



THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

1314 KINNEAR ROAD • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212 • (614) 422-9207

Executive Board Minutes

December 10, 1977

One United Nations Plaza - New York, New York

RESIDENT

C. Ray Jeffery
School of Criminology
Bellamy 159
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

RESIDENT-ELECT

Ronald L. Akers
Department of Sociology
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

ICE-PRESIDENT

Don M. Gottfredson, Dean
School of Criminal Justice
Rutgers University
15 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102

CE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Frank R. Scarpitti
Department of Sociology
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711

CRETARY

Joseph E. Scott
The Ohio State University
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212

EASURER

Harry E. Allen
The Ohio State University
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212

EDITOR - CRIMINOLOGY

James A. Inciardi
Division of Criminal Justice
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711

EDITOR - THE CRIMINOLOGIST

Alvin W. Cohn
15005 Westbury Road
Rockville, MD 20853

78 PROGRAM CHAIRPERSON

Paul J. Brantingham
Department of Criminology
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby Mountain
Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6
CANADA

EXECUTIVE COUNSELORS

Juncan Chappell
Edith E. Flynn
Paul Friday
Brian Grosman
James Hackler
Elmer Johnson
Iarnoff Mednick
Barbara R. Price
Charles Wellford

ST PRESIDENTS

1977-William E. Amos
1976-Gilbert Geis
1975-Nicholas N. Kitterie
1974-Edward Sagarin
1973-John Ball
1972-Charles L. Newman
1971-Simon Dinitz
1970-Albert Morris
1969-Bruno M. Cormier
1968-Gerhard O.W. Mueller
1967-Marvin E. Wolfgang
1964-66-Walter C. Reckless
1960-63-Donal E.J. MacNamara

Present: Harry E. Allen, Edith E. Flynn, Brian Grosman, C. Ray Jeffery, Elmer Johnson, Gerhard O.W. Mueller, Barbara R. Price, Frank Scarpitti, Joseph E. Scott, and Charles Wellford.

Guest : J. Price Foster

President C. Ray Jeffery called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

A motion was made by Harry Allen and seconded by Charles Wellford to approve the Executive Board minutes of November 16 and 20. Motion carried. Joseph Scott reported the Business Meeting minutes of November 17 would be available at the next Executive Board meeting.

J. Price Foster was invited to the Executive Board meeting to sit in at the beginning of the meeting to exchange information regarding the ASC/ACJS Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards.

ACJS ISSUES

President Jeffery reported that a copy of the ACJS proposal had been distributed to the Board members for their information. Questions were raised as to where ASC stands at the present time, what is its role, and what position ASC should take.

ASC was requested to appoint 4 members to the Commission, which would give the Society a minority vote, Jeffery noted. He inquired of Price Foster if the applicants appointed by the previous Board were permanent or could this representation be changed.

Foster stated the preference was to maintain as much continuity as possible, but the representation could be changed if the Board so desired.

Jeffery inquired as to what extent the Society is limited to the 4 people already designated by ASC and if the Executive Board has to approve their representation. He went on to explain that he personally was not representing ASC when appointed at the November meeting, but appointed to attend as an individual. Jeffery queried whether the proposal called for ASC representation as such? Jeffery stated he had talked to Amos regarding this matter and Amos' desire is that things not be upset and the present

representation continue. Jeffery stated his own inclination is that he did not want to go down in the annals of the ASC as President at this time when this particular topic was enacted. Very serious issues pertaining to accreditation and standards existed and he wished to express his concern about it at this time. He proposed withdrawing completely from the activity and leave it to ACJS.

Frank Scarpitti suggested that the issue be placed out on the table and proposed the following motion:

In light of the discussion at The American Society of Criminology Business Meeting on November 17, 1977, where several members expressed concern over the nature of the ASC involvement with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences on the standards and accreditation issue; and to protect those who have attempted to facilitate The American Society of Criminology's role in this matter; and in the spirit of the motions adopted at the November 20, 1977, Executive Board meeting; Be it resolved that the Executive Board of The American Society of Criminology requests the resignation of those members currently serving on the criminology and criminal justice standards commission and that new representatives of The American Society of Criminology be appointed by the Executive Board at its meeting in New York City on December 10, 1977.

Seconded by Harry E. Allen. It was asked that the motion be temporarily tabled for discussion.

Foster requested the Board go through their regular process in identifying those people it wanted to represent ASC. He indicated his desire for ASC was to have them feel comfortable with the people representing the Society, rather than being just four criminologists.

Edith Flynn stated that in reading through the proposal she saw that something had happened in October, one month prior to the Society's last Board meeting, and wanted to know if there was any authorization from our Society to submit this joint proposal. She wasn't aware that this was an official act by the Executive Board.

Charles Wellford called the Board's attention to the November 20 Executive Board meeting and the sense of that Board (page 7, November 20 minutes). The minutes of the Joint Commission reflected what was presented at the membership meeting (November 17). The ASC members were there as four individuals, an interpretation put on the appointments following the objections of people being representative of ASC. He thought the Board was on record, whether it is 4 individuals or 4 ASC representatives, and he stated it should be that way -- the only issue now is which 4?

Barbara Price stated that the Board indicated that those 4 people were to report back to the Board and get direction from the Board; this Board would give instructions on how to vote. The information received at the Business Meeting was reversed and we are not there now as individuals.

Brian Grosman stated this was not a closed issue that we have now and that the time spent in Atlanta on the issue was dealing with a matter different than what we now understand it to be. Therefore, he felt we were engaged in a digested version of what should be a full-blown discussion of this matter, and wouldn't like to see one area closed off totally from our discussion at this time. The whole question should be discussed. You may have appointed individuals as representatives of the Society

originally; that is how the grant reads. We have confirmed in the last meeting Society representation. He would not like to have that totally closed; we may want to move with different membership.

Jeffery stated that because of our interaction in Atlanta, this meeting in New York was called.

Johnson stated he could distinguish between long term and immediate objective. None of us want to reject this. Matter of whether you feel comfortable. Our previous president, in a way, jumped the gun too quickly. We don't want to put him out on a limb; his intentions were all right. He did commit us; I feel he was premature. The grant itself may be the tip of the ice berg. The issues he felt were:

- 1) What is the membership and purpose of the ASC? Very deep disagreements on this. Is it a group of practitioners or exclusive schools who mandate rigid boundaries?
- 2) Accreditation itself.
- 3) An anti-intellectual movement.
- 4) All kinds of talk about the junior college programs dictating the graduate programs. We are trying to get standards in the graduate programs. There is a fear that LEAA is involved in a ploy. Access to funds would be cut off if academic people do not "toe the mark".

