ICPSR Council Minutes
June 12-13, 2008

Council present: Francine Berman, Michael Goodchild, Michael Haines, Kathleen Mullan Harris, Aletha Huston (Chair), Thomas LaVeist, Jeff Moon, Sam Myers, Ruth Peterson (Past Chair), Matthew Snipp, Lori Weber

ICPSR staff present: JD Alford, George Alter, Rita Bantom, Bryan Beecher, Linda Detterman, Peter Granda, Myron Gutmann, Bill Jacoby, Peter Joftis, Felicia LeClere, Stacey Kubitz, Nancy McGovern, James McNally, Mary Morris, JoAnne O’Rourke, Michelle Overholser, Amy Pienta, Ruth Shamraj, David Thomas, Mary Vardigan, Cole Whiteman, Kristine Witkowski

Visitors present: Kevin Schürer, UK Data Archive

The minutes from the March 2008 Council meeting were approved unanimously.

Director’s Report

Myron updated the committee on activities and accomplishments since the March meeting.

Visitors
ICPSR is hosting eight undergraduate summer interns and two OR sabbatical fellows this summer -- Rui Wang, Central Michigan University, and Gregory Adams, Southern Connecticut State University.

Budget and Forecast
Although the budget forecast for FY 2009 projects a $170K deficit, that outcome is likely to change over the course of the year as we have several pending grant proposals and other opportunities. The anticipated end of year results for FY 2008 show a surplus of over $400K, due in part to Summer Program revenues.

Summer Program
The Summer Program is off to a good start with a near-record number of registrations -- to date, there are 900 students who have registered. Despite the fee increase imposed this year, we have seen no drop in enrollment but have seen lower CIC participation because of the decision by the University of Michigan to end its support for CIC students. The final University of Michigan payment for 2007 was $350,000, about a $325,000 loss. The program is back to its traditional home in Helen Newberry Hall. An interesting slate of Blalock Lectures will be offered.
**Membership News**
Fifty-three new members have joined during the last year. A new Colorado Federation recently joined, making a total of four new federations for FY 2008. We may see some churn in membership, due to the fact that the new members, largely smaller BA schools, are not as committed to staying as long-term members. A recent survey of ORs showed that about 54 percent of them work in the library versus academic units, up from 41 percent in 2005.

**Online Learning Center**
This Web site devoted to quantitative literacy and classroom use of ICPSR data will be fully launched by the end of July. We currently have five developers working on the OLC. This activity is linked to one pending and one planned NSF grant proposal.

**Enhancing Bibliography**
ICPSR has joined CrossRef, which will enable us to locate Digital Object Identifiers for citations in our Bibliography. We are also evaluating DOIs for data.

**Data User Help Center**
This is an ever-growing series of multimedia tutorials about how to find and use ICPSR data. Since November 2007, there have been 17,383 unique visits and 4530 repeat visitors to the help center pages, with an average of about one visitor an hour.

**Publications Going Green**
The goal is to replace recurring publications with electronic versions to save on trees and money. ORs have been polled about this and approve of the idea.

**Collection Development**
Several new activities are under way, including: a processing workflow committee; offsite processing as part of the Fenway Population Center; joint processing with the Roper Center; and a project to reduce the backlog in studies – 113 unprocessed studies have been reduced to 47 since February. We continue to build the collection, with several notable new studies recently released, including the 500 Family Study and the Latino National Survey, 2006.

**Digital Preservation**
We are moving forward with the first ICPSR-sponsored digital preservation workshop, to be held in October. New staff have been hired and an advisory panel constituted. A UM-China workshop on digital preservation was presented in Beijing.

**Legacy Storage**
ICPSR has copied nearly all of its old magnetic tapes to disk and its paper archive has been reduced and repackaged and sent to the company Iron Mountain for storage.

