the United Kingdom.

Approval of March 1998 Minutes

Halliman Winsborough made a motion to approve the March 1998 Council minutes as written. Diane Geraci seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Announcements

* Wendy Watkins was unable to attend the meeting but participated by telephone.
* Zack Allen has been promoted to the position of Senior Research Associate.
* Concurrent with Council's next meeting, October 16-18, 1998, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) will be celebrating its 50th anniversary. An attempt will be made to schedule Council activities to permit participation by Council and staff in the ISR events that weekend. Funds generated by the ISR anniversary celebration will be used for graduate student fellowships and research projects at ISR.
* Simon Musgrave, the Acting Director of the Essex Archive in the United Kingdom, was welcomed as the European representative to the meeting.

Memorandum of Agreement

Just prior to the meeting, Council received the first draft of a new Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) dated June 5, 1998. This document is intended to describe the new organizational arrangement for ICPSR within ISR -- that is, ICPSR will no longer function as a subunit of the Center for Political Studies (CPS) but instead will become a separate, hosted unit operating out of the ISR Director';s office.

Copies of a letter that Council Chair Hal Winsborough wrote to ISR Director David Featherman after the March Council meeting (which David did not receive) were distributed, along with copies of the previous MoA annotated with changes.

David indicated that he had hoped to be further along in the process of adopting the new MoA, but unavoidable delays had occurred as a result of reorganization within the office of legal counsel at the University of Michigan (U-M). Hal and Past Chair Carole Shammas had been authorized to undertake negotiations regarding the MoA and to present the results of their discussions to Council, but time had not permitted this activity to take place.

The draft MoA is basically a realization of a letter David wrote to Carole last summer and is ISR's best effort at this stage to create a broader scope and a more flexible financial and administrative arrangement for ICPSR than had been the case when the Consortium was a program within a center. It is an attempt to be as responsive as possible to Council's concerns and to provide opportunities for ICPSR to function more as a partner within ISR. It should be noted that many of the items that seem new in the MoA are actually the result of making explicit what were before tacit assumptions.

Previously, no formal negotiations took place between Council and U-M; CPS performed that role, and these matters were viewed as being "all in the family." Now all parties involved need to be clear about the operating rules; this will be beneficial in the long term to ICPSR, ISR, and U-M.

The new arrangement has come at a price: it means that CPS is losing one of its biggest programs. But relations with CPS have remained collegial, and the ISR Policy Committee has also demonstrated a willingness to move ahead with the process. It should be possible to negotiate a new relationship providing more financial and administrative autonomy for ICPSR and, more importantly, further opportunities for scientific and intellectual contributions.

A concern was raised that Council is facing a serious time problem. The next meeting will not take place until October 1998, but a plan for operating in the interim needs to be approved by July 1, 1998.

As the MoA exists now, it is in clear conflict with the Bylaws. Also, there are additional problematic areas dealing with liability issues. For example, the MoA states that, in the unlikely event that the Consortium liquidates and there aren't enough funds to cover the closeout, U-M or ICPSR's creditors can assess the member institutions for the remaining financial obligations. Also, Council is not shielded by U-M with respect to lawsuits. These are examples of matters that previously were perhaps implicit but have been made explicit in the new MoA. It would be impossible for Council to sign off on either of these conditions as currently presented in the MoA.

A suggestion was made to investigate other consortia like the Big 10, CIC, CIESIN, and MERIT network, which is another hosted unit at U-M. The contracts and MoA's of these other consortia may provide some guidance in terms of structuring the new agreement between ICPSR and ISR.

ICPSR might also consider incorporating as a 501(C)3 nonprofit organization. There are several benefits to this approach. Council would have protection, and financial liability would be limited to the assets of the corporation. Insurance could be purchased to protect Council against suit by personnel, members, survey subjects, data providers, and others. ICPSR would become a legal entity separate from ISR, U-M, and the academy in general; it would be set up to take in money, pay taxes, hire staff, and possibly build a building.

On the downside, such a step would involve legal expense. It would also bring an added complexity to Council's oversight role. Moreover, incorporation might involve changes in ICPSR's relationship with ISR, U-M, data donors, and the membership, who would most likely have to vote on the incorporation issue.