Jeffery questioned joining criminology and criminal justice? Criminology is a behavioral science, he stated.

Foster stated that the kind of issues you are talking about are what we felt. The notion of LEAA getting into accreditation, even if not directly is going on; interaction between criminology and criminal justice is a part of that. The office Foster is involved with is very sensitive to academics in this field. One of the questions this grant needs to deal with is the possibility of accreditation for criminology and criminal justice jointly, individually, or not at all. Foster stated several things seem to be happening in the field. He stated ACJS had been into accreditation for about 3 years and they have their own set of what the guidelines should be. There is a possibility they could be the recognized group by HEW or COPA. He stated he was sensitive to the interaction of the two organizations (merger and collaboration). He was concerned about this and did not want to see his Office get into the accreditation business. He stated a lot of educational programs are managed in LEEP and over one-half of the schools in the program are not on par with what the social sciences programs should be.

With this setting, they began to do what they could to assist the academic community to improve the programs in criminology and criminal justice. One way of doing this was with this grant to ACJS. We are investing in exploratory research; what should we be doing? Let's find out what's happening in the field is the initial goal. Foster stated that from the start he felt if ACJS were awarded the grant, ASC should have an active part of it. This is one reason it took so long in getting the grant signed, Foster indicated, because he wanted assurance of ASC involvement. He stated ACJS was upset with him because of the way the proposal was set up. We need to use our knowledge to show the way and how fast they go.

There are two primary professional groups in this field and they have something to say about these issues. If we are going to have a grant dealing with this issue, Foster

EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES - DECEMBER 10, 1977 Page 4

stated he must have the two groups (ASC and ACJS) involved. The way each organization chooses its members is clearly each organization's decision. Whatever process you go through to choose your representatives will help the grant. The grant will go, regardless. Foster stated he saw it as an opportunity for ASC to influence the movement in the field of these issues. He stated that as far as the merger is concerned, he saw that as a separate issue. He is merely providing an opportunity for some interchange to happen; the merger or collaboration is up to each organization.

Joe Scott asked Foster if he had ever received any written assurance from ACJS or ASC that ASC would be involved. Jeffery replied that Amos made the commitment. Foster stated there was a meeting in his office on March 23 at which Charles Wellford and Alvin Cohn were present. The meeting came about, in a large part, because Foster wanted to have the director of the grant to have an opportunity to meet with the groups (ASC, ACJS, APA, ASA, etc.) involved. He stated they came down to having two primary groups, and they needed to have these groups sit down and talk about this activity. He wrote a letter to each president to have someone attend this meeting.

Flynn stated there was no authorization to have our organization put into this grant proposal. Wellford stated he was involved in the March meeting and that Amos had called Jeffery and Allen regarding the matter.

Foster stated the first year of the grant was viewed as an exploratory effort and the ground rules very carefully laid to where we are talking about. The grant itself is general. The more we looked at it we found we knew less. Getting both groups involved this way we would have a joint board and view it as an exploratory effort. Now is the time to do it rather than halfway through the project.

Barbara Price called the members' attention to the May 6-7 minutes regarding the ACJS/ASC standards project.

Johnson stated it was clear what Amos did was premature but wondered if continued discussion about it would accomplish much. He indicated he saw it simply as a research effort to determine similarities or differences with regards to standards for criminal justice and criminology. Johnson suggested joining the research to find out our views, clearly stating that no policy decisions are involved in this; what the parameters are, and with time indicate what research topics we could undertake?

Foster said it was consistent but a little bit off. For example, questions like "What are some measures of quality in the educational setting?" Johnson said it could be done at a higher level of abstraction.

Grosman stated that the purpose for the Board being here today was to look fundamentally at this thing; look at it afresh, as a matter of principle. The fundamental problem, Grosman felt, was is Foster looking towards organizational integration by participation in this grant. Are we interested in organizational integration? If the ASC Board pulls out stating these people are not representing us, we will not jeopardize the grant.

Scott asked Foster if the grant would have been jeopardized if ASC had not been a part of it and Foster replied he probably would not have funded the grant. Grosman questioned if ASC should be part of this grant? What are the principles involved? What are we fundamentally doing here? The point he wanted to know was if it was too late for ASC to be really engaged in this kind of fundamental discussion? Certain undertakings have been made and the authorization is questionable.

Foster stated this kind of discussion would have been preferred six months ago and stated the grant was written in a very loose fashion because of OCJET sensitivity to ASC and ACJS. The grant is simply an effort to respond to the human cry in the field: "what is going on in criminology and criminal justice education?" Two associations are involved to provide for a forum and some dollars to talk about it and see what can be done in this area. If you feel like we need to move toward some accreditation in a few years, that is your advice to give to HEW. The guidelines we have are reflecting what is happening in the field. If LEEP is still around in 1985, the guidelines the project developed might be established. Foster indicated he was bothered by some aspects of the ACJS accreditation process.

Wellford stated the first draft of the proposal which was prepared by ACJS could be summarized as an application to (1) establish an executive office for ACJS in Washington, and (2) go through a relatively complex structure to validate the accreditation principles that had been established by ACJS. At the March meeting, several organizations met and felt this was not a very good project and that it still needed a lot of work. The work was done in a lot of offices to write the grant to: (1) bring two groups together (ASC and ACJS) to talk about these kind of issues. Amos' primary concern was that ACJS would go ahead and get the grant and be in the accreditation business and that ASC would not be able to do anything. He made some appointments of convenience. Cohn and Wellford were asked to attend the meeting because they were local. The grant has moved along to where we can participate in it and a year from now to pull out. To pull out now would be sticking our heads in the sand.

Scott stated ASC's whole involvement may have started on a false assumption; namely that ACJS would get the project with or without our participation.

Jeffery said legally we are not limited in any way. Three past presidents are involved. Frankly, you can do what you want with it. Are you going to go back and reverse the action? Do we live with it for a year? Do we start planning?

Wellford said he would like someone to speak to their fears that must be very real to them -- why we shouldn't be involved in some form. He suggested that if we got away from the people and the process, what is the concern in the project that we should debate and discuss to see if the Board should be represented?

Flynn indicated she believed the Academy was an organization that seeks the acquisition of power and money as their principal objectives. If the report by Paul Friday is true (that there is an accreditation team from ACJS going throughout the country selling their services for \$1,500), they are already involved in accreditation. This group hasn't looked into the issues. If they are in Michigan accrediting, that is outrageous. Wellford said that ACJS was steamrolling for accreditation because they have a lot of junior colleges to put up the money for it. They will go ahead without our involvement. The grant does not have to lead to accreditation. The grant is to address the feasibility and desirability of standards and accreditation for the field. (1) ACJS will go ahead; (2) grant will go ahead; (3) what will the grant produce? Grosman asked what was the objection. The thought the Society was ahead in terms of intellectual credibility and was fearful that by being a minority representation on the project, ASC could give to ACJS intellectual credibility which is undeserved.

