

REPORT OF THE
ICPSR REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hubert Blalock, Chair
Allan G. Bogue
Robert T. Holt
Judith S. Rowe
John Sprague

June 1989

ABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PART I Findings, Analysis, Recommendations	1
PART II The Functions and Performance of the Consortium	15
PART III ICPSR: A Historical Sketch	39
APPENDICES:	
A. The Review Committee, Its Mandate and Procedures	75
B. Responses from Organizational Representatives . . .	78
C. Memorandum of Organization	80

PART I

FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) was founded in 1962 as a partnership between 18 universities and the University of Michigan through the Institute for Social Research. It has grown over the past quarter of a century and today has 325 dues-paying members. The membership includes virtually all the major research universities in the United States, a high percentage of other universities and liberal arts colleges, several federations of smaller schools, and cooperating universities and consortia in Western Europe, Canada, and other countries. A Memorandum of Organization spells out the details of the relationship between the partners (see appendix for a copy of the Memorandum of Organization).

The ICPSR has two primary functions: (1) to archive and distribute social science data in a variety of fields and (2) to conduct a summer program to train graduate students and faculty in statistical and methodological modes of analysis. It also has some secondary projects including the production and distribution of teaching materials designed to improve social scientists' ability to work with computer-based data sets.

Each of the member institutions of the Consortium appoints an Official Representative (OR) who, in turn, elects the ICPSR Council, the purpose of which is to represent the interests of the national constituency as well as the several academic disciplines involved. Thus the Council is the prime policy-making body representing the membership.

The Executive Director of the ICPSR is appointed by the Director of the Center for Political Studies after consultation with the senior staff and with the Council. The Consortium is formally a program within the Center for

Political Studies with all the rights and obligations of other programs within that Center.

The details concerning our investigation, including a brief history of the ICPSR, are contained in Parts II and III, and in the appendix to this report. There are three generalizations that emerge from the information in our investigations that are a crucial foundation for our further analysis and recommendations.

1. The archival role of the Consortium constitutes a critical, intermediate step in many kinds of social research. Social sciences have changed substantially over the 25-year history of the Consortium and have become more quantitative in nature and, therefore, utilize considerably more large scale data sets which have, in many instances, been collected or funded by government agencies. Although many social scientists continue to engage in small-scale non-funded research, in many fields it has become virtually impossible for individual investigators to collect their own data, given both the large expenses involved and the time this would require. It is more than just prudent to preserve data sets that were costly to prepare so that they can be used again and again. The National Science Foundation, for example, is beginning to insist that principal investigators promise to make their data available to other social scientists, and they are suggesting that the ICPSR archives be used for this purpose.

Given these trends and the fact that social science research has also become more interdisciplinary and cross-national in scope, the archiving function of the Consortium should be considered as constituting a stage in the research process, or a facilitator of research rather than a mere "service" for the social science community. In this sense it plays a role

for the social sciences similar to a common scientific research facility such as an accelerator or an astronomical telescope.

This important and unique role that archiving plays in modern social science research requires a specific set of skills that the staff must possess if the work is to be done efficiently and effectively. But these special skills are not acknowledged by the traditional academic criteria that focus on publication and teaching. Indeed, to the extent that archiving and data dissemination activities are efficiently accomplished, those who have immediate access to archive material have no special advantage or any proprietary rights in connection with the data sets that are passing through their hands. In short, data archivists, programmers, and those who deal directly with the membership institutions play very different roles in the research process than do those at either end of the chain: those who collect the original data and those who ultimately analyze them. Some sort of special structure is required in which these important kinds of specialists can function securely and with appropriate rewards. The establishment of the ICPSR is a genuine case of social invention that has provided this kind of special social structure.

2. The summer program is a unique and important component in the graduate education of social scientists from around the country. It attracts over 300 graduate students and faculty who feel the need for additional advanced training from a wide variety of fields and universities. It provides graduate courses in methodology (broadly conceived) at three levels of difficulty ranging from rather introductory, to graduate-level work, to advanced workshops in specialized areas. The large number of participants who leave their campuses to come to Michigan each summer is a strong testimony to the value of the offerings to individuals. We must

also recognize, however, that there is an important collective good in the cross-university and cross-discipline socialization that takes place. The summer program has had no small impact on the social science profession over the past two decades.

3. Not only are the two functions, archiving and the summer program, perceived as important by the social science community, they are also perceived as being well-executed. We contacted ORs, council members past and present, Associate Directors, and providers of grants that finance archiving and have found almost unanimous testimony to the quality of the operation. This does not mean that there were not some critical comments and suggestions for improvement, but the overwhelming majority feel that the Consortium staff at the University of Michigan are doing an excellent job in providing an important service.

If this were not the case, it would show up in other ways. The Consortium is a membership organization with a relatively high level of dues. If there were dissatisfaction it would probably show up in very vocal comments from membership institutions or a decline in membership. But we heard no such comments and the evidence clearly points out that the membership is not declining.

Analysis

We thus conclude from our investigations that the ICPSR has had a remarkable impact on the social science academic community by rendering two crucial services. The lofty vision of its founders has more than been fulfilled. But, while the archiving proceeds at a steady, professional pace, data sets are provided to users promptly and efficiently, and the summer program continues to have a salutary impact on young scholars, there are signs of serious strain that threaten the future of the organization.

The most obvious indicator of the strain is the animosity and conflict that has existed between some officers and top staff at the ICPSR and some at the CPS. Accusations and recriminations of a serious nature abound. The notes from our interviews and personal letters to us spell out the detail. We five committee members are veterans of some academic wars and have a purple heart or two (if not a legion of merit) among our souvenirs. We have witnessed conflicts that have torn valuable organizations apart and destroyed their capacity to make any significant contributions to the academy. Rarely, however, have we observed a situation where the bitterness runs as strong and as deep as has been reported to us over the past few months. And this phenomenon is not of recent vintage. It goes back almost a decade and has been at a high level of acrimony in recent years.

The details of the accusations and recriminations and the passion with which they are recounted need not concern us here. But the issues over which the conflict occurs are of central interest to this report.

First, there are matters of budget and resource flows. The Consortium's Director and Staff feel that it is providing an unwarranted subsidy to the CPS, while the Directors, past and present, of CPS believe that the University and the CPS are providing a significant subsidy to the ICPSR which is not appreciated and may not be well used. Early in our deliberations we felt that the disagreements might be over matters of fact that were hidden in somewhat arcane accounting procedures. If the facts of the matter were clarified, there would be a basis for understanding and conflict resolution. Deeper probing, however, indicates that this is probably not the case. The conflict is over rights, and justice and judgment. There are several ways to interpret the books that would allow each side to strengthen its position by the way it provides "facts" to support its case. But take away the disagreement over

facts and there would continue to be conflict over what set of norms should inform decisions when there is some discretion in dealing with funds, the kinds of activities that should be given resources, and the property rights that accrue to such things as indirect cost recovery and tuition payments.

Secondly, there are disagreements over program direction. Some people in CPS, for example, question the mix of beginning and advanced courses in the summer program, and fault the decisions made on which data sets to archive. At the same time some people in the Consortium question why the CPS should support areas of research that seem unable to bring in significant outside revenues.

Third, there are disagreements over the use of shared resources, largely the computers and the staff that manages them and provides service. If it were not for the other difficulties, this one would not be serious.

Fourth, there is a difference of opinion over the appropriateness of rewards. People in CPS think that the staff salaries in the Consortium are too high while the ICPSR Director is concerned about the lack of security of his staff.

These conflicts are most serious. If not resolved, the effectiveness of the Consortium, if not its very existence, is threatened.

There are some who hypothesize that the problem is basically one of personality conflict. Among the cast of characters are some who grate on each other so deeply and continually that every minor source of irritation seems to be elevated into a major disagreement. The diagnosis implies the solution. Change one or two of the key actors and the craggy mountain of conflict will dissolve into a tiny molehill which does nothing but add a bit of relief to the otherwise flat landscape of day-to-day routine.

After careful and considered analysis, we have rejected that diagnosis and solution. We have identified characteristics of a basic structure of the ICPSR, the CPS, and their interrelationship that will necessarily generate conflict if the director and staff of each are doing their respective jobs effectively. We recognize that there is personality conflict, but change the key actors and within a few years we predict that one would again witness personality conflicts unless there is either some significant change in the structure or at least one of the actors is a milquetoast character who cannot, or will not, adequately defend the legitimate interests of his/her organization.

There are three major structural problems:

① The first is the different intellectual arenas in which the ICPSR and CPS operate. In the beginning these areas were virtually identical and one man, with intellectual ease, could simultaneously be director of both.

Warren Miller, in his scholarly role and as director of CPS, did election studies through surveys and other techniques that resulted in the collection of a large amount of quantitative data. These data were a valuable resource for secondary analysis and, after a number of studies were done, for longitudinal analysis. The ICPSR was designed to clean and archive these data, and make them available to the scholarly community. It was also set up to provide a training program in which young scholars could learn these new (to political science) techniques and methods necessary to use the data. There was a happy congruence of interest and purpose. Over the years, however, the interests of the Consortium expanded beyond election data and even beyond political science. Data sets in such areas as criminal justice and aging were added. The Council, which in the beginning was almost entirely made up of political scientists, was expanded to include sociologists, historians, and

others. The Official Representatives, who in the beginning came largely from departments of political science, now come in substantial numbers from other departments or from units such as libraries that are responsible for central information acquisition and distribution. What was in effect a consortium of political science departments in a small number of universities has become in reality a consortium of a significant part of the social science community in a large number of universities. (See the historical section below, Part III, for the chronicle of this evolution).

The CPS has remained, and understandably so, an organization whose interests are mainly limited to those of a certain subset of political scientists. The national election study is by and large its most important research activity. The fact that the Director and Staff of the ICPSR must represent and speak for a wide segment of the social science community nationally, while the Director of CPS must defend and speak for the interests of a much narrower subset of political scientists, has the potential for conflict given the best of motives and intentions on both sides.

2 The second source of potential conflict derives from the fact that the Director of the ICPSR must, in effect, serve two masters. On the one hand, there is the Council which represents the dues-paying members of the organization; on the other, there is the Director of the CPS to whom the Director of the ICPSR formally reports. If the ICPSR were located in the CPS only for "quarters and rations" there would be little difficulty. But the Director of CPS must personally defend a research agenda. It cannot be a matter of indifference to him/her and the researchers in the Center what projects the ICPSR pursues and how it runs its summer program. As a participating unit in the CPS, the ICPSR is expected to make its contribution to the health of that organization. But as pointed out above, the interests of

the member universities in substantive issues as reflected through the Council cannot be the same as those of the CPS. This source of conflict has been exacerbated by the fact that the Council which represents members whose dues make up 48 percent of the budget has so little control over the Director and the Staff. (By contrast, 8 percent of the budget comes from the University of Michigan, largely from tuition payments for the summer program.)

There have been great advantages for the ICPSR to be located in the CPS and, more generally, in the ISR. And the contribution of the University of Michigan in providing the framework for personnel, accounting and other administrative matters has been of great value. But some modifications in the memorandum of organization are absolutely necessary, both to make the situation in which the Director of ICPSR serves two masters a more tolerable one, and to recognize the heavy financial contribution of the members.

The third structural problem derives from the size of the ICPSR measured in terms of the annual budget in the total CPS operation. In the beginning of the Consortium it was a relatively small organization, its membership was small and somewhat tenuous and it could exist quietly and contentedly within a Center in the ISR. But today its budget is about 45 percent of the total budget of the CPS and it has a regular source of revenue in its membership dues. Its substantive interests, however, are not central to the CPS. It is something of a tail, but now a very large tail which will want to wag the dog. A tail which consists of 45 percent of the budget of the dog can create a good deal of consternation if it decides to throw its weight around. Given its different substantive interests and its necessity to meet the needs of members as expressed through the Council, it will always want to wag with some independence.

Recommendations

Our review of the history of the Consortium and its performance in its role as it has evolved, as well as our analysis of the problems and issues that have been generated by that experience, lead us to recommendations for actions by the parties most concerned: the members of the Consortium and Consortium Council, the University of Michigan, the Institute for Social Research, and the Center for Political Studies. The most compelling characteristic of the ICPSR experience has been the evolution of the Consortium into a multidisciplinary central archive with enormous significance through scholarly interests of the member institutions and the academic community in general. The activities of the Consortium are no longer closely tied exclusively to the political science discipline, and the Consortium has become a large-scale operation. We believe that the preservation of the smooth flow of archival service to the research enterprise is the significant good to be realized by the Consortium in the long run. The Consortium's performance in this dimension has been outstanding and our recommendations are directed to the goal of assuring that that high level of performance is maintained.

