

ASC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
April 29-30, 1988
Gramercy Park Hotel - New York, New York

Members Present: William Chambliss, J. Robert Lilly, Charles Wellford, Nicole Rafter, Raymond Michalowski, Don Gottfredson, Neal Shover, Margaret Zahn, Marvin Krohn, Terence Thornberry, Joan McCord, Marc Riedel, Carl Klockars, Douglas Smith, Phyllis Jo Baunach, Julius Debro, Roland Chilton

A motion was made by Don Gottfredson and seconded by Julius Debro to approve the minutes of November 11 and 14, 1987, as amended.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Treasurer J. Robert Lilly distributed financial reports covering the end of 1987 and for the first three months of 1988. Projected income for 1987 was \$147,750.00 and the Society took in \$200,921.59. 1987 expenditures were budgeted at \$167,762.84 versus \$184,519.11 spent. The difference of \$16,402.48 was profit for the end of the year equaling 8%.

Julius Debro requested that financial information be provided to Board members in advance of the Board meeting. **A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Don Gottfredson to accept the Treasurer's report. There was one abstention.** Don Gottfredson noted that the Board should acknowledge the great amount of work that Bob Lilly has done and commend him for his efforts.

1988 PROGRAM AND BUDGET

Raymond Michalowski distributed copies of the 1988 program budget for the Board's consideration. He noted that revenue was projected at \$39,750.00 with \$37,850.00 in expenditures, leaving a projected \$2,000 surplus. Translation funds in the amount of \$200.00 for the president of the Japanese Society of Criminology are required. The Committee has proposed a banquet with band and cash bar in another room after the banquet. The Local Arrangements Committee also proposed providing a play, Peasant of El Salvador, which would cost \$1,200 plus expenses. He reported that tickets could be sold and maybe all of the expenses could be recouped for the play. It was suggested that registration waivers be given to community groups in Chicago involved in crime and justice areas and work for non-profit organizations. Professor Block has agreed to participate in a debate on anti-trust in the Reagan era. Four people from the People's Law Office, which provides free counseling to various people in Chicago, could pay one registration fee for the whole group.

Terry Thornberry inquired if the Society would be paying all the travel costs for the Peasant play. If there is enough money to pay the basic cost of the travel, he suggested that it could be covered by the ticket cost which could be between \$5 and \$7. Wellford suggested that the play should be self-supporting. Michalowski suggested that if the ticket sales could be utilized he might be able to negotiate with the theater group on travel and lighting costs. President Chambliss inquired if the Board wanted to authorize this type of enterprise. Michalowski noted that if the play could not be done within a reasonable figure, he would not have the play presented at the meeting. Wellford inquired if the

Committee had considered other ways to enhance the meeting. A motion was made by Neal Shover and seconded by J. Robert Lilly that the Program Committee be authorized to underwrite the play up to \$1,500.00. MOTION FAILED.

Julius Debro made a motion that Ray Michalowski be given the opportunity to look at the budget he is presenting and represent the budget at tomorrow's meeting; seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. Motion carried.

CRIMINOLOGY REPORT

Douglas Smith, Editor, reported that he took over operational control of the journal in April 1987 and through April 15, 1988 he has received a total of 149 submissions to the journal. He noted that the submissions seem to be increasing and this bodes well for the quality of papers that appear in the journal. Within 60 days of receiving a manuscript, a decision is made. He reported that the University of Maryland has not charged ASC for any secretarial services and do not anticipate doing so. There is a three month time period between the start of an issue and receipt by the members. Smith said that he does use membership in ASC as criteria for reviewers.

A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Neal Shover to accept the editor's report on CRIMINOLOGY. Motion carried unanimously.

President Chambliss reported that Doug Smith had submitted a letter requesting an editorial board luncheon for approximately 25 be held during the Chicago meeting at an anticipated cost of \$560.00. Smith wanted to do this as a formal gesture of thanks to the Editorial Board for all their help. A motion was made by Julius Debro and seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach to approve the cost of an editorial board luncheon in Chicago. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Julius Debro to commend Douglas Smith for an excellent job he has been doing with the journal. Seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried unanimously.

EDITORIAL BOARD REPORT

Marc Riedel reported that the matter of diskettes will be taken up at the November meeting. He reported that Hugh Barlow's term of editorship of the newsletter is over with the November 1988 issue. He noted that there are three possible options for the editorship: (1) Open the bidding and if Hugh wants to bid he can; (2) Reappoint Hugh for a three-year term; (3) Hugh favors that he be reappointed for one more year as he is not sure that he wants to take on another three-year term. Riedel stated that the Board could be setting a precedent in letting Hugh serve for an additional year as there is not presently any written policy regarding the newsletter editorship. He could be appointed for one year and a policy could be established for future editors and would govern the Board from that point on. Klockars noted that in the past the editorship of the newsletter continued on without anyone's approval and if the Board were to say that once the term was over and the editor could reapply along with other candidates, this could be interpreted as an affront to the editor.