Wellford cited the differences in the organizations; being intellectual and scholarly versus an organization that has not been that but is trying to be. Wellford believed that because ASC does have the credibility already established and will bring it to any discussion the right issues will prevail. ASC will not be outvoted because we are 5 to 4.

Flynn stated that the Board should be paying more attention to what the Academy is trying to do even in Michigan. By affiliating, what is to prevent the Academy people to say in Michigan or anywhere else that they are the organization that is developing standards and ASC is with them. ASC is giving them direct and indirect credence which they will use. Wellford stated the benefit the Society will get is when the final presentation comes to COPA and HEW, where ASC can say here is how we have been involved, and we strongly oppose any licensing of ACJS. Wellford indicated he felt it a bad idea to withdraw at this late time. COPA would have more reason to listen to us than if we had been sitting on the sidelines.

Scott stated that this was the first grant and assumed that there are other awards/grants pending on the outcome of this one. Scott asked Foster, if at the conclusion of this grant, the majority votes in favor of setting up standards whether ASC participating at this point did not increase the probability of ACJS receiving continued funding increases. Scott asked Foster that if the Society broke away from the project and requested funding of their own to look into standards for criminology if ASC could receive funding? Should we be concerned about these two issues? The more successful this project is, the more likely they will get additional funding. Foster replied "yes", but if it founders, "no".

Johnson stated the Academy had been manipulated into a position different from what they expected. They now state there is a greater interest in quality. How do we respond to this? We could still insist that we are great believers in research and we would like to know the boundaries between criminology and criminal justice; what the purpose of standards are and what their relationships with other allied fields should be? Therefore, we could cooperate in this research activity that clearly states that we are not abscribing to any final conclusions. If President Jeffery wants to change the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards membership now, it should be a Board decision.

Foster replied: (1) He would really like for ASC to choose people they feel will be on the Board for the duration to give continuity (one year from now), and (2) He would like for it to be people that the Board feels comfortable with and would represent ASC, and that is different from binding the organization.

Jeffery stated he had received letters from Newman and MacNamara that they planned to continue on the Committee. Grosman replied that it was up to this Board who decides who represents the Board.

Scarpitti stated that the motion he proposed was on the assumption that this group decided to go ahead. That should be the first thing the Board decides. If we decide that, we need to address ourselves to the motion as to how we are going to participate and who will represent us. Jeffery stated they have been appointed, but can they be reappointed? Do we want to reopen it and divide the Society in the middle? Grosman inquired if the appointments were there with the approval of the Executive Board.

Foster stated the extent of ASC's involvement in this grant will dictate the outcome. He said there was a possibility ending up with accreditation guidelines recognized in the federal government and that is why he insisted ASC should be involved. Wellford stated there was another issue that relates to this matter -- #13 on the agenda, the proposed Institute of Justice. He stated the Attorney General has submitted a plan to the President to create a National Institute of Justice that would be the reorganization of LEAA. Thrust for research statistics may become the dominant activities of the agency and giving money to state and locals would be a minor function. It could happen that the authorization will exist to do research and statistics. We could be in an excellent position to know what the impact of this project has.

Barbara Price inquired if our organization tends to be heavy on 4-year schools and graduate schools, and the Academy on junior colleges, could there be an amendment to the grant that ASC have equal voice on the Board of Directors? Right now we are outvoted. Scott replied that this is the Academy's grant and not ASC's. Grosman questioned if the Society was tagged on against the Academy's wishes.

Wellford stated that the key person in the ACJS project will be the project director, and with vote of 5:4. Currently organized, they could elect Larry Hoover or Gordon Misner as an executive director. However, the project director has to be approved by the project monitor. If we could have an assurance from Price that he would not approve a project director if the majority of ASC representatives would oppose the appointment, Wellford stated he would feel more comfortable. He stated he would like to know that ASC can expect a non-approval to the key personnel clause of the grant.

Scott asked if we could add an addendum for additional participation. There are no radicals or minorities on the Commission. Could you ask for two additional members from ASA such as Richard Quinney and Eileen Bernstein?

Wellford stated they came to the March meeting and a week afterwards he received a phone call from them stating they were not interested. Flynn questioned since LEAA has been the leader, how could this project come about without any minority representation? Foster replied that they were asking the two associations to appoint their own people through their own process.

Flynn replied that ASC was not fully involved. Foster stated the project was not to allow one group to move along and achieve recognition for accreditation, but saw this as an opportunity for ASC's assistance to be actively involved in the forum. He stated he didn't know how you could differentiate between criminal justice, criminology, sociology, etc. Wellford stated that if accreditation does become available. ASC or ACJS would not be the accrediting body.

Jeffery called the Board's attention to the model currently drawn up by Larry Hoover. It covers corrections, security, etc.; nothing to do with behavioral sciences. It's a merger of Fox and Stinchomb's material of 10 years ago.

Mueller stated that unless we want to tolerate this kind of "micky mouse", the Society has to be involved. Grosman questioned if the Society was involved in this issue. Scarpitti asked about the efficacy of ASC doing what this grant says on its own? Could we charge and juice up this committee with its recommendations for standards to be submitted to LEAA by next August or any time without participation on this Joint Commission? Grosman stated ASC is participating, but not participating. The major components are resisting. To go in with your hands tied behind your back is not the way to participate. Foster stated the people on the policy board of ACJS are not adversary to ASC being involved. Grosman stated if ASC had full ranking participation and balanced, he would not object to ASC's participation in the project. ASC is losing credibility by cosmetic involvement.

Scott asked Foster if it was possible to make an addendum to the grant if the Board passed at today's meeting that they were unwilling to participate in the project unless one more member from our Society was selected or two members from another society would be appointed. Foster said it was possible, but he would appreciate it if we didn't do it.