The Consortium's multidisciplinary development, coupled with its substantial growth and size, makes its administrative location in the Center for Political Studies unsatisfactory and the key factor in the structural problems discussed above. It is conceivable that the CPS could develop over time into an organization with a multidisciplinary research agenda that would be congruent with that of the archival domain of the ICPSR. This development might make the present administrative arrangements satisfactory, but we do not believe that to be likely. Furthermore, it would far exceed our charge to make a recommendation about the future development of the CPS. Accordingly, we recommend:

1. The ICPSR should be removed administratively from under the Center for Political Studies.

There are a number of possible alternative administrative locations for the ICPSR, ranging from a unit within the ISR to an independent corporation contracting with the University of Michigan for services to a totally separate corporation, perhaps with a tie to another university.

We have concluded from our study that the ICPSR has been very good for the University of Michigan, and the University of Michigan has been very good for the ICPSR, and we would like to see the close relationship continued. Our preference would be to have the ICPSR organized as a semi-autonomous unit within the ISR. We choose the word "unit" advisedly. It does not seem appropriate for a large membership organization like the Consortium to be a center in the ISR with all the rights and responsibilities of other centers. But it does seem possible to develop an appropriate position for the ICPSR in the ISR that would accommodate the unique characteristics of both these outstanding organizations.

Our second recommendation is a necessary concomitant of the first.

2. The Memorandum of Organization must be rewritten with the particular goal of establishing a new relationship with the University of Michigan and specifying the role of the Council in performing its stewardship for the interests of the member institutions.

It would not be appropriate for our committee to recommend the specific content of the revised Memorandum of Organization. That must be worked out between the ICPSR Council and the ISR. There are, however, some points that must be included in this revision.

- a. The appointment and review of the Executive Director of the ICPSR should take place with the active advice and consent of the Council.

In our view the appointment should be for a specific period of time (e.g., five years), with reappointment permissible following a review in which the Council fully participates. It is inappropriate for the review of the Executive Director to take place at the present time. If our recommendations are accepted, we would anticipate at least a two-year period during which time negotiations are carried out with the University of Michigan and a new Memorandum of Organization written and approved. The Executive Director should not be going through a performance review during this period.

A protocol in the new Memorandum of Organization must deal with the transition from the old Memorandum to the new, and that protocol should deal with the review of the Executive Director if he wishes to continue in that position under the new Memorandum of Organization.

- b. Provision should be made to provide the senior staff at the Consortium with job security without the creation of sinecures.

problem (?) We expect that the University of Michigan, like other large research institutions, has provisions in its personnel system for "professional and administrative" employees, that include protections for both employer and employee that would be appropriate for the senior staff of the ICPSR. It would be better to use an existing system as much as possible rather than try to create one with all the problems involved, including the possible legal pitfalls.

- c. The Consortium Council should appoint Associate Directors for fixed terms of service.

Over the years a set of special positions known as Associate Directors of the consortium has been created. These appointments are for uncertain terms, perhaps life, and their status is in many ways

ambiguous. A specific oral charge to the review committee was to evaluate these positions and, in particular, to make recommendations concerning the tenure of such appointments and by whom they are to be made.

The rationale we find for Associate Directors is that they provide a living institutional memory for the Consortium and the Consortium Council. The Associate Directors are well established professionals who have had some systematic connection with the organization. Some of them are long-standing Michigan Center for Political Studies persons, while others have come from outside the Michigan orbit. We believe that the making of such appointments should be continued and regularized in order to secure the benefits for the Consortium's pool of accumulated expertise and wisdom.

How many Associate Directors there should be and how long they should serve are matters to be decided by the Council, in our judgment. We are convinced, however, that the Council should make these appointments and that service should be for a limited term.

- d. The Council should give serious consideration to the creation of an Executive Committee.

The Council cannot become the administrator of the Consortium's activities, but it must assume a more adequate means of carrying out its oversight role in behalf of its members. On matters of finance and personnel oversight, an Executive Committee might be a great asset. Stewardship requires watching the flow of funds and the general management of personnel. The Council has a set assignment; a regularized way of discharging it would be desirable and we believe that an Executive Committee might well be a less cumbersome way of

discharging these responsibilities than leaving them in the hands of the Council as a whole.

Our formal recommendations are few but sweeping. In many ways they follow naturally from taking cognizance of the great growth and success and importance of the Consortium, and of the great contribution that the rich social science environment at the University of Michigan has had which contributes to this record.

In Part II of this report, we make some further suggestions for action that should be seriously considered by the Consortium Council. But these suggestions will necessarily follow a revision of the Memorandum of Organization and the development of a new relationship with the University of Michigan. Thus, we have not made them as formal recommendations so as not to distract from what we consider to be the most important issues. Nevertheless, we do ask that the Consortium Council and the Executive Director give consideration to the suggestions contained in Part II.

PART II

THE FUNCTIONS AND PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSORTIUM

Part II contains five sections, each dealing with a separate aspect of the Consortium's activities. These sections are (1) Archival Development, (2) Servicing the Membership, (3) Computing, (4) the Summer Program, and (5) the Intellectual Leadership Function. Our overall judgment is that the Consortium is performing very well in at least the first four of these areas and that too much should not be expected in the fifth. Nevertheless, improvements can always be made in any program, and we have therefore attempted to suggest a few ways in which this might be accomplished. We stress, however, that it is the primary, ongoing function of the Council to monitor and contribute to all such activities, as well as to set priorities among them. This presupposes, then, that the Director and Senior Staff will continue to make every effort to keep the Council fully informed concerning any difficulties that are anticipated in each area, as well as the budgetary implications that are involved.

1. Archival Development

For member institutions ICPSR's primary mission is the development of a broad-based social science data archive and the delivery of data in a timely and accurate fashion. Currently the ICPSR archive has 1,750 titles which consist of 25,000 files (e.g., the 1980 Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) is one title with 150 files, or at best three titles with fifty files each). In addition the average size of a file is much larger today than fifteen or even ten years ago; multi-reel files are no longer uncommon.

Included among the current titles are almost 60 serial data collections, the subject matter of which ranges from the traditional American, as well as British and German, election studies; both current and historical decennial census data; the General Social Survey (GSS); the Panel Study of Income

Dynamics (PSID); four collections from the International Monetary Fund (IMF); three from the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS); Cost of Living and Consumer Expenditure Surveys from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS); four studies from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), etc. It is worth noting that it is these serial collections which account for the greatest number of data requests and, further, that the "top 20" cover the full range of social science interests: political behavior, labor force participation, international economic time series, social surveys (longitudinal and cumulative cross-sectional), aggregate historical data and 1970 and 1980 census microdata. Political data account for only 25 percent of the data requests.

Clearly the holdings are unbalanced in many ways. In areas in which funding has been available (e.g., criminal justice) or for most of the studies generated within the Institute for Social Research (ISR) and particularly within CPS (e.g., The American National Election Studies (ANES) and PSID) data come promptly and routinely. Surveys of Consumer Finance and some CPS studies come more slowly. When user demand has been unified and substantial (1980 census or GSS) the collection is complete. There is no systematic way for this demand to be expressed and some ORs are more vociferous in expressing their needs than others. However, in areas in which the cost of acquisition is substantial (e.g., UN data) or in which the demand is not as well articulated (e.g., labor force time series) the collection tends to be spotty.

How complete should the archive be and in what substantive areas? How can the needs of the social scientist of the 1980s be balanced against those of the social scientist of the 1990s or even beyond? How much substantial knowledge of the content of the data evaluated or acquired must be resident within the ICPSR staff? How much could be acquired by providing fellowships for visiting scholars? What opportunities should regular staff be provided to keep abreast

of their disciplines? These are the questions which the archive must address. It seems clear that many heads must be involved.

III Numerous requests for advisory committees in specific subject areas have come from the senior staff. These committees are needed to identify specific data collections which should be acquired or upgraded and to assist in their acquisition. It has been many years since there have been active working committees or even "committees of correspondence." Almost all the data that are offered to the archive by either individuals or agencies are accepted, and unless there are technical problems (e.g., inadequate documentation or inconsistent data) Class IV checking is performed and the data are made public. Far fewer studies are upgraded today than in the past but it is probably fair to assume that the quality of most Class IV studies is technically superior today to what it was ten or fifteen years ago. This may indicate a need to rethink the systems of classes in order to provide more useful information to users.

The maintenance of the serial collections alone is very demanding and as a result there is always a backlog of studies awaiting even routine checking. Although 150-200 data collections comprising 500-900 discrete data files are processed each year, the average backlog is nearly a hundred collections. This is without any active solicitation, although there is some evidence that the various National Science Foundation requirements that data be deposited in an archive are beginning to pay off. It would not be possible to move more studies into the archive or move them at a faster rate without additional staff.

The staff problem is particularly acute at a time when users are requesting the addition to the archive holdings of data as varied as economic data from Pacific Rim countries, additional Current Population Surveys (CPS),

data on medical costs and, in general, much data not otherwise easily available to the user community, whether because of cost or of accessibility.

In addition to the data-related activities, the 28 people in archive development prepare the bibliographic descriptions of each study, including the detailed summaries, and produce 20-30 publications a year. It is worth noting that in recent years a bibliographic consistency has been instituted at ICPSR which insures that the title and author of a study will be the same in the Guide, the codebook, and anywhere else it appears. This is very useful for ORs and local data libraries and insures the development of union lists through the Research Library Network (RLIN) or the Ohio Library Cataloging Corporation (OCLC) or in federated memberships. This consistency makes it far easier for the OR or the user to locate data.

III It seems appropriate that the Council appoint a personnel committee to make recommendations on dealing with some of the issues of release time, subject specialization, etc., particularly since any of the possible options would require additional funding. No one solution will suffice but a whole array of options must be in place to meet the changing needs of the archive. IV It is possible that additional funding be built into grant proposals to cover some staff development.

2. Servicing the Membership

The Tobin Report of 1986 notes that ICPSR "appears to lag behind the state of the art in electronic storage, retrieval and transfer of data. The testing and development which, we are informed, is under way deserves high priority...As yet there are no generally available electronic mail facilities to which users can connect to search for data sets, call up codebooks, or request files. Electronic methods by which users can communicate directly with

the archive, and can search for and retrieve data, need to be developed and implemented." We question this observation.

The "Guide to Resources" has been available to users on tape for more than a decade. The present system of automated servicing was first proposed in 1976. FAST, the automated order fulfillment and tape setup system was implemented in 1981 and CDNET, the online ordering service, in 1986. The Roper Center has a SPIRES system which allows comprehensive searching of their complete holdings and of some additional data as well. The charges for both connect and machine time are borne by the user. ICPSR supports the machine time for CDNET since automated ordering is more efficient and less expensive for them. Roper has no online ordering system and although they are on BITNET they do not regularly monitor their archive account and prefer phone orders. ICPSR, on the other hand, prefers CDNET orders but monitors BITNET daily for both orders and messages and accepts written orders as well. Phone orders must be confirmed electronically or in writing. Most archives accept BITNET orders but no other archive has developed an online ordering system. It is worth noting that the University of Michigan was one of the last major U.S. universities to affiliate with BITNET, thus delaying the development of an efficient interuniversity mail system.

Along with the ordering system has come the availability of (1) searchable SPIRES versions of the Guide, which is updated quarterly to include new titles announced in the Bulletins; (2) the Roll Call votes, which is updated with each new Congress; (3) Variables, which currently includes full question wording and often the frequencies from the election studies, GSS, Euro-barometers, etc., and soon of numerous studies of health and aging; and (4) the Survey Methodology Information System (SMIS), the bibliographic file of entries for articles on survey methodology originally established by the Bureau of the

Census and now maintained by ICPSR. Users of CDNET may also make use of the messaging and conferencing features of CONFER or use either SPSS or OSIRIS to analyze data in OSIRIS form.

Plans are underway to store codebooks on WORM (Write Once Read Many) disks which could be made available to members, thus allowing them to store a full collection of codebooks in a compact and searchable form. Thus far, there is no network which is willing to permit the regular transfer of data files. Occasional transfers are possible but there is no guarantee that large files will not be held up or even discarded somewhere along the way since officially they have no place on the networks. It is not even clear that NSFnet will be able to handle the quantity of data which ICPSR currently transfers in a year, let alone the growth which has been the pattern in recent years. In 1987-88 ICPSR transferred 3,741,396,924 card images in 22,749 data sets as compared to 103,443,394 card images in 8,901 data sets in 1975-76. Had the automation of the data servicing process not been started as early as it was it is hard to know where servicing would be today. Data are delivered as promptly today (or more so) as they were fifteen years ago in spite of the vastly increased volume. Servicing must continue to automate in order to save time, money, and space.

Probably the thorniest decision that ICPSR has to make in the area of servicing is the one which relates to direct service to end users. ICPSR has functioned very efficiently in the past 25 years by dealing only with ORs. With the advent of microcomputers there is some pressure to deal directly with users, e.g., to send extracts on diskettes to meet the research needs of a specific user. What are the implications of such a decision? One danger is that end users will make too many demands on the servicing staff as they learn to understand the data, the hardware and the software. A possibility is to

allow users to access data at cost (connect and machine) and to download whatever data they wish, assuming it does not exceed limits set by the networks, but to direct their questions to their ORs, who could provide at least some guidance. ORs could continue to obtain tapes, particularly for the more popular collections and for those users who lacked the interest or the funding to obtain their own extracts. Downloading for these users would continue to be handled locally. Although CD-ROM is now very popular, it is far too slow for any significant amount of numeric data. The decision to include user-drawn extracts in the local data library would be made locally. There has not been a substantial use of direct user access to the Michigan system for analysis purposes, but obtaining extracts might be easier and cheaper and might therefore elicit more interest. Certainly the service must eventually be offered, and offered in such a way as to preclude a substantial increase in the servicing budget.