**Funding Success and Pending Proposals**
ICPSR has received three new grants: a supplement to the Child Care project, funding to process the Long Beach Longitudinal Study of Memory, Cognition, and Aging; and a supplement to support the CPES summer workshop.
Proposals under review include the NSF CI-TEAM Collaborative Tagging (NSF); Infusing Quantitative Literacy throughout the Social Science Curriculum (NSF); Quantitative Social Sciences NSDL (NSF); Rescuing and Archiving Social Science Data (IMLS); Historical Demography Training (NICHD); Historical Demographic Data (NICHD); Epidemiology of Functional Status in Elderly Hispanics (NIA); NHANES Enhancements (NIA); Confidentiality and Contextual Data (NICHD); and Child Care Project Continuation (HHS).

**Internal Communications**
The staff is working on improving communications throughout the organization. A plan is complete and is being implemented, with full implementation finished by the end of the calendar year.

**Plenary: Leadership Qualities and Strategic Plans**

Gutmann began the plenary on leadership with a series of questions getting at the heart of what leadership means. He then posed five specific questions to generate discussion: (1) In what areas do we lead? (2) How do we provide leadership? (3) To whom (which constituencies)? (4) What’s the relationship to the Strategic Plan? and (5) At what cost and risks?

Gutmann then suggested possible answers. To answer the first (which leadership areas), he offered the following possibilities and asked whether these are the right areas of focus:

1. Collection
2. Training
3. Metadata development
4. Digital preservation
5. Confidentiality protection
6. Open source technology

Council members raised other questions, including where leadership counts, whether we have the financial and human resources to lead, how we foster a culture of collaboration and leadership, and whether we are considering specific areas of confidentiality since different standards for confidentiality are in use at different government agencies.

To answer the second question about how we lead, Gutmann offered the suggestions of (1) learning how to do things for ourselves and our constituents and when we are best and unique, undertaking projects to demo, teach, publish, explicitly share, and sell; and, (2) choosing areas for leadership potential and building them explicitly to demo, teach, share, sell, etc. Council suggested starting with ICPSR’s core strengths, and then expanding, noting that leadership outside of an organization’s core areas takes lots of time, effort, and resources.

In terms of which constituencies to lead, Gutmann offered several possible groups: traditional ICPSR member organizations; government sponsors; other data archives; and the broader scientific community. Another constituency suggested by Council was the public.
In general discussion, other questions arose, including how an organization knows when it’s a leader and how we pay for leadership, which has costs. An observation was made that perhaps we don’t need to be so concerned with leadership because it is actually influence that is useful.

**Plenary: New Technology Developments**

Bryan Beecher, Director of ICPSR Computer and Network Services, led a discussion of trends and innovations in technology and ways in which ICPSR might take advantage of these trends to benefit its users.

**Social Networking**

Beecher started off by describing the current situation in which ICPSR is for the most part a destination site to which users come to search and browse metadata and to download data they select. However, what if users don’t know about ICPSR; are there other paths they could take to discover ICPSR and its data resources?

Beecher looked at search engines, online encyclopedias, and social bookmarking in order to assess how effective these tools are in leading people to ICPSR when they are interested in a specific dataset, such as the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR). In terms of a Google search, a search on UCR does not bring ICPSR up in the top list of hits. We could pay to have a higher page rank, or we could work on getting other sites to point to us. For example, there was no link to ICPSR in the Wikipedia entry on UCR until recently. An action step for us might be to hire students to seed the prominent Web vehicles with links to ICPSR in order to increase our visibility. To determine how successful this activity is, we should implement tools that show us the referring page that people were on before landing on our site.

With respect to social bookmarking sites like Digg and de.li.ci.ous, which make it possible for users to apply tags to their top Web pages, ICPSR is not on the radar screen. A suggested action would be to use an ICPSR account to tag ICPSR resources and increase our visibility.

Through community-based resources like these, a filtering process takes place as users rate and rank resources and the most popular resources rise to the top. Students increasingly use these kinds of tools to find what they are looking for. Some libraries are using library catalogs with social networking features to enable students to catalog books themselves.