It was pointed out that not all Council members were comfortable with the concept of incorporating, and concern was expressed that Council's role might change dramatically if ICPSR were to incorporate. Also, this could be perceived as an attempt to "get rid" of ICPSR, given the upcoming move off-campus. It was emphasized that the move is coincidental, and that ICPSR is a part of ISR's vision in five years when all of ISR is again housed in a single building.

Council was also reminded that we have been operating under a temporary MoA for about a year, but if a new MoA is not approved by July 1, 1998, the previous arrangement with CPS goes back into effect.

It was decided to investigate incorporation and to get legal consultation. The Administration and Governance committee will take this up in greater detail during their meeting.

Council members highlighted additional sections of the MoA that contained problematic language. The previous MoA laid out several areas in which Council had a decision-making or consulting role that appears to be absent in the new agreement. It was noted that the Bylaws actually set out the role of Council. Also, endowments are not addressed specifically, nor are agreements with third parties like MicroCase. The response was that, under Section IV, Subsection 2. (Revenues), there is language relating to ICPSR's ability to earn interest on accounts, and this applies to endowments as well.

The budgets sent out as part of the Council packet describe a financially healthy organization. Whose money is it that is reflected in the budget, and would it travel with the organization if it were incorporated? It was noted that most grants and contracts are paid to the U-M Regents.

A clarification of the status of ICPSR within ISR was requested. It will be a unit called ICPSR, hosted at the U-M, with reporting lines to the ISR Director. References in the MoA to "other centers" should be modified as ICPSR will not have center status. The Executive Director will have a seat on the ISR Policy Committee but will have no vote. A suggestion was made to amend the language regarding nonvoting rights to cover the possibility that the Policy Committee might at some point grant voting rights to the ICPSR Executive Director.

It was emphasized that incorporating would make little difference in the arrangement with ISR. It would simply provide a mechanism for buying insurance and limiting liability; it would not be the first step to the Consortium's setting up its own shop.

It is important to compare the new MoA closely with the old one. In what ways does the new MoA change the role of Council? The old MoA appeared to provide more opportunities for Council to offer advice and consent and also specified a fiscal oversight role. While it may seem that the new MoA limits Council's role in fiscal oversight, it is still the case that Council retains the right to approve the budget. The ISR Policy Committee considered Council's role carefully; they tried to clarify instances when advice, consent, or approval was involved and to be more specific about the language used, particularly in areas where there had been disagreement in the past.

The old MoA provided a pseudo grievance procedure, the intent of which was to provide access to Council by ICPSR staff. It is unlikely that U-M would permit an outside body to interfere in personnel matters, but some level of access by staff to Council could be desirable.

Under Section I, Subsection 1.B. (Programmatic Review), there appears to have been a shift from a substantive review of the organization in terms of whether it is fulfilling its mission to the social sciences to an evaluation of whether the Executive Director is doing a good job. Also, it appears that the ISR Director can initiate a search for a new Executive Director, but Council cannot do the same.

The concern was raised that in order to vote on the new MoA, Council needs to see a point-by-point comparison, and that has not yet happened. If ICPSR were to revert to operating under the old MoA, $247,657 of ICPSR's funds would transfer to CPS. The new arrangement will not replicate these charges at this level, although ICPSR will have to pay for an administrator.

A solution to the time problem might be to write up a temporary MoA that covers the fiscal matters and identifies the larger concepts that are still subject to negotiation. This temporary MoA would be in effect for six months, until Council meets again in October. It was noted that the July 1 deadline is rapidly approaching and it may be difficult to get U-M counsel to act that quickly. It was also pointed out that the rental agreement for the Borders building space that ICPSR is planning to expand into cannot be signed until some type of legal agreement between ICPSR and ISR is in place.

It was decided to deputize Hal and Carole to work with David and Peggy and legal counsel to put a temporary agreement into place; copious feedback will be solicited through e-mail.

Council will continue to mull over these matters and will come back to them in Executive Session. The Administration and Governance Committee will provide a motion to engage legal counsel, to explore the option of incorporating, and to affirm that Hal and Carole should begin to negotiate with ISR posthaste. Council members were directed to inform Hal or the Administration and Governance committee of concerns over specific issues.