In 1975-76 servicing had a staff of 6 FTEs; it now has 10 but those 10 are delivering far more than 67 percent more data. One can hardly discuss ICPSR servicing without commenting on the outstanding job which Janet Vavra has done in that area. She runs a truly magnificent operation. The servicing group not only keeps their own records, but keeps records for the ORs at every member institution. The quality of service at a given institution, and particularly within a federated membership, is primarily a function of the quality of local staff and procedures.

A professional association, (the International Association for Social Science Information and Technology (IASSIST)), contributes substantially to the development of data services at the growing number of institutions at which ORs are on staffs of libraries, computer centers, institutes, data archives, or data libraries. It does not reach the graduate student or Assistant Professor,

for whom this is an onerous auxiliary responsibility. ICPSR does make an effort to help these people, but it might explore the development of systems which would allow all ORs to make better use of ICPSR's records in doing their jobs.

3. Computing

Fifteen years ago the activities of the computer support group were limited to data cleaning, documentation development and tape setups on the university's mainframe. Microcomputers were unheard of and distributed computing was something that was more talked of than done. Ten years ago ICPSR obtained its first major equipment grant from NSF. With it the first PRIME was purchased and with that ICPSR began the task of developing internal computer facilities dedicated to the specialized needs of a large archive with extensive and growing servicing responsibilities. It also began to reduce its dependence on the mainframe and to use it only for those applications for which it was most appropriate, e.g., tape setups. Subsequent NSF grants have provided for the upgrading of the PRIME and for the purchase of PCs and workstations. The application orientation during this period focused on servicing; initially on automated job setup and more recently on online ordering and other aspects of CDNET (cf SERVICING summary).

The current NSF equipment grant is in the second of three years. Its goals are "to contain and reduce costs; improve management, control, and dissemination of data holdings; gain efficiency in creating, storing and disseminating codebooks and documentation; improve efficiency in management and administration; extend reference databases while reducing storage and access costs; replace aging and obsolete equipment; and capitalize on alternative modes of data access and transmission that are either now available or which will become available in the near future."

In order to achieve these goals new equipment has been purchased to replace old, unreliable equipment. Specifically, eight microcomputers and a printer were replaced, and a new printer acquired. Additional memory was also acquired to replace three older and smaller disk drives. The most recent step was to purchase the hardware and software required to create a LAN (local area network).

The direction for the second year includes three categories of equipment: (1) optical scanning; (2) further replacement of microcomputers; (3) equipment and software to link the ICPSR LAN to the University of Michigan campus network and thence to MERIT and NSFnet; and (4) data base software (DBMS). Plans for Year 3 are currently being formulated. They include some sort of mass storage capability, most likely optical disk (WORM) storage. The total amount of this three year grant is \$650,000.

The grant stipulated both the appointment of an "Equipment Committee," made up of individuals familiar with ICPSR and with the use of computers in the social sciences, and the development of a high-level advisory committee made up of individuals in the forefront of developments in the field of computing. The former group is now in place and has already met several times; the latter group is currently being constituted.

It is also worth mentioning that, apart from the grant activities, the computer support group has developed and continues to maintain and enhance a network interface for CDNet; a data entry and screening package called Devil; and the GIDO data preparation and documentation software. In addition the group responds to countless inquiries from ICPSR members on every computer-related subject imaginable.

ICPSR has been in the forefront of computer developments in the social sciences. They stay abreast of what is happening in computing and, overall, they have made good decisions.

4. The Summer Program

Overall, the summer program is in excellent shape and has been a credit to the University of Michigan, the ISR, the CPS, and the entire ICPSR membership for a number of years. Beginning, as it did, as a relatively small "bootstrap" operation designed to enable political scientists to develop basic skills in quantitative research, it has evolved into a major program that has for the past six years attracted over 300 participants from a wide variety of social science and applied fields. The two academic disciplines with the largest representations are sociology and political science, with approximately equal numbers from each, but there are growing numbers not only from other social science disciplines but also from such fields as criminal justice, business administration, medicine, public health, nursing, education, social work, journalism, and gerontology. The program attracts a combination of graduate students and established faculty and other academics and serves a very substantial fraction of the member institutions. In 1987, for example, 116 member institutions were represented, and this figure has been consistent over a number of years. A number of participants from overseas countries also take advantage of the summer program.

The summer program also serves the University of Michigan well. Approximately a quarter to a third of fee/tuition paying participants over the past six summers (1983-1988) have been from Michigan. For the most part, these are graduate students who are taking advantage of summer offerings to fulfill their normal training requirements in social statistics. Presumably, the existence of the ICPSR's summer program makes it unnecessary for Michigan

social science (and other) departments to hire the faculty that other comparable universities need to staff such courses. Michigan students are thus able to take advantage of the opportunity to study under a variety of instructors who are regular faculty from other comparable institutions (e.g. Yale, Indiana, Ohio State, North Carolina, and Iowa). Perhaps more importantly, graduate students in Michigan social science departments, particularly sociology and political science, have available to them, during the summer, a series of advanced courses and workshops that are simply unavailable elsewhere. This very substantial intellectual contribution to Michigan's M.A. and doctoral programs is thus a major asset provided by the ICPSR (and its membership Universities) to the University of Michigan. Furthermore, over the years much of Michigan's reputation as a site of quantitative training in political science has been heavily based on the ICPSR summer program.

We have stressed that the ICPSR is a unique organization. The summer program is also a unique social science training facility that does not exist elsewhere in the country. From time to time, scholarly societies such as the American Sociological Association have attempted to set up much smaller-scale quantitative training programs for targeted groups, such as women, minorities, or faculty at smaller institutions. Each time this has been attempted, however, it has been impossible to sustain the operation beyond one or two summers because of funding shortages. Furthermore, such operations are of necessity of a much smaller scale than the Michigan program, with the frustrating result that they can rarely handle the heterogeneity of backgrounds that students and faculty present. Of equal importance, the Michigan program offers stability. One can count on the offering of a standard set of courses, summer after summer. This means that persons can come back over a period of

several summers, and they can plan their schedules several years in advance. It is difficult to overstate the importance that the existence of such a diversified and dependable program has had over a period of some twenty five years.

Prior to the time when the current Director (Heitowit) was appointed, the summer program was directed by a series of University of Michigan junior faculty members who did not receive tenure. Since then, Mr. Heitowit has served admirably well in what is primarily an administrative role, guided by advisory committees that have been set up by Council and composed partly of council members and partly of other social scientists who have either been intimately familiar with the summer program or who, themselves, are methodologists contributing to the "cutting edge" of applied statistical work. We believe this current mode of operation has worked very well in the recent past and have no recommendations to alter the existing setup.

The summer program has been designed to offer work at a number of different levels of expertise. Its Track I offerings are basically elementary. Over time, these courses have served different disciplinary mixes in accord with the extent to which alternative training programs are readily available in most academic departments in those disciplines. In the field of history, for example, graduate students at most universities rarely find themselves in settings in which they are actively encouraged to go very far in statistics. The History Department at one of the Ivy League Universities, for example, indicates that it is heavily dependent on the Consortium's summer program. In general, summer program participants coming from history are often found in Track I courses, supplemented by special workshops especially designed for historians.

As the field of political science has evolved toward parity with sociology in the field of applied statistics, a much higher percentage of political

science departments currently offer standard statistics sequences or have them available from other departments, whereas this was certainly not the case prior to the early 1970s. But there are many others who benefit from courses at this Track I level. There have, for example, been special workshops for Latinos, Asian-Americans, and social scientists in applied fields such as gerontology and criminal justice, and a similar workshop series is currently being contemplated for nurses. Clearly, the summer offerings at this rather elementary level have served and will continue to serve an important function, both to membership institutions and specific types of clientele. The University of Michigan, in turn, has benefited from this "service" function of the summer program.

The core set of courses and lectures are directed more at the typical graduate student and faculty member in, say, political science or sociology. These are the Track II courses devoted to a number of standard topics such as least squares and regression, causal modeling, and scaling techniques. Although many major departments in both sociology and political science have courses available at this level, it must be recognized that others do not. Therefore there are graduate students caught in departments that, for whatever reason, are weak in the quantitative area, and these persons may find it to their advantage to participate in the summer program. Furthermore, there are many faculty in member institutions who need retooling in these rather basic topics, perhaps because their own training was sufficiently remote in time that their knowledge of more recent topics is inadequate, or perhaps because of other weaknesses in their training.

Faculty who are at relatively smaller colleges or at universities with heavy teaching loads and less than sympathetic mathematics or statistics departments also find it very helpful to have available a summer program that

is sufficiently large-scale that their very different knowledge gaps can be addressed. Persons coming at quantitative methods from very specialized angles, as for example Latino scholars, also find that the summer program enables them to locate others with similar interests, as well as affording them the opportunity to work with special data sets of direct relevance to their own work. Some of these persons take work at the Track I level, but others take advantage of Track II courses that are unavailable on their own campuses. Evaluations from such participants have been uniformly positive.

Finally, there are more advanced offerings at the Track III level. These are more likely to be offered during the second of the two four-week sessions or to take the form of briefer workshops concerned with specialized topics. Courses such as these are rarely offered on a regular basis even at other major research universities, although a few quantitatively oriented sociology or political science departments may offer them to their own graduate students. Thus, there are few alternative locations where training at this level can be obtained and, therefore, the ICPSR indeed affords a unique resource for faculty and graduate students who wish to obtain training that is close to the "cutting edges" of their disciplines. At the same time, such workshops or specialized courses are costly and generally attract no more than ten to twenty participants each summer. In effect, they are subsidized by the remainder of the program. Although the exact topics covered vary from summer to summer, and depend upon recommendations by the program's advisory committee as well as the availability of suitable instructors, this aspect of the summer program has definitely not been neglected over the past decade.

As might be expected, there are those who believe the summer program should offer a much higher percentage of such Track III courses and workshops and that, indeed, it should help to shape the "cutting edge" of the future.

Once more, it is evident that we have here another instance of the problem of attempting to be all-things-to-all people. It is questionable whether any group activity can, itself, directly contribute to the actual cutting edge research in statistics or quantitative social science, although it may facilitate the initial dissemination process. Clearly, most cutting edge work is conducted by individual scholars and published in established outlets. It then takes some time before such ideas become part and parcel of the day-to-day work of substantively oriented social scientists, and it is here that Track III courses and workshops may play an important role.

Before one concludes that highest priorities should be given to work of this sort within the summer program, however, it becomes necessary to address a number of questions. Is there not something faddish about wanting to be close to the cutting edge, regardless of which edges are being cut and why? Are all cutting edge advances such that they will substantially benefit user disciplines, or are their expected benefits of marginal importance? Should the summer program attempt to move in all "cutting edge" directions at once, merely because the ideas or techniques are new to the social sciences? After all, what is a "cutting edge" approach in one discipline may be "old hat" in another.

What we believe is needed is thoughtful guidance on the part of the summer program's advisory committee, rather than a blanket endorsement of the seemingly reasonable stance that it is the primary function of the program to help stimulate advances that, say, our scholarly disciplinary societies (such as the American Political Science Association (APSA), the American Sociological Association (ASA) or the American Statistical Association) ought to be encouraging. This is to say, then, that there must be a balance among the offerings at the three track levels. We believe that the current program, as

well as those of the past decade, is indeed offering such a balanced set of courses. Its consistently high attendance record, as well as its highly favorable reputation among member institutions, suggests that it is performing this function very well.

II The summer program is only very loosely coupled with the other functions of the ICPSR and, therefore, need not remain at the same institution if superior options become available elsewhere. Present arrangements with the University of Michigan appear to be highly satisfactory except for two problems that are currently being examined by the Council and the program's advisory committee. One of these is that Michigan's computer system is only very poorly integrated with the rest of the academic world, so that summer program participants are forced to learn systems that are inappropriate at their own institutions. It is our understanding that the University of Michigan is slowly moving to correct this problem, and it is our hope that ways can be found in the very near future to overcome this important handicap.

II The second problem involves the fees that are charged to graduate students who come from other member institutions. Michigan's tuition rates are unusually high, by comparison with those at other state universities, and there are differential fees which in effect give a break to in-state students (e.g., Kalamazoo College) or members of other Big-Ten universities. Given the membership structure of the ICPSR, and the fact that Big-Ten schools pay exactly the same fees as other major state universities, such an arrangement is obviously unfair to most of the membership. Also, fees charged to graduate students might be adjusted downward at no net cost to the program, provided that fees were charged to participants with faculty status at other member institutions. We understand that this matter, as well, is being examined by

III

the current Council, and we recommend that a more equitable arrangement be worked out with the University of Michigan.