It was pointed out that this discussion raises the issue of the expert knowledge model versus the naïve user model. Experts might not label or catalog a resource in a way that would be intuitive to every user. Thus, it may make more sense to harness the power of the potentially vast network of users to tag and label digital objects. Concept tagging of variables is a good example; the individual user can create tags that are more meaningful to him or her than a subject term from a thesaurus. Users may have specific knowledge of a resource that will enable them to tag a resource in a way that makes sense to them but is not necessarily the expert subject term. A subject term is one person’s choice of the right term at one particular point in time.
ICPSR is not embracing these Web 2.0 technologies totally at the expense of the expert knowledge model but is attempting to fit them into our model. We need to experiment to see if this is valuable to our audiences.

**Open Source Software**
For the last several years, ICPSR has used some open source technologies, including Apache, Tomcat, and Linux, and has built custom applications on top of this foundation. There may be a way to become more efficient and to leverage the work of others so that we don’t have to build everything ourselves.

In this context, Beecher mentioned the open source content management system called Drupal, which ICPSR has been experimenting with for the last six months. He contrasted the old way of managing content in which we would create a database, write software, and create HTML for Web display with a new model in which we install content management modules, create new objects, and render them with a custom view. In this area a potential action step might be to evaluate Drupal with the goal of implementing it and delivering content through this mechanism. It would lower the barriers and costs for deploying content and services.

Council cautioned that there are some risks associated with a move in this direction. The technology may require more customization than we think, although we would probably be no worse off than we are now. We do not yet know if it would save us money. Some of the modules for Drupal, like the bibliography module, are quite sophisticated and already have out-of-the-box functionality to do much of what we have written custom software to do.

**Web 2.0**
Beecher set up the following distinctions:

- **Web 0.0**: Deliver data on magnetic tape with paper documentation; order content manually with order forms and the data arrives in a matter of weeks.
- **Web 1.0**: Search the electronic data catalog, find and download data in a matter of minutes in a relatively passive way.
- **Web 2.0**: Deliver, discover, and enhance data content in new ways. This is a term coined by O’Reilly Media to describe second-generation Web-based tools like social networking, wikis, communication tools, and folksonomies that emphasize online collaboration and sharing.

Web 2.0 is not passive but allows the user to influence content. For example, if the dataset that a user is interested in has no statistical package setup files, the user could send email and wait for a response, or with a Web 2.0 oriented service could read the history of a study to see if the question had been asked before and perhaps use content uploaded by others.

**Web Services and Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)**
Beecher indicated that we need to distinguish between Web applications used by people and Web services used by machines. Web services have the potential to expose our content to a broader community of users and an expanded set of tools that might act on our content.
As an example, we create MARC records for our studies. Users download them and feed them into their local library catalogs. With Web services, ingest of MARC into catalogs could take place automatically without human intervention. An action step in this area would be to deploy an SOA-based system.

**Fedora**
Fedora stands for Flexible Extensible Digital Object Repository Architecture. Moving to an architecture of this type would mean shifting our orientation to managing digital objects rather than files and maximizing the durability and reuse of these objects. Thinking in terms of digital objects means that we have information about each object, its characteristics, behaviors, and relationship to other objects, and we manage the object as a package.

Fedora appears to have the most traction in the library and archive communities at this time, and another advantage is that it aligns with the Open Archival Information System (OAIS) Reference Model. Implementing Fedora would position us as a leader in digital preservation. An action we could take would be to implement Fedora in FY09 starting with our out-of-circulation content.

**Summary**
Beecher summed up the discussion by saying that we would continue to investigate Drupal through 2008 with an eye to deploying it externally in 2009. We will move into Web 2.0 services gradually this year as well. We will implement Fedora starting in July.