Space

The issue of how much space ICPSR will need when it moves offsite was discussed. Over the months, ICPSR has learned a great deal about how space is calculated and measured. At ISR usable space is measured by leaving out "dead" space such as elevator shafts, walls, etc. In the private sector, these areas are included in the chargeable measurements. Therefore, although ICPSR occupies over 11,000 square feet of space in the ISR building, in order to have an equivalent amount, 21,000 square feet would have to be rented off campus. ISR charges its units between $3-$5 per square foot.

ISR cannot build fast enough to match its growth. In order to help accommodate this expansion, ISR will rent space offsite and work with units moving offsite to assure that they have adequate facilities to meet their needs. It appears certain that ICPSR will be moving to facilities that ISR will be renting for it at Borders';less than two blocks from the ISR Building.

The ISR Policy Committee has agreed that it will charge all ISR units $5 per square foot for current space that each occupies in the ISR building. Any additional space that is needed will be charged at the going market rate. That means that ICPSR will pay $5 per square foot up to 11,000 square feet for space that it occupies offsite (most likely at Borders) and will pay the market rate for whatever additional space it needs now or in the future before it moves back into a larger to-be-constructed ISR building, using the same measurement system at both locations. The estimate is that this additional space will add about $50,000 to the ICPSR expenses for space.

This is not the first time that ICPSR offices were located offsite. Prior to its current space in the ISR Building, ICPSR was housed at offices approximately four blocks away. The ICPSR staff moved back to the main ISR building in early 1977.

It was noted that there were many plans being made to keep ICPSR integrated with the rest of ISR. Among the activities planned would be ISR committee meetings at the ICPSR offices at Borders.

The Borders area offers the ICPSR staff many amenities. The new space is much more modular than current ISR space. The very high quality cubicles that exist in the Borders building will remain, allowing ICPSR to make much better use of the space that it will have. The few offices that exist in the space will be reserved as meeting areas for staff in the cubicles. The ICPSR committee that has been created to study the space issue has been very impressed with the space. It was also noted that there will not be any connectivity issues for us when we move to the Borders area making it fairly straightforward to move our computing environment to the new location.

Richard noted that ICPSR has set aside an additional $20,000 for the move. This amount is in addition to the cost of the physical move, which will be borne by ISR. The current projected date for the move is around October 1, 1998.

Report from the 1997 ICPSR Summer Program and plans for 1998

The next item on the agenda was a report on the Summer Program by Hank Heitowit. Hank referred the members to the Summer Program Advisory Report summarizing the 1997 program's activities.

There were a little over 500 attendees at the 1997 sessions. Some new one-week courses were added. It was noted that the largest number of attendees at the program came from Political Science, followed closely by Sociology and Psychology. It was noted that the number of University of Michigan students taking the courses for credit is steadily shrinking. The drop in enrollment in this area impacts the budget for the program.

The 1998 Program is now just beginning. Hank noted that although the Summer Program brochure is on the website, there was a great run on the printed copies of the brochure. This was somewhat of a surprise since the expectation was that the electronic version would reduce the number of requests for the paper copy.

A report was given on the offsite LISREL course that was taught by Ken Bollen at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill the week of May 11, 1998. This was the first time an ICPSR course was given offsite, and it was seen as an experiment with this format. A great deal was learned from this experiment.

The course drew eight people, which was a lower enrollment than was expected. It appears that the advertisements for courses offsite will need to be handled differently. There also needs to be administrative support for the course locally to assist with logistics including travel and lodging for the participants. It is expected that more courses of this nature will be offered at offsite locations.

Hank passed out two handouts for symposia being held in conjunction with the Summer Program. One is the SRC/ISR CoSponsored ISR Founders Symposium, which brings in different speakers over a period of weeks.

The other is the Hubert M. Blalock Lecture Series. The organizers of the symposia are especially excited about the section on high performance computers. This has been made possible because of the funding that Richard Rockwell obtained earlier on behalf of the University of Michigan. The speakers in this series are especially innovative in this field.

Hank noted that there have been 580 applications for this year's Summer Program so far; however, not all of the applications translate into attendees. Additionally, not all enrollments are equal financially. Although some students pay tuition, not all people attending the program do, and those who attend as guest scholars pay much lower fees than do those who pay tuition.