A third possible problem pertains, especially, to Michigan graduate students who sometimes substitute summer courses for their regular statistics requirements. No four-week course, even if intensive, can serve as the equivalent to a full quarter or semester course and, therefore, may be perceived, by some, as an easy way out. Several Michigan faculty have expressed a concern that grading in the summer program may be uniformly too high, relative to grades given in regular courses. We believe this possible problem can be rather easily resolved and emphasize that the primary purpose of the Consortium's summer program is to serve a much broader spectrum of students and faculty. It should, therefore, not be conceived as a substitute for more standard courses regularly offered at the University of Michigan.

The University serves as collector and distributor of fees and tuition. It is our understanding that the summer program receives back approximately 90 percent of the fees paid to the University, both by regular Michigan graduate students and students from other member institutions. Clearly, this arrangement should not be considered a "contribution" by the University of Michigan to the summer program, especially in view of the fact that so many of its own students are benefiting from the program. The University does, however, contribute a computer allowance to the program, with some (to us unknown) proportion of this computer time being used by Michigan students.

Thus, it is not entirely clear just what the cash-flow situation is between the University and other member institutions supporting the ICPSR, but we infer that this does not at present constitute a serious problem for either party. We have been told that, with respect to the summer program, dealings

between the Consortium and the University are basically good and that both parties are satisfied with the current arrangement.

Questions have been raised by at least one CPS member, and by council members from time to time, concerning the qualifications of the teaching staff of the summer program. Because of cost considerations, it has been virtually impossible to hire "big name" or "cutting edge" scholars to teach actual courses in the program, although such persons are sometimes brought in as guest lecturers. Given that it is unlikely that well-established senior scholars will want to teach, summer after summer, at the University of Michigan, this criticism seems to us to be based on highly unrealistic assumptions. Summer staff are selected in terms of teaching performance, based on written evaluations by participants in prior summers. This is in contrast to most academic departments, which often hire indifferent to weak teachers, provided only that these persons have substantial scholarly records.

We believe that what is primarily a teaching program should select its staff primarily on the basis of teaching performance. Given that the program does this, we find it remarkable that it has been able to attract such a high quality and enthusiastic young staff, many of whom are presently beginning to develop solid reputations in their own fields of research. A certain amount of turnover is almost inevitable in any such staff, but we also find it surprising that so many very good staff have been willing to return summer after summer. It appears as though they, at least, believe that they are performing an important function in so doing. The program Director also makes every effort to solicit names of potential staff members from his advisory committee, so that there is adequate and high quality "new blood" entering into the system.

5. The Intellectual Leadership Function

Opinions have been expressed concerning the nature and quality of the intellectual leadership provided by both the Staff and Council of the ICPSR. These concerns seem especially prevalent among non-ICPSR faculty associated with the CPS but were also raised in the all-too-brief, and in our judgment highly superficial, section of the Tobin Committee report that pertained to the Consortium. In part, such judgments may reflect a tendency for various parties to expect far too much of the ICPSR and its staff--namely, that it perform functions that happen to have been neglected by other academic organizations such as professional and scholarly societies (e.g., the APSA, ASA, AHA) or by academic departments or research institutes.

Thus, from time to time there have been expectations that the ICPSR produce and distribute educational materials (e.g., SETUPS), provide a methodological monograph series, and offer "cutting edge" workshops as a major feature of its summer instructional program. Indeed, the Director and staff have actively cooperated with nearly all such efforts. It is at least arguable, however, that the ICPSR and its staff should be expected to supplement its two primary functions by accommodating to all such requests. In clarifying its mission, it may be necessary to specify that certain kinds of activities, although important, cannot be permitted to detract from these primary purposes of the Consortium. Certainly, any such supplementary projects should be thoroughly discussed and approved by the Council, on behalf of the general membership, rather than by the CPS or any other component of the ISR.

Having said this, we also believe it is clearly advantageous to the social science community to have available a very unique organization, in the form of the ICPSR, which is financially supported by common funds and which at least can serve as an important catalyst in advancing the social science enterprise

in general. It is our judgment, however, that it is totally unreasonable to hold the Director and staff responsible, in a major way, for projects that ought to be initiated by scholarly societies, academic departments, and institutes the primary function of which is research. One of the major roles of ICPSR council members, however, can and ought to be that of serving an advisory function in anticipating needs of the social sciences that are not being met by other kinds of institutions.


During its earlier phases, the (former) ICPR was basically an organization composed of political scientists, with council members typically being selected from a relatively small pool of persons who were intimately familiar with ICPR operations. Many were alumni of the summer program or had served as ORs during the developmental period of the organization. Presumably, council members knew each other reasonably well and interacted in the various political science scholarly societies, particularly the APSA. Council members were selected not only to represent a diversity of colleges and universities, as is also true today, but also the several fields of political science--international relations, comparative politics, voting behavior, and so forth. Such council members rather easily also served as chairs of advisory committees that not only provided lists of high quality data that needed to be archived but, equally important, they were well enough known within their fields that they could play more informal roles in inducing Principal Investigators to turn their data over to the ICPR.

As we have noted, the ICPSR has diversified considerably since the mid 1970s, and the composition of the Council has undergone a corresponding change. There has customarily been a representative from history on the Council for a number of years. In the mid 1970s sociologists were added to the Council. Initially, there was a single sociologist, then two, and currently three

sociologists on a Council consisting of ten members. Both the current and most recently retired Chairs have been sociologists. For the most part, sociologists who have been nominated and then elected to the Council have been selected to play certain roles or to fill gaps in the Council but have not had close prior attachments to the ICPSR, either as former participants in the summer program or as ORs of long standing. We anticipate that a similar pattern will hold in the case of economists or representatives from other social science disciplines.

Thus, as the mission of the ICPSR has broadened to include a wider variety of social scientists, and to relate more closely to college and university ORs who are more likely to have technical data-librarian or computer-center positions in these universities, the composition of the Council has also changed. There is a genuine problem here, which the Council needs to address head on. Just how much diversification on the Council is desirable? We must assume that future Councils will be at least as diversified as the current Council. If so, then it may be unrealistic to assume that the kind of intellectual leadership characteristic of earlier and more homogenous Councils can ever be expected again. Nor does it seem likely that Council members will retain as close contacts with the ICPSR once their terms have been served. Not only formal turnover, but "activist" turnover as well, can be expected to remain a problem for the Director and senior staff to confront.

Furthermore, if future Councils are to take a more direct responsibility for the governance of the ICPSR, as the present Council is now doing, it hardly seems reasonable to expect its members to take on intellectual leadership responsibilities as well, though they will almost necessarily have to play an oversight role in this regard. Especially in connection with the critical matter of providing guidance to the archiving staff, it is therefore essential



that the Council give careful consideration not only to working out a division of labor among themselves, but also of finding ways to delegate responsibilities to standing committees composed of scholars with known commitments to the Consortium.

Several possible solutions to these problems might be considered by Council. One is to lengthen the period of membership on Council, say from four to six years. Another would be to permit and even encourage selected council members to serve a second four-year term. A third would be to expand Council size, say from ten to fifteen members, with the understanding that "old" Council members might be recalled to serve again after a suitable period of absence. A fourth would be to retain the practice of using Associate Directors as informal Council advisors, but to rotate such Associate Directors and to place them on standing committees. Finally, as already noted, a fifth option might be to retain the present Council structure but to create a number of relatively autonomous standing committees containing members who are drawn primarily from lists of persons who have actively served as ORs or on prior Councils. Current Council members might serve either as liaisons to such standing committees, or as their Chairs.

Clearly, it is especially critical to provide intellectual oversight for the archiving work of the ICPSR. Not only should there be disciplinary advisory groups that have sufficient longevity and "clout" that they can play an important guiding and facilitating role in selecting and then actually obtaining data sets deemed of greatest intellectual importance in their given fields. Such disciplinary advisory committees also need to give attention to the criteria used in deciding which studies deserve to be upgraded in the classification system, so that a study's class status reflects a considered judgment concerning its scholarly and technical quality, and not just the

time to time.

initiated by governmental agencies or foundations that may have agendas that actually compete with or are even largely irrelevant to more scholarly

concerned about the quality, workloads, and intellectual development of the archival staff, particularly its more senior members or those younger persons

who seem most likely to complete their doctorates or who need released time to pursue their own scholarly work. Present archival staff are not only

overworked, but it is apparently the case that they lack adequate opportunities for personal development. Other substantively trained archival staff will

undoubtedly need to be hired, and of course retained, as the Consortium holdings continue to diversify. For all of these reasons it seems essential

that ways be found to allocate additional monies for archival staff needs.
Hopefully, some of these could be made available if there were a more

satisfactory way for the ICPSR to recover a larger share of its indirect costs. Council should also consider archival staff development needs in anticipating

future dues increases to member institutions. The Director should give this matter high priority and should keep Council fully apprised of staff needs, as well as efforts being made to secure additional funding for this purpose.

PART III

ICPSR: A HISTORICAL SKETCH

Within the academic social science community no institutional development so symbolizes the behavioral-quantitative-analytical revolution of the 1950s and 1960s as the organization and growth of the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research (ICPR). Furthermore, once in place, ICPR became a major force in shaping the behavioral movement both in political science and in related disciplines. During the 1950s and 1960s researchers, particularly at Columbia University's Center for Applied Social Research and the Survey Research Center within the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, developed the panel survey into a research instrument of great power. By combining the scientific survey with appropriate sampling methods and the rapidly developing technology of machine data analysis, researchers were able to conduct research on public opinion and citizen decision making at the national or lower levels of political and social life with a precision and rigor hitherto deemed impossible.

Angus Campbell of the Survey Research Center and a group of outstanding young social scientists whom he helped to recruit at the University of Michigan were in the center of these developments. They proved the feasibility of rewarding electoral analysis with a survey bearing on the presidential election of 1948, carried out more elaborate analyses of the 1952 and 1956 presidential elections and, as the decade of the 1950s proceeded,

also fixed their sights on electoral behavior in the congressional off-year contests. Scholars at other research institutions became increasingly interested in the possibility of using the accumulating Michigan data for related or replicatory analysis.

Meanwhile important behavioral research was developing in major social science departments and programs elsewhere. Great interest had developed in the problems of political development subsequent to World War II and Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba conducted a cross-national survey of five western nations, developing variables on political partisanship, political socialization and attitudes concerning the political system and culture; Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor developed an array of variables relating to populations and governments in a cross-polity survey of 115 nations; and Yale University social scientists developed a Political Data Program that assembled aggregate data concerning 141 different political units. Other researchers brought together materials descriptive of the middle and lower levels of government in the United States and abroad. Illustrative in this country were surveys of the legislators in four states prepared under the direction of John C. Wahlke, Heinz Eulau et al and the surveys underlying Robert A. Dahl's famous study of New Haven.

As the first director of ICPR put it, however, the Political Behavior Program of the SRC "inadvertently" developed a near monopoly of survey data relating to American national elections during the 1950s. Scholars found these data plus the summer training program of the SRC to be complementary

attractions. The Social Science Research Council sponsored and supported summer institutes for the study of political behavior at the SRC in 1954 and 1958. Other researchers sought data and methodological assistance from the Center during the same period -- some of them spending considerable periods of time in Ann Arbor. Yale University developed a program of SRC fellowships to enable advanced graduate students to spend time at the Center. From this background came the idea, suggested by various scholars both within and without the Michigan research group, that data availability and quantitative analytical training should be institutionalized in the form of a consortium program involving some one to two dozen major research universities. A grant from the Stern Family Fund allowed the establishment of such a body in 1962 with 18 universities as charter members.

As in all successful collaborations there was to be a two-way flow of benefits within the new consortium. Continually challenged to raise the funds necessary to keep the sequence of electoral surveys in flow, Warren E. Miller and his colleagues of the Political Behavior Program sought in ICPR a device that would generate some funds directly (the initial membership contribution was set at \$2500 annually) and more importantly, allow mobilization of the research community in support of major grant applications. Opposite numbers in social science departments, mostly political scientists initially, saw the consortium as a means of acquiring access for themselves and their students to survey data that were too expensive to generate locally and as a means also of developing the

analytical and methodological skills necessary for advancement in a social science world that was changing much faster than the formal curriculum. This latter aspect of the consortium plan was to involve the summer training of junior faculty and graduate students and provision of considerable remedial instruction for established faculty as well.

The first annual report of the ICPR noted that the first gathering of official representatives reaffirmed the interest of the member institutions in four major objectives: (1) the development of data resources; (2) the establishment of a formal training program for graduate students and faculty; (3) the stimulation and facilitation of new research; and (4) the operation of an informational clearing house concerning ongoing research. Although the record does not perhaps make this clear, the various participants also understood that the proposed activities were additionally innovative in that the consortium research data would be maintained in the ICPR "repository" (the word "archive" was less used initially) and made available in machine readable form. Thus the search, identification, and recording phases that had been basic for all research scholars in the social sciences to this point were to become a community exercise in so far as certain types of important information were concerned. This simple fact was to be fully as revolutionary in its implications and results as the statistical methods used in the analysis of the data.