In terms of the content management system, Council indicated that it definitely makes sense to stop building things from scratch. We need to be more flexible and to do innovative and interesting things so that we can deploy a new service in, say, 90 days as opposed to a year. However, we need to think about the level of robustness and reliability of any system we select and should identify a process and benchmarking scheme for determining the direction in which to move. So far, our exploration of content management systems has been organic; we have adopted Drupal because of its popularity and availability at the University of Michigan. We started experimenting with it for internal communications purposes after being frustrated with the static Intranet and CTools course management system. We will try launching a full Drupal Web site in July for a smaller project and then assess how Drupal fits into the timeline for the August 2009 launch of a revised ICPSR Web site.

**Budget and Policy Committee**

**Council:** Francine Berman, Michael Haines, Aletha Huston (Chair), Jeff Moon, Sam Myers, Ruth Peterson

**Staff:** JD Alford, Rita Bantom, Myron Gutmann, Stacey Kubitz

**FY 2008 Year End Projection**
Staff is forecasting FY 2008 to end with a surplus of $400K compared to the approved budget of $16K. The Summer Program’s increased fees and incentives for early payments by registrants helped to produce higher than budgeted revenues. Also, ICPSR membership
revenue exceeded the budgeted amount. Sponsored projects’ revenues are typically budgeted to equal expenses. In reality, ICPSR had several projects with negative beginning balances close during the middle of the fiscal year. This caused these projects to have higher revenues than expenses for FY 2008.

**FY 2009 Budget**
As promised in the March 2008 meeting, staff attempted to reduce expenses in order to present the committee with a balanced budget. The result is a budget that carries a $170K deficit for FY 2009 (or approximately 1 percent of the total budget). Some of the cost-cutting items include electronic delivery of the Annual Report and reducing the number of temporary staff. Staff also increased the amount of funds allocated for professional development in accordance with the Strategic Plan. While not in the budget, staff hopes Summer Program revenue will continue to exceed expectations and ICPSR will receive funding from the World Bank and the Data Stewardship Initiative to help offset the budgeted deficit.

It is expected that Data Security and Preservation work will be eliminated by the end of September, 2008. This functional area will evolve into the newly created Digital Preservation unit. This new unit has a small budget for FY 2009; staff expects this will grow steadily over the next several years.

The Budget and Policy Committee recommended and the ICPSR Council unanimously approved the FY2009 budget.

**Personnel Issues**
Christopher Maxwell, the Director of the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), has announced that he has accepted a position as Associate Dean for Research in the College of Social Sciences at Michigan State University. George Alter will provide temporary leadership on the project during the transition to a new NACJD director. Staff expects to post the position shortly after the June Council meeting.

Professor John Garcia from the University of Arizona will visit ICPSR and the University of Michigan in regards to the Diversity Program Leadership position. It is expected that this position will focus on creating visibility and raising funds rather than on managing specific projects.

**Strategic Plan Implementation**
The final wording of the Strategic Plan has been agreed upon (a copy was included in the Council binder). ICPSR has begun a series of meetings with rank-and-file staff to hear their ideas for how to implement the Strategic Plan. Staff will plan to have reports from these discussions available for the October meeting. Staff and Council also agreed to include a plenary discussion on Strategic Plan implementation in the fall.
**ISR External Review**
As required by the Provost, ISR is in the process of being reviewed. The first of two reviews -- the external review by faculty and administrators from other institutions -- took place immediately before the June Council meeting. The internal review was expected to take place shortly after this Council meeting.

**Grant Applications Submitted since March**
The committee did not spend time discussing the new submissions. Details of each are included in the Council binder.

**Collection Development Committee**

**Council:** Thomas LaVeist, Matthew Snipp (Chair), Lori Weber, Chris Zorn  
**Staff:** George Alter, Peter Granda, Peter Jofits, JoAnne O’Rourke, Amy Plenta  
**Visitor:** Kevin Schürer, UK Data Archive

**IRBs and Informed Consent**
George Alter gave an overview of the content of ICPSR’s Web site with respect to IRBs and data confidentiality. The group discussed the existing pages as well as proposed new content and possible informed consent language that might be added. With minor changes Council approved the addition of new content to the Web site about IRBs and informed consent.