Foster listed the groups that he knew about that were involved. He was asked where the social workers were. He didn't know if you could get "the listing". You

may have to bring in consultants. Wellford asked, "what if the project director had to have the approval of ASC and the grant was modified to give the project voting rights? Foster said there would be a meeting January 6 in Washington, D.C. to review the applicants for the position of executive director and another meeting is planned for January 20 (site unknown at this time). There is advertising in both the ACJS Journal and ASC Newsletter regarding this position. Because of the nature of the appointing process, if we had strong representation from this Society and were not in a box, then this might be one approach worth exploring. Flynn questioned why the project director couldn't be a black female. Foster replied it would be hard to predict if you would have a 5:4 vote. He felt very strongly about this activity and asked for the members to have faith that he would not have an executive director that will "blow it". He said if finding a good director for the project means extending the grant, he would do so because he felt so strongly about the leadership of the grant. If you don't find any good ones, look again. He noted that some of the names suggested for executive director were Larry Hoover, Gordon Misner, Julius Debro, Alvin Cohn, etc. Foster stated if they couldn't find a good candidate to be a project director because of the academics, the project could start in June. He stated key personnel can make or break the activity and he felt very strongly about the rest of the Society had faith in his judgment. He stated the Society's major self-protection is getting four people they believe in to serve on the Board.

Allen called Foster's attention to the sixth page of the grant regarding cost assumption planning. During the first year of funding, a cost assumption plan will be developed and submitted to the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training. This plan will outline a procedure whereby participating organizations will assume at least 20% of the funding during the second year; 50% during the third year, and 100% after the third year. Allen wanted to know the Society's obligation to this requirement. Foster replied that if there is not activity after the first year, there is no need for that clause. Allen questioned if the Society was bound in to putting up hard cash. Foster stated that ACJS was "on the hook" to them for the grant. They must get the 25% and how they do it is between them and the Executive Board of Directors. If ASC decides they do not want to contribute to the match, ACJS will have to do it. Foster felt that was not the matter of concern during the period of the grant. Allen replied that the current grant does commit ASC for soft-match money, and felt that there were some latent commitments which appears that ASC is bound by and wanted to know what the percentage in the second year and for the following year was.

Foster stated Allen was stretching the issue, as we are only talking about a one year activity. There is the possibility of further funding if the first year is a success. If it comes to a close and it is a failure, and ASC decides not to be willing to continue, ASC will be permitted to do this. That decision is way down the road. ACJS is legally obligated to LEAA. ASC is involved because Foster insisted on it. Foster stated it was important that ASC have the attitude that there are a lot of issues in the field and he is trying to get ASC actively involved in dealing with them rather than having ACJS doing it unilaterally.

Jeffery stated further that he wanted the members to be involved but would leave it to the Board to determine the membership or any control of the involvement of the Board. Scarpitti questioned if anything could be done for the balance of the 5-4 in terms of membership? Foster stated it would be difficult to change, and said we are talking about depending on the professional maturity of the people involved. Jeffery reiterated what Foster stated: Foster thought it would be difficult to change the membership of the Board; we should have people there that we are comfortable with; and was referring to numbers but not particular people.

Wellford suggested that the Board consider a motion that if the project director is not acceptable to a majority of the members of the Commission representing ASC, then this Board would not authorize further involvement in the activities of the Joint Commission. Some real leverage is needed. Grosman said if indeed our names are on the letterhead, we have some effective participation. We would inform them that the representatives are operating under the following mandates of this Board. The Board would have to consider this and would then withdraw from the Commission. Wellford asked Scarpitti to withdraw his motion so the Board could reconsider Friday's motion that was passed at Atlanta which would establish if we want to go head, and then go to Scarpitti's motion, and then come to Wellford's. (1) Determine if we are going ahead; (2) Who goes ahead?, and (3) What restrictions we put on our participation and participants. Scarpitti stated he was willing to defer his motion until there was a discussion of the first motion. Allen withdrew his second.

Jeffery spoke in favor of remaining in and would not care at this moment to entertain a motion to change the membership. It would so split the Society at a critical time, the issue is not worth it. He endorsed Wellford's statement that we would not participate unless certain actions are taken. Jeffery indicated he saw all kind of headaches if we go to MacNamara and Newman and tell them they are no longer on the Committee. He indicated he would not vote on the question because it would put him in a very compromising situation.

Wellford made a motion that the Board appoint four members of the Society to represent the Society in the activities of the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards; seconded by Elmer Johnson. Grosman stated if we didn't have people here that represent the Society, he didn't know what we were doing.

Wellford again made his motion that the Society participate on the Board of Directors of the research project, Developing Minimal Standards for the Evaluation of Post-Secondary Programs in Criminal Justice; seconded by Elmer Johnson. Motion carried. Records show that all voted in favor; none were opposed.

Scarpitti again gave his motion which was previously tabled; seconded by Harry Allen. Wellford said he would like to speak against the motion. According to Scott and Price, the Constitution provides that any appointments of committees by the President must be confirmed by the Executive Board. Amos appointed a committee and did it in good faith. The Board has yet to confirm. All the Board has to do is confirm the committee. If it does not, the President can designate another process; the motion is not needed.

Jeffery requested if the Board wanted to handle the matter on the basis of this Board confirming or not confirming; handle it as if they were never approved. Grosman stated the motion was not in order. If the mover and seconder withdraw their motion, Wellford's motion that the Executive Board today confirm the appointment could be processed. (Cited from the Constitution and By-Laws, Section III, The Executive Board, C-6: The Executive Board shall ratify the appointment of the various Editors of the Society's journal, CRIMINOLOGY: An Interdisciplinary Journal, as well as the chairpersons of the Editorial Board, the Publications Committee, and any other committees of the Society.) Grosman stated this had to be ratified and until it was ratified, the Board could not ask for resignations from the committee. They are not a committee of the Society. We may have no jurisdiction in this matter. Price stated the President cannot make personal appointments. Flynn commented that Wellford was right; they have never been confirmed. Jeffery stated the issue is whether to confirm or not. Let the record show that we are now discussing the issue regarding confirmation of appointment.

Mueller stated the motion was ruled by the chair as out of order because appointments had not been confirmed. You do not have official Society members on the Board. The issue before us is whether we want to ratify four people or we want to elect four new ones. Grosman replied, if indeed we are represented. Price stated the President did not have the power to make the policy decision on the Society's being involved in the grant; the President shall appoint such committees as deemed necessary. Grosman stated if indeed we are to have effective participation, we shouldn't duplicate in our personnel the attitudes and background which will already be there from the personnel on the other point of view. Our personnel should be academics engaged in the pursuit of criminology rather than in the practice of criminal justice, generally. He was very sensitive to what the President said, if we now made the decision that we are participating really to mean something from our point of view.

Jeffery stated ASC's name was in the project and we want to be involved in it as a Society, not as individuals. Foster stated the representatives do represent the two organizations involved. Grosman said the Society wanted the most effective representation we could get. It is no slight to Bill at all. They (the first four appointees) were appointed on an interim basis until this Board could meet, review the situation and agree that we are going to participate in a full way. We need certain people to do that and mandate that they represent the views of the Society as reflected by this group. Mueller subscribed to those views. They are not in their individual capacity; they have to put their own emotions aside. Go with strict supervision of this Board and wouldn't be all that worried to have the previous four appointees there because they cannot speak their mind but go as members of the Society. There is a certain danger in not choosing the same four people over again. Going there as a representative of our Society with limited powers; I would try it out for a while. If they do not follow your instructions, recall them.