Chambliss noted that the Board had previously discussed reappointing Joe Weiss as editor of the journal for another three year term. It may well be that the Board doesn't want that tradition to continue and when the three year term is up, we must automatically open the bid for new editors.

Riedel suggested that at the present time the Board could extend Hugh's appointment for one year and then seek bids. **A motion was made by Don Gottfredson that the Board ask Hugh Barlow to continue for another year as editor of the newsletter and that the President ask the Constitution and By Laws Committee, in consultation with the Publications Committee, to review the newsletter editorship policy and make a recommendation at the Board's fall meeting on what tenure the editorship of the newsletter should be. Motion carried unanimously.**

Riedel reported that the Publications Committee is working with the Division on International Criminology in developing criteria for journal distribution to third world countries.

ONE PAGE GUIDE FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Phyllis Jo Baunach distributed copies of the proposed Guide for Committee Chairs noting that it was intended to be an outline and she was interested in receiving suggestions for the Guide. The Guide will provide incoming committees and chairs with information from the previous year's activity and provide a record for developing policies and procedures. President Chambliss suggested that the Board look the Guide over this evening and have Baunach present her report again at Saturday's Board meeting.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Charles Wellford reported that at the University of Maryland no blacks have been admitted to candidacy in the last two years. In reviewing Thornberry's program at SUNY-Albany, there were no blacks in their Ph.D. program. Rutgers has some. He noted there is a decreasing number of minorities entering and finishing doctoral programs. APA and ASA have tried to do something by sponsoring programs to encourage and facilitate minorities getting into the discipline and it is now time for the Society to do this, Wellford noted. A mechanism is needed to stimulate discussion and develop a plan to bring more minorities into the doctoral programs and discipline. Riedel concurred and suggested that effort should be made to have minority students attend the annual meeting.

Gottfredson suggested that the Society try to find organizations that would provide money for fellowships. Nicole Rafter suggested that the Society could ask members to add additional funds from \$2-25 to their dues which could be earmarked for this purpose. Margaret Zahn reported that her university had tried to recruit black students and give them double the amount of funds that the other students received, but they could receive larger incomes from outside industry. She suggested that mentors introduce undergraduates around at the annual meeting. Carl Klockars noted that the University of Delaware has two black students and three more coming in the doctoral program and the issue was not money as minority fellow money is available. The issue is generating interest to get them to consider these kind of careers. Riedel suggested that one possibility might be for Charles Wellford to chair a committee and appoint some people to make specific recommendations to the Board in November regarding this matter. Julius Debro noted that the majority of black students are in black colleges that have criminal justice programs. He suggested that we get together with directors of those programs and sit down at a meeting to talk about getting their students to come. He suggested that the Society look at the ASA model on how to obtain funds. Baunach suggested that a Division on Blacks could generate more interest for them to attend the annual meetings.

Wellford suggested a long range development in working with black schools as a organization be instituted. Bring people to the meetings, sponsor a speakers series to have people go out for lectures, etc.

President Chambliss noted that he would appoint a committee and will talk with Wellford about including some Board members to work out a program to address this issue. He will also talk to the ASA to ask whether the fellowships enhance people getting in the program and work with the Finance Committee in terms of what expenditures would be involved for the ASC and will report back to the Board at the November meeting. Gottfredson suggested that the Board should entertain the idea of seeking funding for fellowships. Michalowski inquired if it would be reasonable for the program this year to invite all the heads of black criminal justice programs for some type of meeting about this issue. Julius Debro volunteered to provide a list to Michalowski.

INTERNATIONAL DIVISION ON JOURNAL DISTRIBUTION

Theodore Ferdinand, chair of the Division on International Criminology, submitted a list of third world institutions that he recommended be sent copies of the journal. Chambliss noted that at the last Executive Board meeting there was authorization to provide up to 500 copies of each issue of the journal to institutions and individuals in third world countries. There had been a lengthy discussion on what constituted a third world country and the International Division was asked to provide a list to the Board. Chambliss reported that in talking with Ferdinand and his committee, that a list of 136 institutions had been provided. He noted that he had spoken with Sarah Hall at the ASC office regarding the number of issues to be distributed and the number was reduced from 500 to 300.

Debro stated that the list looked worldwide rather than third world. Chambliss reported that this would be an opportunity to get the journal into Russia; the Western European block could not afford to subscribe to the journal, and the African countries were left out of the list provided by Ferdinand. He suggested that a new committee be formed that would specifically focus on this area and generate a list that would be consistent with the motion passed at the last meeting.