**Training**
JoAnne O’Rourke gave an update on the confidentiality training that she is planning. Council supported her planning activities and underscored the importance of the training at ICPSR.

**Older Data Formats**
Peter Granda gave an overview of the various data formats represented in ICPSR holdings. ICPSR is in the process of updating data in older formats to make it more widely usable. Kevin Schürer discussed similar challenges at the UKDA. Council endorsed a plan to prioritize the migration of older format data.

No action items came from the meeting.

**Membership and Marketing Committee**

**Council:** Michael Goodchild, Thomas LaVeist, Jeff Moon, Sam Myers (Chair)  
**Staff:** Linda Detterman, Mary Morris, David Thomas

**Membership Activity and Utilization Reports**
Since July 1, 2007, 53 new members have joined ICPSR. Many of these are at the BA and Associate levels and a large number are additions to existing national memberships. In March 2008, Detterman indicated that given the type of new joins, it is possible that these institutions may go in and out of membership over the years. In fact, 12 institutions dropped membership in FY2008.
**Membership and Marketing Initiatives Update**
Detterman reviewed the titles of the 2008 Undergraduate Research Paper Competition winners. While the papers were of very good quality, ICPSR and MDRC would like to see the number of submissions increase. To that end, the deadline for paper submissions has been moved to May 30 with hopes of capturing more senior honors papers in the term they are written. Other marketing efforts, likely concentrating on listserv announcements, will also be reviewed. Council also suggested including some demographic questions on the application forms to achieve a better understanding of who is submitting applications.

Retaining members at the Extensive and Intensive levels is important to our membership base and for maintaining our funding level. After the conclusion of fiscal year 2008, utilization reports will be run. Low utilization institutions will be identified and workshop and promotional materials mailed to the ORs.

A targeted direct mailing to former members and institutions that have inquired about membership was conducted in early May. Over 360 letters with brochures were mailed to potential new members representing about 120 institutions – the mailing has already resulted in one or two new members.

The Membership & Marketing group will assume the role of managing internal communications at ICPSR. An advisory board consisting of ICPSR staff has begun meeting to discuss and guide implementation of solutions geared towards increasing the effectiveness of internal communications resulting in an improved working climate.

The Online Learning Center is in content population mode and promotion efforts are in the planning stage for the hard launch later this summer. This discussion led to a discussion of how best to promote resources like the OLC, MDRC, undergraduate activities, and underserved communities. The discussion led to the following action item:

**Action Item:** Create an advisory committee, chaired by a Council member and consisting of faculty (perhaps representing member and nonmember institutions), ORs, and ICPSR staff, to assist in guiding outreach efforts to promote the ICPSR resources named above as well as to promote ICPSR and its services and resources to underserved communities.

**OR Meeting Review**
The June action item was to review results regarding the OR Meeting that were garnered from the 2008 OR membership survey. Detterman reported that ORs overall were satisfied with the OR Meeting in its current format, but that they are open to changes in timing, location, and frequency. There was some concern that non-responders may have a different view of the OR Meeting, but Detterman noted that 70 percent of responders had not attended the 2005 meeting, so that non-attendees are well represented.

Planning for the 2009 OR meeting will start in July, so major changes in location and timing would be difficult to implement. Therefore, the survey data will be used largely to assist in programmatic content and approach for the meeting, but the timing and location will remain the same. Detterman suggested that sessions be held during the OR Meeting to discuss what
the 2011 and beyond meetings should look like. Council agreed that such sessions should be scheduled as part of the program.