The Summer Program is funded from four sources: 1) tuition, 2) ICPSR fees which are set by Council, 3) ICPSR operating budget, and 4) outside grants and contracts usually for specific programs. Funds coming from tuition have been dropping as noted above, primarily because of the drop in the number of University of Michigan students attending and of students seeking credit for courses. The fees are keeping pace with inflation. If we want to balance the Summer Program budget, we will need to look toward an increase in the amount of money being allocated to the program from the ICPSR operating budget.

Hank pointed out that in the past when the ICPSR budget was less robust, one of the areas cut back was the Summer Program. This may now need to be restored since the ICPSR budget has become much healthier.

It was noted that one of the suggestions in the Executive Director's five-year financial plan which had been presented earlier was to drop the ICPSR Summer Program subsidy to students attending from member institutions. Almost everything proposed in that plan has been adopted except the discontinuation of the Summer Program subsidy. It may be time to review this again. It might be useful to get input from members to determine how critical the subsidy is to their decision to come to the Summer Program.

Discussion of changes occurring in ICPSR's data distribution policies

The Executive Director noted that ICPSR continues to receive requests from institutions to distribute ICPSR data through their local websites. Last year Harvard requested permission to allow access to a website service they had developed that provided statistics from the ICPSR Historical Census materials. This year we have a request from Princeton to make available information through 1995 from the United Nations Roll Call collection. The Princeton request asks that anyone be allowed to query the data although they would not be allowed to download them. While requests such as this singularly do not hurt us, there is a potential cumulative effect from these that could damage ICPSR in the long run.

Currently ICPSR has approximately 20% of its titles freely available to anyone. These are primarily in the fields of criminal justice and data supported by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHDA). Data from the National Archive of Computerized Data on Aging (NACDA) will shortly all be made publicly available, and eventually the data being archived under the Education project will also be freely available. There is a question as to what this will do to the membership base. This is something that the Council's Member Relations Committee needs to consider.

It was suggested that extra services need to be developed exclusively for members to help compensate for the opening up of much of the archive to all users without charge. It was requested that the Member Relations Committee draw up a set of questions around this and bring them to the full Council for consideration.

Archival Development

Friday, June 12

The Committee held a special session devoted to the development of an acquisitions policy. Working from a list of talking points, the group established a time table and working list of issues to address in a policy.

A reading list on collection and acquisition policies has been circulated. Policies of prominent and national level archives will be gathered and reviewed as we develop the document for ICPSR.

Saturday, June 13

The Committee discussed the following items on Saturday morning and reported a summary of its discussion and decisions to the full Council on Saturday afternoon:

1. Policy for ICPSR participation in value-added CD or web products.

ICPSR does not really have the resources to fully develop value-added products, and has welcomed the efforts of the membership and others to take on these activities. At the same time, ICPSR needs a policy to use when approached about such projects. The Committee discussed the following criteria ICPSR could use:

* 1. What is the value of the proposed product to the membership?
  2. Should the resulting product be archived as a part of the ICPSR collection and should it be available to both members and non-members?
  3. The data to be augmented should already be a part of the ICPSR general collection.
  4. Documentation in the final product must be in electronic form.
  5. The proposed product must improve the original format of, or access to the data.
  6. The Committee will help develop an agreement form which addresses the criteria to be used in evaluation and renewal.
  7. The proposed product cannot compromise privacy or confidentiality.

1. Confidentiality and private-use datasets

Thus far, ICPSR has been somewhat lenient in how access to limited-use data has been provided. The Consortium does archive data which has either privacy or confidentiality problems. The Committee discussed various ways to address the issues and decided to devote substantial time to this area at its October 1998 meeting, based on a report distributed by Erik Austin and Chris Dunn.

1. Selection guidelines for retrofit conversion of codebooks to electronic form:

The Committee has had ongoing updates from Zack Allen on the progress of the codebook conversion. The Committee has been asked for input on how to set priorities for future conversions. Zack Allen prepared a hot list of items which are scheduled for retrofit. Each entry has had ten or more requests. Economic studies are to be converted first, followed by older studies and then studies which have been popular with the membership.

The Committee asked for a section on the ICPSR website to indicate titles which have been converted to PDF form, but which are not yet in a final version. This will permit users who can work with PDF formats to have access to this 'intermediate' version before the final version is released. The complete version of converted codebooks will appear in the Recent Updates section of the website.