Jeffery stated we were not bound in a legal way. Scott suggested the Society thank the four people for their efforts they have made on our behalf and proceed to select four people (either the same four or four different ones) and put this other issue out of our mind if it is not binding on us in any way. Price stated it should be spelled out very clearly to these four people what went on today and they will be tightly bound by the mandates of the Executive Board and, given those conditions, would they be willing to serve? Grosman said the four should be told with great diplomacy and appreciation and thanks for the liaison that has gone on. What has gone on will have to be wiped clean and start again. All should be off and then new appointments made.

Jeffery stated it was agreed that no one was on. We can confirm the four or start from scratch. As the next Joint Commission meeting is January 6, Foster stated the names are needed today. A motion was made by Edith Flynn and seconded by Joseph Scott to appoint four members to the Joint Commission by the Executive Board; motion carried.

Grosman suggested that the four people be members of this Executive Board and represent this Board. It was moved by Brian Grosman that C. Ray Jeffery, Edith Flynn, Charles Wellford and Harry Allen comprise the Society representatives. Scott suggested a member not from the Board be included to bring in refreshing ideas (from a radical group or a big-name type person). Grosman said they could be brought in as consultants but the people on the committee should be part of this organization, that are active in every sense, and that is why he suggested members of the Board.

Scarpitti said he would like to speak against the slate, against recommending members from this body. We have been classified as the "old-boy" organization; run by old-timers who started it up. We should be concerned about breaking it away. We perpetuate it by running these members again. We can find two, three or four qualified

members to represent the views of ASC regarding accreditation. It looks bad to have Jeffery and Wellford on and moving two others off. Wellford stated he declined any nomination to be appointed to this Commission and suggested that the selection of members should be by organizational office -- president, president-elect, vice president and vice president-elect. Scarpitti stated he rejected that because of what he previously said. Flynn stated the comment regarding the "old boys" refers to the two members not here. She stated she was not sure in which direction the Society should go; it might rip the Society if the Board did not confirm those four people. For the good of the Society, confirmation might be the best way to proceed. She stated she could not vote for it because there was no minority represented on the Commission. Scarpitti said there was a great deal of sentiment against the four people chosen because of the "good old boys". He suggested seven or eight people could be nominated and in descending order have some one get on the telephone and get four people that are acceptable. Flynn said the ideas behind Scarpitti's suggestions were good; the Society is at stake. Price stated we shouldn't be so smug that the only people here represent the views of the Society. We don't know how our Society feels. Grosman stated it was a very political, sensitive issue and people sensitive to these issues are needed.

Brian Grosman made a motion that four people be appointed from the Executive Board to represent the Society on the Board of Directors of the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards project, Developing Minimal Standards for the Evaluation of Post-Secondary Program in Criminal Justice; seconded by Edith Flynn; motion carried. (For - 5 Against - 3).

Price stated her personal preference was to go with the previous four appointees. She stated she and Edith were the only females on the Board and this year with the recent exposure of women to the Society, she wanted to make sure that women have a voice in the Society. Price stated she was in favor of disbanding the previous group.

A motion was made by Joseph E. Scott that one of the appointments to this Commission by the Executive Board should be Edith Flynn; seconded by Barbara Price; motion carried.

Brian Grosman moved that C. Ray Jeffery serve on the committee; seconded by Edith Flynn. Scott spoke against the motion because of Jeffery's previous appointment and would put him in a very compromising position.

Mueller proposed that this Board could have the President as an ex-officio member of the committee. He would be a non-participating member and a voting member in the absence of one member. Grosman stated he would remove his previous motion, and made a new motion moving that the President be an ex-officio member of the Committee; seconded by Edith Flynn. Motion carried. (President would be monitoring the actions of the four people involved.)

Frank Scarpitti moved that Harry E. Allen be nominated to the committee; seconded by Barbara Price. Motion carried.

Joseph E. Scott moved that Frank Scarpitti be the third member of the committee; seconded by Harry Allen. Motion carried.

C. Ray Jeffery moved that Don Gottfredson be the fourth member of the Board; seconded by Barbara Price. Gottfredson was contacted by telephone and declined the appointment. Barbara Price moved that Simon Dinitz be made an alternative, in the event that Gottfredson would be unable to accept; seconded by C. Ray Jeffery.

Jeffery stated it should be made clear that the members of the Joint Commission attend in person rather than by proxy. Grosman stated he would consider being the alternate if given appropriate notice. Edith Flynn moved that Brian Grosman be listed as an alternate to the Committee.

Wellford moved that if the project director of this project is not acceptable to a majority of the members of the committee representing ASC, then the Board will not authorize further involvement by the Society in the project; seconded by Edith Flynn. Motion carried. (Withdraw at that point in time--report back to the Board to solicit their opinion for a decision.

Scarpitti spoke against having an alternate and stated he would be willing to have the ex-officio member voting for him in his absence. Jeffery stated the next scheduled meeting is Friday, January 6, at 1:00 p.m. in the Old Post Office Building, Washington, D.C. If reservations are needed, members are advised to contact Price Foster and he will make whatever arrangements are necessary. There is a possibility that the meeting will run over into Saturday. Details for the January 20 meeting will be finalized on January 6.

Scarpitti asked if there was a plan to contact the two people not here today that were on the committee. It should be done in a most diplomatic manner. As a member of the Board, Scarpitti said he would like to see the letter before it is sent. Price suggested that Amos should be contacted following today's meeting to keep him apprised of what has transpired and describe in detail what has happened. Wellford stated he would like a way to get out of the situation, such as a letter from Jeffery to him that the Board has been reconstituted and that he is no longer a member of the committee. Price suggested that Jeffery telephone Newman and MacNamara and let them know what has transpired at the meeting. Jeffery was requested by the Board to place three phone calls to Amos, Newman and MacNamara, and a letter should be sent to Richard Ward apprising him of today's actions, or a letter to Price Foster with a carbon to Ward.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Allen called the members attention to the Cash Summary Sheet and the Cash Summary and Year-to-Date Statement. There is a balance in the checking account of \$9,570.61 as of November 30, 1977 and a total combined cash on hand of \$23,503.67, as of that date. A preliminary report for the Atlanta convention regarding expenditures and income to date was discussed. A total of \$7,432.89 has been expended to date. A motion was made by Brian Grosman and seconded by Edith Flynn to accept the Treasurer's Report. Motion carried.