Council inquired as to how ORs are selected to represent their institutions. Detterman reported that it is up to the institution as to who plays this role and that ICPSR really has little influence on this decision. Council believes that both the library and faculty should be represented and staff agreed that this is the optimal combination. ICPSR has made accommodations to enable any individuals at an institution to receive information updates about ICPSR by subscribing to the public listserv (historically, only two individuals could receive such information). Still, ICPSR cannot dictate who in the organization plays the official roles; however, we might provide greater direction by perhaps including a Web page on how to select ORs/DRs. Council also suggested considering a name change for the roles. No action item for this discussion was formalized, but Detterman will work on clarifying the selection process recommendations.

ICPSR Federations Review
The committee discussed ICPSR’s federation memberships. As part of the last pricing restructure, federation pricing for U.S. academic institutions was standardized for all federations. Federations offer three major benefits: first, one invoice is produced and remitted, requiring low effort to track down unpaid invoices (the federation hubs handle this); second, federation members tend to be more stable (fewer drops); and third, federation members tend to market to other nonmembers, thereby assisting membership growth without ICPSR’s expending resources to do that marketing itself. Are the benefits worth the discount? In reporting out this discussion, it was decided that this is a question best reviewed by the group that will develop the pricing structure that will go into effect beginning in FY2012.

Preservation and Access Committee

Council: Kathy Mullan Harris (Chair), Matthew Snipp, Ann Wolpert (via telephone)
Staff: Bryan Beecher, Nancy McGovern, Matthew Richardson, Mary Vardigan
Visitor: Kevin Schürer

Identity Management
The committee discussed different possibilities for ICPSR in terms of identity management. Currently, ICPSR provides its own identity management service called MyData, which authenticates individuals and also provides authorization in terms of which data users can access. In the higher education community, Internet2 has been promoting the use of a middleware technology called Shibboleth for identity management. The promise of Shibboleth is that one can use one’s own campus ID to gain access to resources located elsewhere through a single sign-on. So far there has been greater adoption of Shibboleth in Europe than in the states, although it is still slow to gain traction in Europe as well. There are currently 59 members of InCommon, the federation of Shibboleth users in the U.S.

Another emerging identity management mechanism is called OpenID. This also provides a single sign-on service, but the difference is that it doesn’t tie the user to a single location as
Shibboleth does. Instead, identity is portable and follows the user from campus to campus. OpenID and Shibboleth can work together and there is an OpenID module for Drupal, the open source content management system that ICPSR is exploring.

An advantage of Shibboleth is that it provides a way to potentially access multiple resources across country and collection boundaries. The CESSDA Portal will be using Shibboleth for identity management, so the CESSDA data resources could be accessed by ICPSR users if we also used Shibboleth.

With respect to downsides of Shibboleth, it does not appear to be compatible with the fundamental way that the academy works in the sense that academics increasingly have multiple appointments in different universities and are not tied to a single location. Shibboleth also imposes a non-trivial administrative burden, and there can be significant delays in getting signed up and verified before being allowed to access data. In addition, there is concern that research can be tracked and people can be identified through Shibboleth credentials.

It was pointed out that the Preservation and Access Committee has discussed identity management several times without coming to closure or to concrete action steps. This issue appears to be larger than our committee or ICPSR, and we may need some outside help to come to a resolution. MIT may have a white paper on this topic that could provide useful information.

**Action item:** Ann Wolpert will investigate whether there is any information at MIT that could help us make progress, and the staff will discuss the possibility of hiring a consultant to guide us in making the best decision for ICPSR. An update will be provided on these issues in October.

**Persistent Identifiers at ICPSR**

Staff have been investigating Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) in connection with the Child Care Project and the ICPSR Bibliography of Data-Related Literature. DOIs come out of the commercial publishing world, and they have some properties that are advantageous for ICPSR: specifically, they would ensure that data resources are cited accurately and uniquely and that they can be found at persistent locations. In terms of the ICPSR Bibliography, having DOIs would also streamline the process of connecting users to the full text of publications cited in the Bibliography.