MEMORANDUM OF ORGANIZATION:

A copy of this document first appears in the Biennial

Report, 1966-1968. It differs in only minor respects from archival documents bearing 1963 and 1964 dates. In the '66-68 version the ICPR "is conceived as a partnership between a group of universities . . . and the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan (SRC). The purpose of the Consortium is to promote the conduct of research on selected phases of the political process." Membership categories were defined as A, B, and C (outside U.S. and Canada), with fees of \$3500 (initially \$2500) per year for A members and \$2000 (originally \$1500) for the others. Member contributions were to be "used exclusively to finance services to the member universities by an SRC staff to the Consortium . . . to be administered through the SRC ICPR Project Account."

The memorandum outlined the familiar ICPR organization of official representatives from the member institutions and an elected council. The duties of the Council are relevant to this report. It was to be the executive committee of the representatives with authority to recommend the creation of standing committees and to create ad hoc committees. It was "to receive an annual report from the executive director of the Consortium regarding the staff's activities during the previous year" and to "receive general statements of expenditures from Consortium accounts held by the SRC" for transmittal with recommendations to the annual meeting of the ORs.

The Council or its subcommittees was to select and approve the participants in "ICPR program activities." It was "to advise the staff to the Consortium in the execution of approved program

activities" and had "the authority to amend and supplement the decisions of the annual meeting" and "to arrive at agreements with the SRC; such agreements to constitute decisions by the ICPR and will be sufficient to authorize action on behalf of the ICPR."

The contracting party at the University of Michigan was the Survey Research Center which was obligated to "administer the activities of the Consortium through provision of the necessary professional and technical staff and of the administrative services appropriate to the management of Consortium funds. The SRC will participate as a partner of the member universities in the development of training and the conduct of research by the ICPR." Other provisions clarify the role of SRC as visualized at that time. Among these is a description of the personnel to be provided -- "a program director and such additional personnel as are deemed by the SRC to be necessary to accomplish the program objectives." The SRC was to "cooperate wherever possible" with ICPR in executing ICPR activities, including the provision of housing and "make available the other facilities and personnel necessary for the reproduction and processing of data." It would "cooperative wherever possible in the execution of studies under Consortium sponsorship or under the direction of individuals from the member universities." It was to provide appropriate "technical consultation." "The SRC will select the personnel for the staff to the Consortium and will determine the availability of its facilities for research in residence." A final section of the Memorandum spelled out the relations between ICPR members and other scholars.

In the corporate world partnerships may be of different kinds and, if most of the leading off-campus scholars involved in the early years of ICPR felt no need to define prerogatives or areas of responsibility precisely, a few apparently were concerned about such matters. Miller recalls that at the first meeting one of the participants was insistent that the location of the veto power in the organization be identified and that his response was that there could be no organization if the question of veto power was really important. But the issue seemingly did continue to lurk in the background. The first page of the 1972-73 Report was to define ICPR as "a partnership between the Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan and The University of Akron" The same publication of the next year carried a somewhat different definition of ICPR as "An Organization for Cooperation Between the University of Michigan, the Institute for Social Research, the Center for Political Studies and the Social Science Community." But during the 1970s the issue of defining the powers of the member institutions precisely was never a pressing one and the changes made in the 1966-68 document in those years related primarily to the membership and fee structure and the name of the organization.

DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE MILLER YEARS:

The development of ICPR in its early years was truly impressive, even phenomenal. Once the basic shape of ICPR-formed in Warren Miller's mind he proved himself to be imaginative,

foresighted and a master in the arts of academic persuasion. The foundation world as social scientists knew it was changing. During the early 1960s the National Science Foundation emerged as a major provider of aid to the social sciences, the National Endowment for the Humanities was created and various national institutes became academic funding agencies as well. The private foundations began to reorder priorities to match the changing concerns of academia. Through this world of funding agencies Warren Miller moved with a sure step. No funding project that might assist in the growth of ICPR was either too audacious or too minor for serious consideration. And as Miller admits, ICPR's funding grew both on the basis of shrewd and imaginative planning and unanticipated fortuitous circumstances -- as in the emergence of a group of quantitative historians led by Lee Benson and in the unexpected interest of the Ford Foundation and NSF in financing the development of a machine readable historical archive of American electoral data and the conversion of all congressional roll calls from 1789 to the present to the same form.

Members of the early ICPR Council remember their role as being largely that of assisting in the recruitment of new ICPR members. The consortium concept of one university providing funding for services to another was strange to most university administrators who tended to view their institutions as self-contained entities. Were they perhaps being bypassed in educational leadership by the University of Michigan and being asked to help finance a diminution of their own prestige and status? Council members provided Miller with the appropriate

contacts at the schools that they knew best and helped in the development of arguments designed to convince faculty and their administrators that membership in the consortium was both opportunity to upgrade their programs and an exercise in economy.

As the so called data repository began to develop there were some doubts expressed in other major institutions. None could deny the utility of making the Political Behavior Program (PBP) survey data more freely available. But would not joint sponsorship of a repository that sought to add all of the most useful and interesting data sets relating to current research interests give undue advantage to Michigan researchers and deprive scholars seeking to build data libraries at their own institutions of "trading stamps" which could be used to obtain interesting data sets developed elsewhere at an early date? The issue was one of centralization versus decentralization and the Roper Center's gambit at one point of seeking pledges from its affiliates not to join other data-distribution bodies was perhaps the most striking indication of potential problems on this front. Council members and official representatives sought to calm local fears of this sort and to emphasize the advantages of the ICPR program. As ICPR summer graduates seeded the departments of both member and potential member departments they served as illustrations and advocates of both the new social science and ICPR. No other data archive was part of so broad a program as that of ICPR, none possessed so astute a diplomat and so successful a fund raiser as Miller and the issue of centralization versus decentralization never became a central

problem. But early Councils put considerable thought to it, endorsing coordination and division of labor and the formal establishment of a national network of archives.

The ICPR summer program began successfully and by the time Miller surrendered the directorship in the late 1960s, its seminars on research design, quantitative methods, and data analysis were attracting more than 90 students each year, recruited from the graduate programs and faculty of both domestic and foreign colleges and universities. Small stipends generated initially from operating funds and then NSF funding assisted summer students from member schools in meeting the expenses of attendance. The \$6000 that the University of Michigan contributed to the second summer session budget began the cash subsidies to that program which have continued to be the University's major direct annual cash contribution to the ICPSR. The summer programs of the 1960s were greatly enriched by the grants that NSF (mainly) and other agencies provided for the holding of a series of summer seminars that did much to shape research agendas in various areas of political science and also in history. Funding for such activity unfortunately was severely diminished as a result of federal research cutbacks during the Nixon administration.

It was a logical step to move beyond the concern with advanced research training of the summer program to interest in the ways in which ICPR data might be used in the curricular offerings of member institutions. The 1968 Report included a proposal addressed to the NSF to underwrite a special project in curricular development for training in data analysis, the data

sets and routines to be made available to the membership after initial testing in the ICPR summer program. This application was funded and a curricular development section appears in the ICPR administrative organization structure presented in the 1968-1969 Report, the last one in which Warren Miller appears as Director of ICPR.

The early history of the data repository is not easy to chart quantitatively. It too, however, was obviously a story of very considerable innovation and success. A key early decision involved giving priority to the development of automated data handling procedures. Federal funds also were tapped to provide a state of the arts computer capability. The problems of bringing data sets that had been produced initially outside the SRC to a general systematic format stimulated the development of advanced expertise in the recording, organization, and processing of machine readable data. Success on these fronts led to the surprising early achievement of finishing some accession projects ahead of schedule. Almost initially the decision was made to build a time dimension into the repository resources by cooperating with historians of the American Historical Association in developing a massive collection of historical electoral data (relating both to representation and to referenda) and processing the congressional roll calls, 1789-1940, that had been assembled by a Works Progress Administration project team under the direction of Dr. Clifford Lord. The Social Science Research Council provided modest but vital early funding to finance a survey of historical electoral data resources and the

feasibility of their conversion into machine readable form. Both NSF and the Ford Foundation contributed major grant support for the history projects and NEH ultimately made substantial grants (direct and indirect) to these or other historical projects.

Successive ICPR Reports listed new data sets acquired and the progress made on making them available for general distribution to the membership. A mere count of data sets acquired is not very meaningful because the size of the data accessions varied greatly. The growing numbers of ICPR staff and the number of data card images supplied to member (or occasionally other) institutions are meaningful, if indirect, measures of repository activity. By the late 1960s the Council had designated committees in various areas of political and historical research to survey the availability of useful data sets within the research community. All were active and some particularly energetic in identifying useful accessions and sometimes in helping with the diplomatic negotiations required to have them placed within the ICPR repository.

The Annual Report of 1968-69 was the last one submitted by Warren Miller as Director; thereafter he was to direct the Center for Political Studies, a new unit of ISR created from the Political Behavior Program of the SRC. Miller surrendered the immediate supervision of a consortium which now numbered 134 members, a staff of more than sixty people, and a total budget of more than \$1,000,000. Of this the member institutions had contributed \$369,500 and the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, International Business Machines and the Mathematical Social Science Board had contributed in varying but

significant degrees, reflecting the energetic search that Miller had conducted for grant monies as did further applications in the Report to NSF to support advanced science seminars for the 1970 Summer Session and to support data processing and documentation in the Historical Archives. Two hundred and forty two students attended the 1969 Summer Session, representing 93 consortium members. The ICPR data repository distributed more than 11,000,000 data card images during the course of Miller's last fiscal year as Director (See Table 1).

THE HOFFERBERT YEARS:

Richard I. Hofferbert succeeded Miller as the new Director of the ICPR program, now located within CPS. Then a faculty member at Cornell University, Rich had served for three years previously on the ICPR Council and came to his new position with a good grasp of the organization's objectives and its challenges. The latter included a deficit of \$60,000, reflecting the tightening of federal research budgets and the completion or near completion of the processing of large historical data bodies. Hofferbert has himself reported that his major aims in 1970 were threefold: (1) to broaden or diversify the scope of the data repository collections thus enlarging the clientele and support community; (2) to improve the financial picture by holding and increasing the membership, streamlining the executive structure, and shifting some personnel costs to the University of Michigan; (3) to rationalize the administrative and internal organizational structure.

Member institutions of these years also were suffering from the Nixon cutbacks and during the early seventies there was much discussion at Council meetings of member withdrawals and the problems created by the failure of recidivists to give the required year of notice. Reductions in NSF financing forced ICPR to scale back summer student stipends and tap the operating budget for such monies, and move from annual to biennial annual meetings as an economy measure. Membership growth slowed for a time but the development of the federated campuses concept (applied first in relation to colleges in the California state system) opened the way to further growth. Assiduous diplomacy abroad strengthened the roster of foreign members, as well as opening the way for the acquisition of various European data sets and establishing rewarding relationships with the developing European Consortium for Political Research. These European contacts had some bearing on another important decision. Funding for projects in the International Relations Archive was available from the Office of Naval Research and a substantial grant was obtained from that source. In European eyes as well as those of some American scholars this raised the question of possible influence on ICPR administration and policies by the federal defense establishment. After serious discussion the Council recommended that grants not be accepted from the Office of Naval Research or similar funding sources.

The annual reports do not make the contributions of the University of Michigan to the ICPR enterprise completely clear. The University split of Hofferbert's salary and that of Jerome M. Clubb, Director of the Historical Data Archive, between ICPR and

the Political Science and History Departments, favored ICPR given the fact that these men devoted most of their energies to Consortium work. The University contributed additional salaries and computer time to the Summer Program. On the other hand the University received the benefits of an enriched summer school population, summer tuitions, collected rent on the downtown building in which much of the ICPR enterprise was housed, and made a 15% overhead charge on the total direct costs in the ICPR budget. Hofferbert briefly discussed this issue in the 1970-71 Report: "Like all other programs, ICPR is required to pay an overhead rate which, in this case, is 15% of total direct costs in the operating budget. This is nearly as low as any project is allowed. The University of Michigan overhead rate for all federally supported projects is 54.5% of salaries and wages, a figure substantially over that represented by our 15% of direct costs. On the basis of 1971-72 projections, the federal overhead rate would require approximately \$165,000. The 15% of direct costs, even including the rental payment, will be less than \$95,000." (p.117) Two years later Hofferbert returned to this subject in a discussion of "indirect costs:" "As with all organizations, ICPR must bear some portion of those costs of building maintenance and operation, accounting and personnel offices, etc. ICPR pays its indirect costs to the Institute for Social Research. The budgetary items labeled "indirect costs" represent both that portion of externally supported activities customarily paid as overhead as well as 15% of the ICPR Operating Budget. The 15% actually represents a substantially lower rate

than usually paid on government grants and contracts. The latter normally carry a fraction of salaries and fringe benefits computed for purposes of indirect cost recovery. That fraction has, on the average over recent years, ranged between 25 and 30% of total grant funds. The ICPR 15% indirect cost rate, therefore, represents a substantial lower net rate than comparable overhead charges on projects supported by government grants." (1973-74, p. 99).