Allen reported that 645 registrants attended the Atlanta convention and 63 new members were recruited. To the best of his knowledge, 472 guest rooms were used for 674 persons in attendance, in terms of being in the facilities for the convention.

Allen reported there was no provision in the budget for Jeffery to attend the ACJS Joint Commission meetings. There is money in the OCJET grant for members of the Commission for travel expenses, but Jeffery would not be covered. A motion was made by Wellford and seconded by Flynn that the Board approve the travel expenditures for C. Ray Jeffery to attend the 12 proposed meetings of the Joint Commission as an ad hoc member. If one of our representatives cannot attend and Jeffery attends in his place, the travel funds will be paid for out of the project. Jeffery stated he would be out of the country next summer and may not be available for some of the meetings. Grosman stated he would be willing to accept an alternate role if Jeffery would accept

being the full-time representative to the committee. Allen moved and seconded by Flynn that C. Ray Jeffery be the fourth person on the committee with Brian Grosman serving as alternate. Motion carried.

The Committee will consist of C. Ray Jeffery, Edith Flynn, Harry E. Allen, and Frank Scarpitti.

MEMBERSHIP APPROVAL

Allen reported that 106 new members had applied for membership in November. If there were no objections from the Board, they will be admitted to the Society on the 15th of December. A motion was made by Barbara Price and seconded by Edith Flynn that the November members be accepted for membership in the Society. Motion carried.

INFLUENCING LEGISLATION

Allen reported that the Internal Revenue Service has changed the current ground rules for tax-exempt organizations. Previously, the tax-exempt status of the Society had been threatened if the Society had spent a lot of money for lobbying purposes. Allen wrote a letter to the Society legal counsel, John Palmer, requesting his opinion on the matter. Palmer recommended the Society elect this option as it would be permitted to spend some monies for lobbying without losing its tax-exempt status. (Attached hereto.)

Wellford made a motion that the Board authorize the election of this option with IRS and approve that any expenditures made will require the legal counsel's recommendation. Seconded by Brian Grosman; motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY APPOINTMENT

Jeffery reported that he had appointed Joseph E. Scott to a 2-year appointment to serve as Executive Secretary.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Jeffery reported that he has made the following recommendations for the Nominations Committee: Chair, Gerhard Mueller; committee, William E. Amos, Gilbert Geis, Nicholas Kittrie and Barbara Price. A motion was made by Harry Allen and seconded by Elmer Johnson that the entire slate for the Nominations Committee be approved. Motion carried.

Jeffery recommended the following slate for the Awards Committee. Chair, Don Gottfredson; committee, Simon Dinitz and Edward Sagarin. A motion was made by Elmer Johnson and seconded by Barbara Price to approve the entire slate for the Awards Committee. Motion carried.

Jeffery announced that he had appointed Edith Flynn to serve as Chairman of the Student Paper Competition Committee. A motion was made by Brian Grosman; seconded by Barbara Price to approve Edith Flynn as chairman of the Student Paper Competition Committee. Motion carried.

ERA PETITION

Jeffery reported he had received a petition from Niki Hahn while in Atlanta requesting ASC to withdraw from Dallas as our next annual meeting site, since the state of Texas had not yet ratified the ERA Amendment. Barbara Price reported that Texas had indeed ratified the ERA Amendment and Jeffery requested that Price write to Hahn regarding this matter.

Price reported at the Business Meeting in Atlanta a motion was made by a male member that ASC go on record as in support of the ERA as it now stands, and that this motion was voted down. This was in conjunction with drawing away ASC's support from cities (states) that did not support the ERA. Price requested that the Society, through the Executive Board, go on record as being supportive of the ERA. Seconded by Edith Flynn. Grosman expressed his concern that over the years the Society has spoken as to how activist its position should be with regard to political issues. Will this appear as an exception to the Society's general policy in this area?

Jeffery stated he would not be in favor of the motion although he had no objections in terms of the ERA. Wellford stated if the motion was to ask for Board authorization to send such a plebisite to the membership, he could support it fully. Price saw this as a friendly amendment.

The motion was amended to read that the decision to support the ERA Amendment be referred to the membership for vote with the support of the Executive Board; seconded by Edith Flynn. Motion carried. A separate mailing to the membership will be prepared for their vote on this motion.

Flynn reported that she and Price were invited to attend a special meeting prepared by the women attending the annual meeting in Atlanta. She wrote a letter to Brantingham asking that he give the women his cooperation in giving them space on the program and embrace their activity. Saw it as a healthy sign of growth in our Society. She advocated we do not create artificial barriers to our group.

Scott stated he favored active recruiting and soliciting of support and participation rather than setting them aside. Flynn stated women have not been too active either in criminology or criminal justice, and there is a need for identity. There is a need for space on the program devoted to the issue; possibly Women in Criminal Justice. She wanted to make sure there would be no obstacle raised in their request. Grosman requested her to contact the Program Chair with this request and if there is any problem to report back to the Board as in all probability a group of women will want to have a session at Dallas and wanted to inform the Executive Board.

AD HOC FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

Allen reported this committee had attempted to explore the advantages and disadvantages of getting a major hotel chain to commit themselves to the Society for a number of years. A number of responses have been received, showing a considerable amount of interest in this possibility. He reported on working with the Hyatt and Sheraton chains to see what they might still shave from their costs and bring it back to the Board. The committee may make a recommendation about the Board pursuing further, but the committee in no way will negotiate for the Society with any of these facilities. He reported that the chair of the Local Arrangements Committee for the 1979 meeting in Boston, Robert Coates, has asked to be relieved of his duties as he will be leaving Boston and moving to Chicago. Grosman encouraged the committee's endeavor. He stated members have complained about the facilities and this is a sensitive area with people. Allen stated this required no action of the Board; he was merely stating the committee's progress at this time.

A report will be asked of Ron Akers at the February meeting in San Diego regarding the 1979 Boston meeting.

1978 CONVENTION UPDATE

Jeffery reported the general theme is the same, and they are moving ahead in selecting major speakers. Brantingham is going ahead with receiving materials and is sorting them out. Jeffery stated that at the Atlanta meeting, one of the areas of the program most under attack was the banquet. The present plan for the 1978 meeting is to do away with the banquet. The Dallas County Sheriff had offered a free barbecue and for those who want to stay over, they could go to that function. In the banquet's place will be a major awards luncheon on Friday.

Price said one of the recommendations made to her was that the Society have an informal session gathering on the first evening -- cash bar session or "smoker". The program could start off with a plenary session.