1. NAPA Update

ICPSR staff circulated a revised diagram describing how new acquisitions arrive at ICPSR, and the levels of processing they receive. Staff also circulated a flow chart of operations and decision options used in determining the level of processing to be applied to an incoming item.

Finally, staff presented a chart documenting ICPSR acquisitions between September 1997 and May 1998. Approximately 78% of the collection arrives at ICPSR in ASCII format; about 10% of arrivals are in a statistical package portable format, while about 12% are deposited as system files.

1. Virtual archive web links

The ICPSR staff presented a list of websites which have been contacted to gain permission to set up a link between such sites and the ICPSR website. A number of the proposed sites have agreed to be linked. ICPSR staff will now be selected to familiarize themselves with the sites. A list of the linked sites will be placed on the ICPSR website. In addition, each individual website will be given an ICPSR study number, and the study description will refer to the URL and will provide some general tips on using the website. A short user response form will be automatically sent to the user to obtain information on the linked site. These responses will be used to evaluate the utility of the virtual archive idea.

Member Relations Committee

The Member Relations Committee met on Saturday, June 13, 1998, with Diane Geraci, Huey Perry, Mary Vardigan, and Mary Morris in attendance. Wendy Watkins joined the meeting via phone. Richard Rockwell also joined the group for most of the meeting.

In response to questions from new committee members, Rockwell provided general information about membership status, marketing activities, and retention efforts. Membership grew in the 1980's and early 1990's and has been fairly stable over the last two to three years. A recruitment drive was initiated two years ago and was targeted at B institutions. Council was asked to identify contacts at the B schools that were not members. Those individuals, as well as department and library heads, were included in the mailing. Letters were mailed to over 60 schools, which resulted in two new B category members and two new federation members.

If a school indicates it is going to drop membership, a letter is sent, describing the benefits and advantages of membership. Schools are reminded of the one- year advance notice requirement for dropping and the reentry penalty, if reentry is desired at a later date. When a school officially gives the one-year notice, Rockwell writes again to the Official Representative, and copies the letter to the chairs of all the social science departments. This sometimes results in additional support for the membership.

Questions were raised as to why schools drop membership. A recommendation was made that ICPSR keep detailed information on reasons for dropping membership. This information would be helpful in efforts to both increase and retain membership.

Rockwell noted that we have sent ICPSR staff to member schools to conduct workshops as one way of publicizing ICPSR on local campuses and thus retaining membership. Suggestions offered by committee members to retain membership included increasing archival holdings of international data and economic data; exploring Consortium purchases of data whereby ICPSR would obtain site licenses for certain databases and then charge members for the data; and offering more value-added features, such as data extraction options and regional training.

Suggestions pertaining to the marketing of ICPSR membership included creating a marketing position at ICPSR to centralize membership efforts; identifying schools that are adding new research programs in the social sciences; increasing follow-through with nonmember academics who request price quotes; attending the Association of College and Research Libraries annual meeting (sending both an ICPSR staff member and Official Representative); encouraging summer program attendees who are not at member schools to lobby for membership; and emphasizing the digital nature of our archive to libraries that are not members (since there is increased emphasis for libraries to be digital).

The issue of freely available data from the ICPSR topical archives and its impact on membership was part and parcel of these discussions. Should all data be free and membership be based on something other than the provision of data? Would support of the social science infrastructure be a sufficient rationale to support membership?

Rockwell gave a status report on OhioLink. That consortium will probably join July 1st. The OhioLink membership will include all Ohio higher education institutions, including private colleges and universities. It is uncertain whether community colleges will be part of the membership.

Rockwell also reported on the University of Michigan initiative. Previously Council approved an experiment to give access to ICPSR data to the entire UM campus for a fee. This has not yet gone forward. Plus it was noted that Harvard has already implemented individual access locally, with no increase in membership dues.

Finally, responses from the open-ended questions on the survey of Official Representative conducted in the fall of 1997 were presented. The responses had been categorized and tabulated. In general, ORs want increased acquisitions for international data and economic data, additional promotional materials for local use, and better searching tools for locating data in the ICPSR holdings. Results of the survey, including item frequencies, will be sent to all Official Representatives this fall.