ICPSR has joined an organization called CrossRef. This organization will help us acquire existing DOIs for publications in our Bibliography to ensure that each publication is linked to a DOI. CrossRef membership will also enable ICPSR to assign DOIs for the nearly 7000 studies in the ICPSR holdings.

Council members pointed out that because DOIs have mainly been used in traditional publishing, ICPSR is breaking new ground in using DOIs for data and this is a leadership area for us. As community standards develop for how data are managed persistently, we may need to adjust our approach to align with the community. The CESSDA Preparatory Phase
Project (PPP) has as one of its components an investigation of persistent identifiers, so there is a lot of activity in this area. As we gain more experience, we could write a white paper or a blog on this topic.

DOIs will solve some problems for ICPSR but not all. Persistent IDs play a fundamental role in digital preservation, and DOIs are not suitable for that activity because not all digital content to be preserved equates to published material; additional identification schemes may be required to manage the containers of digital content. It is probably the case that we will need to use multiple types of IDs to cover all of our needs. Making the decision to use DOIs is part of a larger conversation about persistent identifiers that needs to continue.

**Action Item:** We will provide an update in October on how ICPSR is managing persistent identifiers internally and how it is talking to the community about this. We also need to determine the level of granularity for DOIs. Right now the intention is to assign DOIs at the study level.

**Training and Instruction Committee**

Council: Michael Haines (Chair), Aletha Huston, Ruth Peterson, Lori Weber, Christopher Zorn
Staff: Dieter Burrell, Bill Jacoby

**Summer Program Portal**

Alex Jacoby (CNS) presented the new Summer Program Portal to the Committee, demonstrating both the student self-registration process and the tools and utilities used by Summer Program administrators.

**2008 Program Preview**

Bill Jacoby gave a preview of the 2008 Program, including a preliminary report on enrollment and revenue raised from February to June of 2008. The Committee also received information on the 2008 Program curriculum and instructor list. The Committee discussed the types and locations of off-site (non-Ann Arbor) three- to five-day workshops.

**Action Item:** The Committee requested that staff provide information, for the March Council meeting, on expanding off-site courses.

**Member Institutional Participation**

Jacoby gave a report on the system of Member Institutional Participation (MIP) funds, summarizing its structure and usage during the previous three years (2005, 2006, 2007). The Committee engaged in a substantial discussion on the MIP funds, the role of the ORs in allocating them, and the institutions that have recently used them.

**Action Item:** The Committee directed the staff to provide a set of recommendations, for the October Council meeting, on the future of the MIP Funds.
Open Session

Aletha Huston briefly reported on the Executive Session. The Council is very positive about the Consortium; the organization is functioning well in all areas and there is a good atmosphere at ICPSR. The following three areas were of particular interest during the Executive Session:

Succession Planning
Huston and Gutmann met recently with James Jackson to discuss planning for Gutmann’s successor. The Council wants to start succession planning early to assure the hiring of a scholar and administrator who will continue moving ICPSR in the direction set by Gutmann and Council. Anticipating a 24-month search effort, Council will start to address this next summer.

Implementation Plan for Strategic Plan
Council wants a detailed implementation plan by October. This should include steps on how to accomplish the Strategic Plan, timetables, and benchmarks for evaluating goals and objectives. In light of the Strategic Plan, the October discussion should also include the question of whether or not the governance structure of ICPSR needs to be revised, and how to plan for the next Strategic Plan three to five years from now.

Relationship Between Membership and Grants and Contracts
These two components of the organization attract and serve different audiences. The question is whether they put stress on each other. Council wants to look at the competition that provides data. How does ICPSR differ from these competitors? What benefits does ICPSR offer over and above the provision of data? Council wants an initial report on this in October. This is really a long-term set of issues—what does membership mean and what does membership access to data mean, given the changing landscape of data providers.