The meaning of these quoted statements is not perhaps completely clear. Members of the Review Committee frequently heard the implicit or explicit suggestion that the 15% overhead charge levied on ICPR has been an extremely generous arrangement given the usual soft money overhead of 50% plus. But the argument is somewhat misleading, since the two figures represent different kinds of calculations. Also, it was the usual arrangement for other entities in ISR and indeed some projects may, if Hofferbert was correct, have been assessed at a lower level. But it is also clear that only at the University of Michigan during the 1960s was there the accumulated data, imagination and will, and critical mass of behavioralists needed to make the ICPR idea work. It is also true that even during the first ten to fifteen years ICPR paid for its material necessities; it was not a free rider and the services provided by the University of Michigan have not apparently been made available to ICPR at a rate substantially lower than that levied by the National Research Council for administering foundation fellowship programs.

Despite the economic stringencies of the early 1970s and

concern on the part of staff and council then and later about the possibility of losing members, a flow of grant funds (even though diminished), increased membership contributions as a result of both increasing membership and upward revision of the rate structure, and minor funding from the University of Michigan left ICPR with a modest surplus in Hofferbert's last year of service.

Other significant developments occurred during Hofferbert's term as director as well. When the consortium was begun there had been some expectation that the summer program would become less necessary to members as social science departments became seeded with skilled methodologists and graduate curricula were broadened to embrace their skills. Although such processes were at work it was becoming clear by the early 1970s that the ICPR summer program was continuing to serve as a very useful center of communication for students and junior faculty from well-endowed institutions and remained invaluable for those from schools where graduate programs were smaller or less well-developed and from a growing number of undergraduate colleges. In these years too ICPR moved more fully to answer demands that Consortium expertise and data be placed at the service of the undergraduate classroom teacher. In a series of workshops beginning in 1970, ICPR personnel and faculty from member schools developed the Setups concept and planned the data sets and documentation for undergraduate classroom use that implemented it. Betty Nesvold was particularly active in this activity. By the time of her term as Council Chairperson the results of her efforts and that of

ICPR staff and other interested members were apparent in the widespread adoption in undergraduate courses of Setups packages.

The Hofferbert years were ones also in which the ICPR Computer Support Staff were active in assisting the development of appropriate computer capabilities at member schools. This group was clearly responsible for establishing data processing and replication programs and methods at Ann Arbor that made the distribution of data to member schools a very prompt and efficient process. Over the years, few official representatives were to complain about these matters. The OSIRIS statistical package was developed for inhouse use by ISR and CPS and the decision to establish and maintain it within the consortium membership in the face of the competition of other general purpose packages was to be somewhat controversial. The degree to which Osiris was developed at the expense of ICPR is a matter of some argument and given the software art of the time there were good arguments in support of the development policies that were followed. No definitive evaluation can be given here.

As noted, Hofferbert took up the directorship with several objectives in mind. His last annual report was that of 1974-75. He had successfully brought the ICPK through a period of fiscal stringency and one in which there were significant developments in membership and fee structure. He had developed important relationships abroad. He oversaw a significant broadening of archival holdings and user clientele. It was in his term as Director that it became clear that no other comparable archive was going to develop. The number of card images and data sets distributed annually grew amazingly. The only area in which

Hofferbert was dissatisfied with progress concerned the internal restructuring and rationalizing that he had hoped to conduct when he took office. He had inherited four separate data archives and, although he effected some cross cooperation, notably between the Historical and International Relations Archives and streamlined ICPR administration to some degree, effective consolidation would not be achieved, he believed, during his service as director. Nor, in this same respect, was Hofferbert satisfied that the computer support group and relations with the University of Michigan computing system were as productively organized as possible but the interrelations of that group with ISR and CPS operations made basic change difficult.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE CURRENT DIRECTOR:

Jerome M. Clubb, Director of the Historical Archive, succeeded Hofferbert and appears as Consortium director in the Annual Report of 1975-76. Some organizational restructuring occurred as the transition took place. With Clubb's encouragement, four Associate Directors were named, all from the CPS/ISR senior staff; there was some thought at the time that rotation of the Director's position might be implemented but the idea was discarded as Clubb settled into the job. During 1978-79, he sought to broaden the range of advice available within the associate director panel by inviting Heinz Eulau to join the group and Hubert M. Blalock and Norval Glenn later became members.

In Clubb's first year as Director the words "and Social" were inserted in the Consortium's name, recognizing the

broadening scope of the organization's collections, far beyond the original emphases on political survey data and historical data series, its enlarged clientele of researchers, and the different character of its summer program. The founding fathers of ICPSR had assumed that the summer session would draw its participants mainly from political science and this was true in the early years. By 1970 a majority of the session students were still political scientists but 23 historians, seventeen sociologists and smaller numbers from four other disciplines were in attendance. By 1979 only 33% of the summer students were political scientists and by 1985 this percentage had fallen still further to 21%.

This disciplinary broadening has been manifest also in the composition of the Council and among the official institutional representatives. Initially the council members were all political scientists. By the end of the 1960s the ICPR's data collecting activities in the field of international relations was recognized and a historical sociologist had also joined the group. At the beginning of the 1970s a historian entered the Council. Currently (1989), five of ten members are political scientists of whom one specializes in international relations and the five remaining come from the fields of sociology, demography, history, and the data library sector.

Concern has sometimes been expressed that the assembly of Official Representatives has over the years come to include a smaller proportion of senior scholars than was once the case as junior faculty members and data librarians replaced them. The data of the Annual Reports are insufficiently detailed to allow

adequate evaluation of these suggestions. However, a check of half of the ORs representing American institutional members in 1968-69 against the biographical sketches in the appropriate volumes of American Men of Science: the Social and Behavioral Sciences (1968) suggests an OR group that was derived heavily from the assistant professor and junior associate professor sectors of political science departments. Approximately half of those checked had apparently not attained sufficient professional stature to appear in Men of Science at that time. One sociology and one history affiliation was found in the 1968-69 group checked.

An investigation conducted by ICPSR in 1988 revealed that the disciplinary affiliations of 270 ORs in 1985 were as follows:

Economics	2.2%	Social Science	7.4
Education	2.2	Sociology	10.7
History	2.2	Technical	25.2
Political Sc.	46.7	Unlisted	3.3

A comparison with 1983 data showed that the Technical Personnel percentage in that year was 12.5%. During the 1970s the Annual Reports provided prefixes in the listing of ORs and in 1979, 8.5% of the ORs carried a prefix other than "professor." That figure may be taken as a rough measure of the technical personnel component at the time and one that a similar calculation for 1969 suggests had not increased appreciably during the 1970s.

When Clubb assumed the directorship the Consortium was in the process of raising the membership dues over a period of years and the inflation of the late 1970s was to place continued

pressure upon the organization. The membership remained relatively stable during this period. But the organization showed remarkable resiliency. Clubb recommended cancellation of the last of a series of fee raises that had been approved during the mid 1970s and held fees constant at \$6400 per annum for institutions with doctoral programs until 1985 when such members began to pay \$7000 per annum (currently \$7700). Clubb was able to do this because ICPSR saved funds by placing the meeting of the Official Representatives on a biennial rather than an annual basis, as was the original practice, and by streamlining the organization and raising the efficiency of the processing and data dissemination functions. The four separate data archives carried over from the Hofferbert years were now merged into one, allowing more effective use of personnel. ICPSR staff carefully monitored developments in computer technology during the late 1970s and took initial advantage of enhanced capabilities by the acquisition of a Prime 350 minicomputer. The Annual Report of 1979-80 carried a grant proposal to NSF requesting the funding of a ten point facilities development program designed to integrate enhanced minicomputer capacity with a microcomputer network, the whole meshed with the University of Michigan mainframe facility. Substantial implementation of these plans greatly increased the effectiveness of the data operations of ICPSR and charges for work done at the mini and microlevel also enhanced income flow.

Another positive aspect of ICPSR finances during the late 1970s and early 1980s was the successful effort to tap nontraditional sources of social science funding. Table 1

shows an increased number of grants during this period and, although the funding agencies such as the NSF and NEH remained important as sources of funds, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Administration on Aging, the U.S. Public Health Service, the Russell Sage Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Bureau of Justice, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the National Institute on Aging, and several other funding agencies all provided grants, ranging from minor to major in amount, for ICPSR projects. Some overrecovery during the early 1980s allowed ICPSR to carry a reserve fund of \$100,000 plus forward as protection against the irregularities in income that might be anticipated by an organization depending on grant funds for a substantial part of its budget. Ultimately some criticism was to be made of this practise by ISR accounting personnel.

Although the Consortium changed its name in 1975-76, the basic memorandum of agreement between the organization, its host agency, and the member institutions remained little changed from its form of the 1960s. During the early 1980s a revision was carried through that should be noted. In its revised form the preamble of the "Memorandum of Organization" stated the purpose of ICPSR as being "to promote and facilitate research and instruction in the social sciences and related areas" rather than "to promote the conduct of research on selected phases of the political process."

The revised memorandum outlined the membership structure of

A (doctoral program institutions), B (nondoctoral with 2500 plus enrollments), C (institutions in developing countries), S (small colleges), F (federated) and N (national) memberships that had evolved during the 1970s. Assurance had been formerly given that membership fees were "to be used exclusively to finance services to the member universities." Now this pledge was defined more explicitly as "used exclusively to finance development, acquisition, and provision of archival, instructional, and computational resources and services to member institutions."
(I.2.)

The changes in size and member terms of the Council, in effect since the late 1970s, were incorporated in the revision. Now also it was specified that the nominating committee would "reflect in its composition the multidisciplinary nature of the ICPSR." (II.2.) Council authority was defined somewhat more precisely than in the older memorandum and now carried the specific provision: "Actions taken by the ICPSR or the Center for Political Studies on behalf of ICPSR will be subject to Council review." (II.3.)

Relations between ICPSR and the CPS were also stated in somewhat more definite terms. Now the Director of CPS was added to the list of those entitled to call the Council into session. (II.4.) The actions of the ICPSR Executive Director and Senior Staff were "to be subject to review and approval by appropriate governing mechanisms of the Center for Political Studies."
(III.1.) Although the Center for Political Studies was to be responsible for appointing the ICPSR Executive Director, "the advice and recommendations of the ICPSR Senior Staff and Council

will be sought in identifying candidates and defining qualifications for this position." (III.2.) Specified as well was the fact that "ICPSR will enjoy the same rights and privileges and will have the same access to Center for Political Studies resources as any other Program within the Center. It will be subject to no special requirements beyond those to which other Center Programs are subject." (III.5)

Beginning in the early 1980s the membership of the consortium began to increase again, reaching 325 by fiscal year 1986-87. Meanwhile the dissemination of data by ICPSR continued to rise at an impressive rate as shown in the accompanying table, reaching heights that would have seemed incredible to the founding fathers of the early 1960s. Complaints from the membership were few and a hot line was instituted to keep ORS abreast of developments. Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Celebrations are not designed to serve as forums of dissent and criticism but most of those attending that of ICPSR during November 1987 sensed no undercurrents of disaffection or criticism among the official representatives attending. It was clear that ICPSR had in many respects become a different and in many ways much more successful organization than its planners had visualized.

Anyone examining the institutional framework within which ICPSR was set must also have noted the anomalous nature of the arrangement -- an organization fulfilling functions and serving a clientele that had become increasingly multidisciplinary was subject to the overall control of an organization whose members are overwhelmingly drawn from a single one of ICPSR's

disciplinary constituencies. Moreover, although the University of Michigan's direct monetary contribution was limited to less than ten percent of the ICPSR budget and that confined to the summer session where it consisted in substance of flow-through funds derived from summer tuitions, the allocation of ultimate power over ICPSR personnel hardly represented a true partnership between the ICPSR Council and CPS. And at the time of the anniversary celebration the programmatic reallocation of overhead funds within ISR and CPS had been a subject of disagreement between the Director of ICPSR and the staff of CPS for some time.

Under the Memorandum of Agreement the Council of ICPSR has an advisory voice in the appointment of the Director and other provisions of the document suggest the possibility of communication between the Council and CPS. But the latter's Director moved unilaterally in late 1987 to implement review procedures relating to the ICPSR Director that suggested the possibility of an undesirable structural reorientation. This action precipitated a crisis in the relationship between CPS and the ICPSR. The Review Committee surveyed a wide spectrum of opinion among the former Council members and Official Representatives. Although views differed somewhat as to the optimal future agenda of ICPSR, there seems to be general agreement that the policies and activities of ICPSR during the last decade have been appropriate and will serve as a solid foundation for the future. Given the increasing structural differentiation between ICPSR and CPS, the wisdom of continuing the current relationship is questioned by some.