Quantitative Research and Training Committee

The first topic was a report from Ken Bollen on his experience in offering a Summer Program workshop at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. In March of 1998 ICPSR offered for the first time ever a course in a location other than Ann Arbor. This was done in part to discover what the problems would be of ICPSR offering off-site workshops. A key element in this type of activity is having a local campus co-sponsor (in this case the Carolina Population Center). The local sponsor needs to coordinate the availability of such resources as: adequate classroom space, computer lab and software and associated staff support; administrative support for registration, housing; and information dissemination. Arrangements must be made for coordinating the handling of fee collection and payment of workshop related costs. Other issues included sequencing the course dates with those of the regular ICPSR Program and special efforts to advertise and promote these kinds of special activities so as to gain the attention of the appropriate market segments.

Next, Ken Bollen reported that he was leading a team of scholars at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill that was submitting a proposal to the National Science Foundation- Science and Technology Center competition, to establish a Social Science Statistics Center. The focus would be on the topic of research and training on longitudinal data. There followed a discussion about ICPSR collaborating with UNC on some aspects of the project. This evolved to a generally shared view that the two groups could team on a limited set of training activities, including: distance learning, video recording of lectures and classes, video conferencing, and regional short course/training.

It was also reported that Bollen and Heitowit were proceeding with plans to hold an advanced methodology conference on the topic of "missing data in longitudinal data analysis." The conference is tentatively planned for the spring of 1999 in Ann Arbor.

There then followed a short discussion of the desire on the part of several members of Council for ICPSR to offer short, one day workshop/presentations on a variety of different and innovative methodologies so that established scholars could stay current with recent trends in social science research. ICPSR already co-sponsors such workshops with the American Sociological Association's Methods Section, the day before the ASA annual meeting. It was also suggested that such an arrangement might be possible to coordinate with the Social Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association, as well as perhaps other professional groups and associations.

Finally it was noted that while the Summer Program was largely self supporting, it was still in need of a reasonable contribution of resources from the ICPSR budgets, on the same basis as other core organizational units.

Administration and Governance Committee

The Administration and Governance Committee met to approve the budget and recommended line items for equity funds, i.e., close-out, capital equipment, sabbaticals, and special projects. It was estimated that 50K a year could be earned in equity funds. Halliman Winsborough made a motion to approve the budget. Margo Anderson seconded the motion. Council voted and unanimously approved the budget.

The committee discussed the proposed MoA and noted several areas that should be reviewed by legal counsel. Due to time constraints, an interim MOA must be in place by July 1, 1998. Members of the Administration and Governance committee recommended the following guidelines be followed:

"*It is the sense of the Council that the process of developing a new Memorandum of Agreement with the Institute for Social Research is developing fruitfully. While we recognize there are many details to be worked out in writing, it is our expectation that an interim agreement will be in place on July 1, 1998 such that the routine business of ICPSR within ISR can proceed efficiently and effectively. We expect the full Memorandum of Agreement to emerge for our review in October 1998.*

*We thank all parties at the Institute for Social Research and the University of Michigan for their thoughtful and considered work on this process.*"

A set of procedures to approve and enact an interim Memorandum of Agreement was also unanimously approved:

"*The draft interim Memorandum of Agreement will be distributed electronically to Council members for review. The ICPSR Council Chair will seek legal advice on the content and intent of the proposed interim Memorandum of Agreement. The cost of such legal advice should be reported to Council if in excess of $10,000. Any activities triggered by the interim Memorandum of Agreement, beginning July 1, 1998, will be fully described to Council so that Council is informed about the progress and outcomes of any such activities.*"

The draft interim MoA will be distributed to the ICPSR Council, the ISR Director and Assistant Director, the ICPSR Executive Director and the ICPSR Management Team for comments. Due to time constraints, the ICPSR Council Chair requested the Council and other's give their immediate attention to comments and concerns.

ICPSR Membership at the University of Michigan

The Administration and Governance committee requested ICPSR strengthen the ICPSR membership on the University of Michigan campus. Council asked that bottlenecks in the process of data distribution and access be identified and worked out. It was noted that the University of Michigan is the host of ICPSR and should receive superior services.

Public Data Requests

ICPSR has been approached for access to the Detroit Area Study. It was suggested the Mayor of Detroit had an interest in this dataset. Requests of this nature will be discussed at the Archival Development committee meeting in October 1998.