Jeffery stated that a plenary session was scheduled for Wednesday evening and that possibly a cash bar could be set up after that. One possible suggestion was to begin the program on Wednesday at 1:00 or 2:00 p.m. Price suggested roundtable discussions at buffet luncheons. Members could sign up in advance for a roundtable session that was of interest to them. Several people would be listed as presenting a paper. One big room with tables for eight and a buffet set up was suggested. On Wednesday evening, she suggested some type of welcoming by the Society to its members. It was suggested that at Thursday morning's session, there could be a major kick-off with a politician. Jeffery reported that Congressman Conyers, Head of the Subcommittee on Crime for the House is very interested in attending and participating in the meeting; possibly as a Friday luncheon speaker or panel presenter.

Scott suggested that, in place of Dallas for our May Executive Board meeting, the Board meet in Boston to look over possible sites for the 1979 meeting. Price stated if the Ad Hoc Committee on Hotel Facilities could obtain a good package deal for the Society, it would not be necessary in the future for Presidential approval of the hotel site. She also suggested that the Board consider Boston as the site of their May meeting.

Jeffery stated that Tom Gitchoff has made arrangements for a lot of the Board members to appear on the Western program in February, and Jeffery would like to have the February Board meeting in San Diego, even though it may not be possible to pick up all of the travel costs for the Board. He suggested that as many of the Board members as possible attend the meeting through grants or university funds to pick up some of the expenses. Grosman stated that Western shouldn't feel alienated from ASC and we should be there and talking to their people. He asked for some clarification of how the percentage allocation for Board travel expenses is figured.

A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Frank Scarpitti that the site of the May Executive Board meeting be changed from Dallas to Boston. Motion carried.

Allen reported that about \$2,000 is partially applied to Board travel. Price suggested the policy could be changed to get so much per diem for travel. Grosman stated it seemed like a healthy situation and vibrant to this organization. He stated he would not want to go "in the hole" regarding his Board travel expenses. Allen reported the Society is coming up on a new fiscal year effective March 1, with the budget being prepared. Flynn reported that for the February meeting there should be

some assistance for the meeting by the Executive Board. Grosman suggested that the Society have a Site Selection Chair prior to the Board meeting in Boston. Possible dates were suggested and it was agreed that the Board would meet in Boston on May 19 at approximately 2:00 p.m. with a working dinner with the Board meeting the following day and ending the meeting by approximately 3:00 p.m. on the 20th. Sarah is to contact Ron Akers and have him start planning for the Boston meeting.

Allen reported that \$4,280 had been set aside for the two meetings already occurred. The Society might be paying about \$3,100 for the New York meeting and San Diego meeting and then will be in another fiscal year. Jeffery asked if the Board could agree on a format of coach travel plus \$50 per day in New York. Allen stated you have to claim actual expenditures. If there is more than \$3,100 claimed, it will be pro-rated.

Jeffery reported that the San Diego meeting will be Saturday, February 18, at 9:00 a.m. at the San Diego Hilton, 1775 East Mission Bay Drive, San Diego, California 9209. A single rate of \$24 has been set for the Western meeting. Jeffery reported that the scope and purpose of the ASC/ACJS merger would be looked into at the February meeting.

ASC STUDENT CRIMINOLOGY CHAPTERS

Scott reported that the student members would like to have a special session set aside for them briefly at the beginning of the annual meeting (roundtables handled through the Executive Office). They would like a social where they pay their own way and would prefer it possibly the first night. From the members attending the special meeting in Atlanta regarding ASC Student Chapters, it was determined that they are not interested in having student chapters set up. Scott was contacted by Alpha Lambda Epsilon who would like to have their meeting tied in with ASC's. Joe reported that this could not be accommodated at this time.

Scott reported the students are interested in having some means of participating. A block of time at the beginning of the meeting for papers or simple discussions. They would like to write into the Executive Office with what they would like to do and have a room set aside for them to meet and talk about issues, followed by some type of social hour. Price suggested a separate room be set aside for the students and possibly have coffee on hand. Scott stated that the students wanted the room for only one evening. Scott will write Brantingham to see if arrangements can be made for the students for Dallas.

INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Allen reported he had received a request for comments regarding a possible Institute of Justice and circulated the information to the Board members for their information. Wellford reported that the President has approved three organization efforts for this year: Justice Systems Improvements -- totally at LEAA reorganization -- state and local assistance, planning, statistics, research and juvenile justice. Division of labor is such that the research part of that total project was to be in the hands of the President's Reorganization Project. Hence the packet is only with regards to a research function that would be reorganized out of LEAA Federal Justice Research Program -- National Institute of Justice etc. Would have given them until May to give a report to the President. Bell has transmitted to the President his own draft. Forced the Reorganization Project to come up with a plan by January 15. Holding seminars next Thursday and Friday to review their efforts and the department plans.

This is almost moot; preempted by the Task Force next week. Will have gone through this with 50 people by next Friday to formulate their own plan. For the Society to establish a committee to prepare comments for the February meeting would be useless as it will be over by then. Jeffery inquired if there was any room in this justice deliberation to bring in the purpose and scope of criminology? Wellford stated he thought there was considerable room for defining what kind of research would be conducted by a justice research and development institute. Jeffery inquired if this new Institute would replace LEAA and Wellford replied, yes.

Edith Flynn stated she would like for ASC to go on record through the newsletter as disapproving what is happening in Michigan. Differentiate the Society's name from what is going on there. Can't see why in advance of any determination of standards for accreditation -- they are hustling. Scott stated we are not sure they are, but suggested that Paul Friday could find this out and then we could come out with a statement. Price suggested that we provide additional direction to Alvin Cohn through the Board. Pick out the critical points and see that they get to Cohn and the members. We promised the membership that appeared at the Business Meeting that we would do this.

Allen reported that Al Cohn has asked for reimbursement of travel expenses to attend Board meetings for information for THE CRIMINOLOGIST. Scarpitti stated that since the journal is at the University of Delaware, and the University is absorbing lots of funds, he was against this suggestion. It was agreed that with the possibility of more Board meetings this year, Cohn's request is denied, but he will be kept informed by the Executive Secretary with reports of the Executive Board meetings.

ASC PUBLICATIONS

Grosman stated that he has been in correspondence with Scott in regards to the volumes that are outstanding in the proceedings series, and the reason for this. He reported he was contacted by Arnold Trebach to cooperate with Jerry Wilson on editing a volume on Police. Wilson is now with Seaboard Service System and has lost the manuscript. Wilson is not willing to do the editing and it will fall to Grosman to do this work. He stated he had written to Wilson asking him to be some way involved, but he has not received a reply. Grosman wrote to Marian Schwartz at Praeger and was told that there was still a lot of work to be done on the manuscript. Grosman stated there should be some policy regarding who is selected as editors and that the Board should have tight control as to who is selected as editors and who is going to edit a volume. Obtain a commitment from these people -- a gentleman's agreement. He said he would do the Police volume, but as yet didn't know how.