TABLE 1

THE GROWTH OF ICPSR: HISTORICAL SERIES

Fiscal Year	Council Chairman	Number Members**	Member Contributions
1962-63	James W. Prothro	25	\$ 60,000
1963-64	Austin Ranney	37	\$ 79,000
1964-65	John C. Wahlke	50	\$ 95,500
1965-66	Joseph Tanenhaus	74	\$132,750
1966-67	Dwane Marvick	77	\$171,750
1967-68	Sidney Ulmer	127	\$325,000
1968-69	Heinz Eulau	134	\$369,500
1969-70	Heinz Eulau	139	\$413,000
1970-71	Donald Matthews	143	\$480,600
1971-72	Charles Jones	148	\$556,700
1972-73	Charles Jones	175	\$606,200
1973-74	Gerhard Loewenberg	211	\$669,800
1974-75	Betty Nesvold	229	\$662,800

Fiscal Year	Council Chairman	Number Members**	Member Contributions
1975-76	W. Phillips Shiveley	218	\$724,100
1976-77	W. Phillips Shiveley	203	\$797,498
1977-78	Charles M. McCall	224	\$791,660
1978-79	Charles M. McCall	240	\$833,887
1979-80	Aage Clausen	237	\$841,033
1980-81	Aage Clausen	247	\$860,334
1981-82	Paul A. Beck	264	\$945,014

Fiscal Year	Council Chairman	Number Members**	Member Contributions
1982-83	Paul A. Beck	270	\$ 964,835
1983-84	Samuel A. Kirkpatrick	284	\$1,011,000
1984-85	Samuel A. Kirkpatrick	300	\$1,030,200
1985-86	Mildred Schwartz	311	\$1,165,984
1986-87	Mildred Schwartz	325	\$1,246,159
1987-88	Karl E. Taeuber	331	\$1,284,425

$\Sigma = \$14,113,729$

1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993

$\$4,477,135$

1988-1993
contributions
(%)

49.7%

Fiscal Year	Grant Awards*		B U D G E T		University of Michigan Contribution
			ICPR Total	Summer Component	
1962-63	NSF	\$ 95,000	\$ 64,300	\$ 12,000	
	SSRC	\$ 10,000			
1963-64	NSF	\$	\$183,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 6,000
	SSRC	\$ 3,000			
1964-65	NSF	\$142,900	\$261,900	\$ 40,500	\$ 8,500
1965-66	SSRC	\$ 5,000	\$431,750	\$103,550	\$ 15,500
	NSF	\$334,400			
1966-67	IBM	\$ 4,360	\$606,403	\$153,303	\$ 48,940
	MSSB	\$ 11,513			
	NSF	\$236,160			
	FORD	\$ 98,000			
1967-68	NSF	\$477,238	\$1,010,300	\$184,000	\$ 38,391
	FORD	\$122,000			
	IBM	\$ 5,457			
	MSSB	\$ 10,185			
1968-69	NSF	\$369,500	\$1,046,300	\$238,900	\$ 63,000
	FORD	\$162,000			
	IBM	\$ 16,000			
	MSSB	\$ 15,000			
1969-70	CRCR	\$217,400	\$1,222,600	\$189,300	\$ 73,000
	NSF	\$277,200			
	FORD	\$125,000			
1970-71	NSF	\$310,500	\$1,151,400	\$249,200	\$ 85,800
	FORD	\$ 15,000			
	ONR	\$242,500			
1971-72	NSF	\$217,200	\$ 900,300	\$238,700	\$ 85,600
	MSSB	\$ 14,400			
	NEH	\$ 26,400			
1972-73	NSF	\$ 99,900	\$ 852,800	\$172,300	\$ 99,100
	NEH	\$ 46,600			
1973-74	NSF	\$105,000	\$ 962,900	\$181,400	\$ 103,000
	NEH	\$ 52,800			
1974-75	NSF	\$117,500	\$ 912,600	\$210,500	\$ 113,000
	NEH	\$ 18,900			

Fiscal Year	Grant Awards*		B U D G E T		University of Michigan Contribution
			ICPR Total	Summer Component	
1975-76	NSF	\$195,000	\$1,109,800	\$270,000	\$ 114,000
	NEH	\$ 25,300			
1976-77	NSF	\$118,833	\$1,140,041	\$216,402	\$ 101,781
	NEH	\$ 98,929			
1977-78	NSF	\$187,909	\$1,398,676	\$193,106	\$ 95,865
	NEH	\$ 23,911			
	LEAA	\$162,211			
	AA	\$ 17,818			
	CPS	\$ 25,000			
1978-79	NSF	\$ 81,128	\$1,516,393	\$286,236	\$ 91,557
	NEH	\$ 9,603			
	LEAA	\$322,325			
	AA	\$117,635			
	USPHS	\$ 7,000			
1979-80	NSF	\$ 59,409	\$1,462,466	\$266,691	\$ 99,313
	NEH	\$ 7,676			
	LEAA	\$288,230			
	AA	\$113,772			
	R Sage	\$9,955			
	RWJ	\$ 3,335			
	USDI	\$ 4,000			
1980-81	AA	\$223,563	\$2,143,286	\$268,169	\$ 100,841
	UILCC	\$2,000			
	USBJ	\$329,860			
	USDA	\$ 4,030			
	USDE	\$ 26,804			
	NES	\$ 8,695			
	NEH	\$ 24,367			
	NSF	\$473,945			
	RWJ	\$ 23,733			
	R Sage	\$ 26,152			
1981-82	AA	\$313,405	\$2,044,061	\$276,061	\$ 103,712
	UILCC	\$2,000			
	USBJ	\$527,975			
	CBS/NYT	\$1,000			
	USDE	\$ 88,039			
	R Sage	\$7,859			

Fiscal Year	Grant Awards*	B U D G E T		
		ICPR Total	Summer Component	University of Michigan Contribution
1982-83	UILCC \$2,000 USBJ \$437,815 CBS/NYT 1,550 NIA \$183,375 NSF \$ 15,000	\$1,799,759	\$294,660	\$ 147,980
1983-84	AA \$ 20,000 UILCC \$2,000 USBC \$ 9,920 USBJ \$440,136 NEH \$ 19,646 NIA \$257,029 NSF \$ 71,676	\$2,061,477	\$272,161	\$ 162,836
1984-85	NSF \$ 6,838 (indir) NSF \$ 57,846 (dir) UILCC \$ 2,000 USBC \$ 10,083 USBJ \$467,964 CBS/NYT \$2,000 NEH \$ 54,000 NAA \$395,850 RWJ \$ 419	\$2,297,153	\$315,592	\$ 172,900
1985-86	NSF \$ 7,882 (indir) UILCC \$ 4,000 USBJ \$537,191 NEH \$ 35,638 NIA \$256,060 RWJ \$ 16,684 Sloan \$10,000	\$2,346,318	\$366,894	\$ 182,233
1986-87	NSF \$ 902 (indir) NSF \$ 2,765 (dir) USBJ \$546,661 NEH \$ 47,261 NIA \$378,629 RWJ \$ 7,304 FORD \$ 27,520 (indir)	\$2,561,497	\$395,356	\$ 208,598
1987-88	BJS \$719,202 CBS/NYT \$3,576 NEH \$ 45,245 NIA \$298,019 NSF \$131,966 RWJ \$ 4,755 Sloan \$ 2,275 Ford \$ 31,243	\$2,990,505	\$485,431	\$ 286,552

29,477,935

Fiscal Year	Staff Numbers	Data Sets	Card Images Distributed
1962-63			
1963-64	18	231	
1964-65	31		
1965-66	38		3,555,600
1966-67	--	96	
1967-68	45		4,163,188
1968-69	64		11,631,405
1969-70	66		17,407,031
1970-71	59		28,171,490
1971-72	46		35,288,499
1972-73	60		44,576,306
1973-74	65		64,193,316
1974-75	81		65,395,341

Fiscal Year	Staff Numbers	Data Sets	Card Images Distributed
1975-76	62	8,901	103,443,394
1976-77	67	6,772	120,457,248
1977-78	62	6,659	171,769,678
1978-79	75	6,653	341,026,620
1979-80	61	7,446	438,331,732
1980-81	60	7,564	521,943,914
1981-82	57	9,522	846,133,224

Fiscal Year	Staff Numbers	Data Sets	Card Images Distributed
1982-83	62	11,745	1,737,187,515
1983-84	77	15,794	2,643,165,666
1984-85	64	15,042	1,962,678,285
1985-86	50	17,487	2,681,840,984
1986-87	49	19,549	3,781,315,560
1987-88	55	22,749	3,741,396,924

* Key to abbreviations in column 2, Table 1, pp. 4-6. NSF: National Science Foundation; SSRC: Social Science Research Council; IBM: International Business Machines; MSSB: Mathematical Social Science Board; Ford: Ford Foundation; CRCR: Center for Research on Conflict Resolution; ONR: Office of Naval Research; LEAA: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; AA: Administration on Aging; CPS: Center

for Political Studies; USPHS: United States Public Health Service;
R. Sage: Russell Sage Foundation; RWJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation;
USDI: United States Department of the Interior; UILCC: University of
Illinois, Chicago Circle; USBJ: United States Bureau of Justice
Statistics; USDE: United States Department of Energy; NES: National
Election Studies Project; CBS/NYT: Columbia Broadcasting System/New
York Times; USDA: United States Department of Agriculture; NIA:
National Institute on Aging; USBC: United States Bureau of the Census;
Sloan: Sloan Foundation.

APPENDIX A

THE REVIEW COMMITTEE, ITS MANDATE AND PROCEDURES

The five-person Review Committee consisted of the following members:

Allan G. Bogue: History (University of Wisconsin, Madison)
Robert T. Holt: Political Science (University of Minnesota)
Judith S. Rowe: Computing and Information Technology (Princeton University)
John Sprague: Political Science (Washington University)
Hubert Blalock (Chair): Sociology and Applied Statistics (University of Washington)

The committee was appointed by Harold Jacobson, Director of the Center for Political Studies, and Karl Taeuber, Chair of the ICPSR Council, and was given a very broad mandate which reads as follows:

On behalf of the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research and the Center for Political Studies, we invite you to serve on an ICPSR Review Committee. The function of the Committee will be to provide to us, the Consortium Council, and the CPS Program Directors an assessment of the Consortium's current status and operations, together with advice and recommendations concerning its future. We expect the Committee to make a site visit, and we would like to receive the report not later than 1 June 1989.

ICPSR is a unique institution of vital importance to the global social science community. It is a partnership between a group of institutions and the Center for Political Studies, the Institute for Social Research, of the University of Michigan. ICPSR is administered as a program within CPS. The purpose of ICPSR is to promote and facilitate research and instruction in the social sciences and related areas. ICPSR provides services to its member institutions including access to computer-readable data and documentation for instruction and research, computing consultation, and the annual Summer Training Program. The ICPSR Council, which is elected by the Official Representatives of the member institutions, participates in the definition of organizational objectives and in the determination of policies to achieve those objectives. The ICPSR staff consists of an Executive Director, who is appointed by the Center for Political Studies, and such other personnel as are required for the conduct of ICPSR activities. ICPSR staff have appointments in the Center for Political Studies of the University of Michigan.

The Review Committee's mandate is quite broad. The Committee should provide us with an external view of the Consortium's current status and operations and its future possibilities, focused particularly on the Consortium's contribution to social science. Specific topics and issues

will doubtless arise in discussions with the ICPSR council and staff and the CPS staff.

The full committee met on two, two-day occasions, the first in Ann Arbor in November of 1988 and the second in Palo Alto in conjunction with the February 1989 meetings of the ICPSR Council. During these meetings the committee interviewed seventeen persons, with these confidential interviews ranging in length between a half to one and a half hours. Persons interviewed were as follows:

<u>CPS Members</u>	<u>ICPSR Staff</u>	<u>Associate Directors</u>
Harold Jacobson	Jerome Clubb	Phillip Converse
John Jackson	Carolyn Geda	Heinz Eulau
Kent Jennings	Erik Austin	Norval Glenn
Raburn Howland	Donna Gotts	Warren Miller
Steven Rosenstone	Henry Heitowit	
	Peter Joftis	
	Vicki Schneider	
	Janet Vavra	

In addition, individual committee members interviewed or held informal discussions with a number of other persons, including the Chairs of the Departments of Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology at the University of Michigan; the Director of the Survey Research Center; the Vice President for Research at the University of Michigan; officials at the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health who have provided funds for archiving; and a number of ORs and former Council members.

The committee also reviewed a large number of documents, including those prepared for Council by ICPSR staff, a financial review prepared by Raburn Howland, and several staff documents especially requested by our committee, including a lengthy document detailing archiving procedures and needs (prepared by Erik Austin) and a similar document (prepared by Janet Vavra) concerning servicing. Documents prepared by the current Council were also made available, and a number of additional earlier documents were used to prepare the

historical review (Part III of the committee report). Committee members also circulated numerous internal memos, including several drafts of portions of the final report as well as suggestions for the modification of these drafts.

Finally, the committee also solicited input in the form of letters from two types of persons representing the general membership. Letters were sent to all current Official Representatives (ORs) asking in very general terms for their assessment of ICPSR performance and soliciting their suggestions for improvement. Replies to this request are summarized in Appendix B. Letters were also sent to all former Chairs of Council and to all members of the most recent Council. Since all members of the committee had served, at one time or another, as former members of Council and had contacts with other council members who served at the same time, we also drew upon our own experiences. In addition, the committee met during an executive session with those current council members who were present at the February 1989 meeting of that body.