Jeffery stated his inclination, after seeing some of the Praeger series, would be to kill the whole thing. Grosman stated it was his considered opinion that it was a low quality academic contribution on police and was concerned about his name appearing on the volume. He could only suggest it be killed if he had direction from the Board to do so.

Scott reported he had been in contact with the various people. There are two volumes still out on the '74 series -- one in press and one that they know nothing about. Allen has a volume out, Scott has a volume out and Flynn will have a volume out in March. Scott reported he had tried to contact Nicholas Kittrie several times as had Schwartz, but with no success. His volume is still in question! Arnold Trebach is the series editor of the '75 proceedings. The Friday volume is out. The Wilson-Grosman volume has a lot of work to be done on it. The contract has been signed. The volume by Szabo and Katzenelson is almost done, but no contract has been signed.

Trebach has been sent queries a couple of times but he has never answered them to Praeger's satisfaction and has not forwarded the completed footnotes. He told them to skip or eliminate missing ones, and they are unwilling to do this. The publisher has stated it is a waste of time to send it back to Trebach and they will not publish it in its present form. The fourth volume is Nicholas Kittrie's about which nothing is known. Kittrie has never been in touch with the publisher, although they have sent him several certified letters. Grosman stated that direction is needed from this Board regarding the proceedings. Jeffery inquired if there was any reason to continue this charade with Praeger? Grosman stated it may have outlived its usefulness. Scott reported that the quality of some articles was excellent but that at least one-third of the papers have already been published in other leading journals. Grosman stated his concern was with the contributors. He questioned our standing and responsibility to these people. Wellford stated that more than one of the people on the program this year expressed great concern in the Society's track record being so slow.

Jeffery inquired as to who controlled the publications -- President, or Publications Committee Chair. He proposed that the current president, along with the editor of CRIMINOLOGY, and Chairman of the Publications Committee constitute a committee of three to determine the publication of the proceedings for that year, to select the individual editors. Grosman suggested that in the case of the Wilson-Grosman volume that the Society consider dropping it because it is out-of-date, and that in the future this procedure should be monitored more carefully. Academic credibility is at stake.

Flynn stated if Kittrie is not willing to do the work, we should have the authority to drop it. She would still say that Kittrie should be contacted and get some type of reading if he plans to go on and if not, they will be dropped. Jeffery stated it was a dead issue. A motion was made by Edith Flynn and seconded by Harry Allen that the Wilson-Grosman volume be dropped on the basis of the advice presented at today's meeting, and Praeger to be so informed.

Allen asked how much commitment has been made by the Society to the individuals on these series. Johnson inquired if there was an obligation to tell the people that have submitted papers to these volumes what has transpired. Wellford suggested that the Board formally write to Kittrie and Trebach and ask them if they don't have something done by ("X date"), it will be given to someone else or cancelled. Also, a letter should be written to Brian Grosman regarding the Wilson-Grosman volume and let him respond. The nine authors should also be informed.

Wellford stated he would try to track down Kittrie. Scarpitti suggested that the Board resolve at the February meeting action to be taken on all the five volumes outstanding. Wellford stated that as papers came into him for the Atlanta meeting, he distributed them to his three co-chairmen, Ron Akers, John Conrad and Duncan Chappell. Jeffery stated he would check with Brantingham to make sure that he has not committed any volumes for the Dallas meeting. Price suggested clarification be sent to the authors as to the Society's procedures and ask them for first commitment and first turn down rights and ask them to let us know if they are or are not interested in having them in the proceedings.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph E. Scott, Executive Secretary



THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

1314 KINNEAR ROAD • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212 • (614) 422-9207

CASH SUMMARY

January 1978

<p>PRESIDENT C. Ray Jeffery School of Criminology Bellamy 159 Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306</p> <p>PRESIDENT-ELECT Ronald L. Akers Department of Sociology University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242</p> <p>VICE-PRESIDENT Don M. Gottfredson, Dean School of Criminal Justice Rutgers University 15 Washington Street Newark, NJ 07102</p> <p>VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT Frank R. Scarpitti Department of Sociology University of Delaware Newark, DE 19711</p> <p>SECRETARY Joseph E. Scott The Ohio State University 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212 Columbus, OH 43212</p> <p>REASURER Harold Allen The Ohio State University 1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212 Columbus, OH 43212</p> <p>DITOR - CRIMINOLOGY James A. Inciardi Division of Criminal Justice University of Delaware Newark, DE 19711</p> <p>DITOR - THE CRIMINOLOGIST Alvin W. Cohn 15005 Westbury Road Rockville, MD 20853</p> <p>978 PROGRAM CHAIRPERSON Paul J. Brantingham Department of Criminology Simon Fraser University Burnaby Mountain Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6 CANADA</p> <p>EXECUTIVE COUNSELORS Duncan Chappell Edith E. Flynn Paul Friday Brian Grosman James Hackler Elmer Johnson Sarnoff Mednick Barbara R. Price Charles Wellford</p> <p>PAST PRESIDENTS 1977-William E. Amos 1976-Gilbert Geis 1975-Nicholas N. Kitterie 1974-Edward Sagarin 1973-John Ball 1972-Charles L. Newman 1971-Simon Dinitz 1970-Albert Morris 1969-Bruno M. Cormier 1968-Erhard O.W. Mueller 1967-Arvin E. Wolfgang 1966-Walter C. Reckless 1960-61 Donald F.J. MacNamara</p>	<p>1/1/78 Beginning Balance</p> <p><u>Receipts:</u></p> <p>Dues: Active and Student 400.00</p> <p>Sale of Membership List 100.00</p> <p>1977 Convention, Atlanta 610.00</p> <p>Misc. Sales 2.75</p> <p>Total Receipts 1112.75</p> <p>Total Cash Available</p> <p><u>Expenditures:</u></p> <p>1977 Convention, Atlanta 35.00</p> <p>Office Expenses 700.77</p> <p>Postage 500.00</p> <p>Administrative Assistant 1269.86</p> <p>Total Disbursements: 2505.63</p> <p>Ending Balance:</p>	<p>\$1912.82</p> <p><u>1112.75</u></p> <p><u>\$3025.57</u></p> <p><u>2505.63</u></p> <p>\$ 519.94</p>
--	--	---

* * * * *