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES FROM ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Although our committee members believed that the best single indicator of membership satisfaction with consortium performance is the fact that membership figures have remained at a remarkably high level over a sustained period of time (in spite of financial cutbacks on many campuses), the committee decided to solicit open-ended responses from current ORs. We received a total of only 25 replies, most of which brought up matters with which the ICPSR staff and Council are very familiar. In general, responses were highly favorable, with 20 of the 25 respondents spontaneously indicating positive satisfaction levels ranging between generally positive to extremely so. The remaining five merely made relatively neutral suggestions without commenting either positively or negatively on their general reactions. We take this pattern of reactions, when combined with committee members' observations of OR meetings and personal conversations with ORs over a period of a number of years, to indicate a very favorable overall evaluation of staff performance. A number of respondents specifically commented about the very friendly, prompt, and efficient servicing of their requests.

Virtually all of the specific suggestions made were idiosyncratic and appear to reflect the peculiar needs of a given institution. The two letters received from representatives of European countries were extremely positive and contained no suggestions for improvements. Only three points were made by more than a single respondent. Four ORs referred to what they believed to be relatively slow turnover time, especially in connection with orders that they had placed by mail. Several others referred to increasing costs of the summer program, suggesting that ways be found to find additional funding, especially

for graduate students. Finally, five or six persons referred to dilemmas faced by ORs on their own campuses, and in particular to the lack of rewards that they received for their work.

The remaining comments concerned technical matters. A number of suggestions were made concerning data archiving problems and the diversity of users and their peculiar data needs, as well as highly specific ways of improving codebooks, networking connections, and so forth. Our committee will make these suggestions available to the relevant ICPSR staff, once university identifiers have been removed. We believe that virtually all of the issues raised are also familiar to staff members and may not be resolvable within the budgetary constraints under which the Consortium operates. Overall, they seem to represent a number of reasonably practical suggestions, all of a "normal" nature, coming from a very small faction of the total membership of some 325 institutions.

APPENDIX C

MEMORANDUM OF ORGANIZATION

The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) is a partnership between a group of institutions (referred to hereafter as the member institutions, members, or membership) and the Center for Political Studies, The University of Michigan. The purpose of the ICPSR is to promote and facilitate research and instruction in the social sciences and related areas. It is expected that all partners will contribute to the success of the ICPSR and that each will benefit from the association.

ICPSR services include access to data and documentation for instruction and research; to the annual Summer Training Program; to computing consultation; and to such other services and resources as may be developed or acquired under ICPSR auspices in the future in accord with governing procedures specified below.

I. Principles of Membership

1. All institutions of higher education offering work in the social sciences are eligible for membership.

Categories of membership in the ICPSR are based upon the size, program, and location of each institution. Membership categories are:

Category A: Educational institutions with doctoral programs in the social sciences or related areas.

Category B: Undergraduate institutions without doctoral programs in the social sciences or related areas and with enrollments greater than 2500.

Category C: Institutions in developing countries.

Category S: Small colleges without doctoral programs in the social sciences or related areas and with enrollments of fewer than 2500 students.

Categories F and N: Federated and national memberships consist of a number of institutions in categories A, B, and/or S which have joined together around a common link to the ICPSR. The common link is responsible for distributing data and documentation from the ICPSR to the other members of the federation. Fees are determined by the actual configuration of institutional membership categories included in the federation.

Institutions of higher education may join the ICPSR as

institutional members. Alternatively, one or more units (departments, schools, research organizations) within a single college or university may become independent members on an equal footing with all other members. Internal arrangements bearing upon the sources of financial support for the membership are the responsibility of the participating institution or unit. Each participating unit or institution will also be responsible for determining the eligibility of its faculty, staff, and students for participation in ICPSR activities.

Each member institution or unit will designate its Official Representative to the ICPSR. Federated members will select their representation as designated in their memorandum of affiliation. Official Representatives will provide liaison between the member institutions and the ICPSR staff, may attend meetings of Representatives, and act on behalf of the participating units.

2. Membership requires annual payment of a membership fee. These contributions are to be used exclusively to finance development, acquisition, and provision of archival, instructional, and computational resources and services to member institutions by the staff of ICPSR along with such additional resources and services as may be developed or acquired in the future in accord with governing procedures described below.

The ICPSR staff will endeavor to ensure equal services to each membership unit. Given the variety of functions, the limitations on time and space in the performance of some activities, and the variable pace of research activities at member institutions, the goal should be equality in service over a period of years.

3. Member institutions will not distribute data or other materials supplied by ICPSR to other institutions or organizations or to individuals at other institutions without the agreement of ICPSR.
4. Membership should be sought only with the full expectation that maximum benefits will accrue over several years' participation. Memberships which contemplate only one- or two-years' participation will not be encouraged. In general, it is expected that membership will be entered into only with the confidence that relevant officials of the member institution understand that membership implies a continuing relationship and agree to attempt to provide the necessary funds on a continuing basis.

The annual fees are established in agreement with the elected Council (see below) and with the advice of the

membership. In no case will fees be adjusted without one year prior notice to the membership.

Budgetary inability to meet a single year's membership fee will not necessitate termination of membership provided that the member institution is willing to make up the deficit across an agreed upon period not to exceed five years. Payment of the annual membership fees will be considered due on July 1, at the beginning of each fiscal year or at the beginning of such alternative annual membership cycles as may be agreed upon by individual members and ICPSR.

Any member is free to withdraw from membership at any time. However, a full year's notice of withdrawal must be given. Except under special circumstances, the ICPSR will require that all materials, including data and documentation, provided by ICPSR during the period of membership be returned or use discontinued upon termination of membership.

A member may rejoin the ICPSR after dropping its affiliation. Except under special circumstances, however, payment of a "re-entry" fee will be required. This fee will be fifty percent of the annual fee in effect at the time of rejoining and the fee is in addition to the normal membership fee that would also be due in full from the date of rejoining.

5. Books, articles, conference papers, theses, dissertations, and other publications or reports that employ data or other resources provided by ICPSR should cite both original data collectors and ICPSR as the source of the data or resources in accord with citation procedures recommended in documentation.

Individuals who make use of data or other resources provided by ICPSR in an article, monograph, book, or conference paper are expected to deposit two copies of each publication or paper in a special collection to be maintained by the ICPSR staff. In the case of theses and dissertations, two copies of the abstract should be deposited.

6. It is hoped, although there is no obligation, that individuals who collect data or develop other research or instructional resources will make such resources available to the membership by depositing them with ICPSR.
7. In general, ICPSR data resources and technical services are available on an "open access" basis. However, ICPSR services will be provided to non-member institutions or organizations or to individuals located at such institutions only in a manner that imposes no handicap on ICPSR

members. In providing services, data or facilities, non-members will defray all associated costs plus additional charges required to maintain equity with members.

8. Participation in those training functions or special research conferences which are supported solely by contributions of the member institutions will normally be limited to students, faculty and staff from the member institutions.

II. The Organization of Membership and Governance

1. Each member institution or participating unit will be represented by one person chosen by that institution or participating unit and referred to as the Official Representative of the member institution or unit. That person will serve as a liaison between the ICPSR and the member and attend meetings of Representatives on behalf of the member institution.
2. The Membership through the Official Representatives will elect a Council to serve as the Executive Committee of the Membership. The Council will consist of ten members each serving a four-year term. Five new Council members will be elected biennially to serve four-year terms. The Chairperson of the Council will ordinarily be selected from among the Council members who will be serving the third year of their terms and will, in turn, normally serve a two-year term as Chairperson.

The Nominating Committee for elections to the Council will be composed of the Chairperson of the Council serving as chair of the Committee, the Council members serving in the third year of their term, at least one individual not currently a member of the Council to be designated by the Council Chairperson, and will reflect in its composition the multidisciplinary nature of the ICPSR.

The Chairperson of the Nominating Committee acting on behalf of the Committee will solicit nominations to the Council from all Official Representatives. The Nominating Committee will present to the Membership the names of a proposed Chairperson and a list of nominees to the Council. The list of nominees will be presented to the Membership with adequate time to allow additions by Official Representatives in accord with stated procedures determined by the Council. Balloting will be by mail.

To the degree possible the Chairperson of the Council, or another designated member of the council, will also act as Chairperson of meetings of Representatives. The Chairperson will have the responsibility for signing

documents which are the joint responsibility of the member institutions.

3. The Council will be the Executive Committee of the Membership and will have authority to act on behalf of the member institutions. The Council will participate with the Center for Political Studies staff to the ICPSR, in accord with provisions that follow, in the definition of organizational objectives and in the determination of policies to achieve those objectives. It will have authority to arrive at agreements with the Center for Political Studies staff to the ICPSR on behalf of the members. These agreements will constitute decisions by the ICPSR and will be sufficient to authorize action on behalf of ICPSR. Actions taken by the ICPSR staff or the Center for Political Studies on behalf of ICPSR will be subject to Council review.

The Council will recommend the creation of standing committees to the membership and will create interim ad hoc committees as necessary.

The Council, acting on behalf of the Membership, will be responsible for establishing policies regulating the participation of individuals in those activities for which limited resources preclude the simultaneous participation of all who might be interested. It will also be responsible for approving activities to be carried out on behalf of the ICPSR such as seeking outside financial support or undertaking a major data collection. The Council will approve procedures for selection of the participants in ICPSR program activities and will advise the ICPSR staff in the execution of approved program activities.

The Council will receive an annual report from the Executive Director and Senior Staff of ICPSR regarding ICPSR activities during the previous year. It will also receive from the Executive Director and Senior Staff general statements of expenditures from ICPSR accounts held by the Center for Political Studies. The Council will transmit these reports along with any recommendations it may have to the representatives of the member institutions.

4. The Council will normally meet at least three times each year with members of the ICPSR staff and other representatives of the Center for Political Studies as provided below. Six members will constitute a quorum for Council action. A meeting of the Council may be called by the Chairperson, the Executive Director of the ICPSR, five members of the Council, or the Director of the Center for Political Studies.

III. Center for Political Studies and ICPSR Staff

1. The ICPSR Executive Director and Senior Staff (described below) are authorized to act on behalf of the Center for Political Studies in negotiations and relations with the ICPSR Council and membership and in the conduct of ICPSR activities. Such actions will be subject to review and approval by appropriate governing mechanisms of the Center for Political Studies. It is expected that, to the degree practicable, these governing mechanisms will be kept fully informed with respect to ICPSR activities.
2. The ICPSR staff will consist of an Executive Director, such senior managerial, supervisory, and other personnel (hereafter referred to as the ICPSR senior staff) as are required for the efficient management, administration and conduct of ICPSR and its activities, and such supporting personnel as are necessary to meet the agreed upon objectives of ICPSR.

ICPSR staff members are formally appointed as members and employees of the Center for Political Studies. As such, they are subject to normal rules, regulations, and governing procedures of the Center for Political Studies, the Institute for Social Research, and The University of Michigan.

The Center for Political Studies will have responsibility for appointing the ICPSR Executive Director. However, the advice and recommendations of the ICPSR Senior Staff and Council will be sought in identifying candidates and defining qualifications for this position. All other staff appointments will be the responsibility of the ICPSR Executive Director and Senior Staff subject to review and confirmation by appropriate governing mechanisms of the Center for Political Studies and in conformity with normal employment regulations of the Center for Political Studies, the Institute for Social Research, and The University of Michigan.

3. The Center for Political Studies will provide administrative services necessary for the management of ICPSR funds and the conduct of ICPSR activities. Separate accounts will be maintained by the Center for Political Studies for the ICPSR Operating Budget, supported by annual membership fees, and for each grant or contract received by the ICPSR. All ICPSR budgets and accounts will be subject to normal Center for Political Studies administrative and supervisory requirements and to all auditing procedures required by The University of Michigan.
4. The Center for Political Studies will cooperate whenever

possible in the execution of ICPSR activities within the limits of available space and facilities and provided that these activities do not impose an undue burden upon other programs and activities of the Center for Political Studies. The Center will provide for storage of ICPSR data and make available facilities necessary for processing and reproduction of data and for the conduct of other agreed upon ICPSR activities.

5. ICPSR will enjoy the same rights and privileges and will have the same access to Center for Political Studies resources as any other Program within the Center. It will be subject to no special requirements beyond those to which other Center Programs are subject.
6. The ICPSR staff may call upon the various units of the Institute for Social Research in meeting agreed upon objectives in the same fashion as other Programs of the Institute.
7. The Director of the Center for Political Studies or another Center Program Director designated by the Center Director will normally be present at regular meetings of the ICPSR Council and at meetings of Representatives of member institutions. The Center for Political Studies representative will not be a voting member at such meetings.
8. The Center for Political Studies and the Institute for Social Research will be free, as will each member of ICPSR, to pursue their own research objectives independently of ICPSR.