Wellford inquired if the committee would describe the process they would recommend. Would there be a letter that goes out asking for a return card? Gottfredson suggested that it be simplified so if we did not have a "needs test." Riedel reported that he had spoken with Ferdinand regarding the list. Ferdinand had looked at the UN third world directory to develop the list. There were a number of criteria in addition. This is an extremely difficult issue to obtain a definitive list. Chambliss suggested casting the net widely to see what happens and then pull back. Once it becomes known that the Society is willing to send complimentary copies we may receive requests.

McCord noted that the Society would receive a lot of benefit by sending the journal worldwide and stated she liked the idea of sending out a card that the journal is available and see what type of response is received. Chambliss stated he along with Charles Wellford and Phyllis Jo Baunach would work out a procedure to get the information started. Riedel inquired if additional people should be added or subtracted from the list on an annual basis. Klockars suggested that the Board should try to keep this the responsibility or role for the International Division as they have done the preliminary work. Baunach agreed with the suggestion and asked that Ted Ferdinand join she, Chambliss and Wellford on an ad hoc committee for this task.

Klockars suggested that Ferdinand not be asked to work with the committee that is being formed, but keep the focus in the Division. It is a International Division project and the committee would be support the project.

Baunach said that the committee could be presented to the Division as the Society is getting involved in memorializing the practices of the ASC. Riedel suggested that professional organizations of the various countries be contacted. Wellford suggested the UN regional centers be included on the list. The Division could be asked to check on the issue of translation as not everyone can read English. Look into the possibility of having the journal translated into two primary languages.

Thornberry inquired how does the Society respond to its members that we are sending issues free of charge to these countries although he felt that the need was important to provide the issues. Chambliss reported that the committee would be asked to consider these ideas and take them into account.

The other item that the International Division requested that they be given a budget for the meetings in Chicago in order to invite third world and Latin American countries to present papers and pay for their way. They would like the Executive Board to allocate an additional \$1,500 to have foreign scholars come to the Chicago meeting. McCord noted she was worried about the "old boy" network and suggested that procedures would need to be regularized. Chambliss suggested that there should be a process in selecting the person to receive the funds.

J. Robert Lilly stated that if the Board was going to spend the membership monies, they ought to ask them if that is what they would like the Society to do. Ask the membership if this is a priority issue. Gottfredson noted that the Board has been elected by the membership to deal with such issues and there was no reason to exclude this Board from taking action. Rafter commented that she felt comfortable in doing it for this year but had a real problem authorizing a division to give honoraria. Chambliss stated he assumed they know honoraria would be involved and would probably invite as many people as they could out of the \$2,500.00. Lilly suggested that the Board establish policy regarding the distribution of any surplus funds.

A motion was made by Don Gottfredson to encourage the International Division to proceed with this program but that they would be required to explicate the criteria they use in selecting the people they would invite.

Motion that the International Division be allocated \$1,500 to select speakers to come to the November meetings and that they give the Board the criteria by which these speakers will be selected with the specification that those criteria would be used in the future.

Motion amended by Nicole Rafter and seconded by Don Gottfredson to inform the International Division that the \$1,500 requested by the Division for international speakers was not granted this year and ask the Division to develop the criteria for selecting international speakers to attend the annual meeting and present to the Board at the fall meeting. It was also suggested funds to cover expenses only and not honoraria be considered by the International Division. Motion passed. Opposed: 2.

A motion was made by Don Gottfredson to encourage the International Division to develop criteria for the selection of third world scholars who would be brought to future meetings without honorarium so that the Executive Board can determine whether they would like to establish this type of policy Seconded by Marc Riedel. Motion passed. Opposed: 2.

ROBERT FIGLIO TENURE

President Chambliss reported that as president of the ASC he had received a request from Elmar Weitekamp and Deborah Barrett to write a letter to the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania regarding consideration of Robert Figlio's denial of tenure. Chambliss told them that he could not do that but they asked that the matter be brought before the Board for their consideration and noted that Figlio had not requested that this matter be brought up before the Board.

Wellford noted that regarding the tenure of Figlio the Society could not enter into this matter without a review of his records. Regarding the suggestion that there is a plan or effort to eliminate the criminology program at the University of Pennsylvania, the Society would be remiss in not encouraging the University to continue the program and that a letter to the president suggesting there may be some reconsideration of the University's commitment to the criminology program be considered

A motion was made by Neal Shover and seconded by Nicole Rafter that the Board take no action regarding the tenure of Robert Figlio at the University of Pennsylvania. Motion carried unanimously. The Executive Secretary will communicate this matter to the writers of the letter.

Motion made by Charles Wellford that the ASC send a letter to the president of the University of Pennsylvania in which we note the recent publicity on the condition of the criminology program and urge continuation of the university's long standing commitment to the field. Baunach suggested a friendly amendment that a letter be sent stating that the Society wanted to express their continued support of the criminology program as someone had suggested that the program may close. Marge Zahn suggested that Marvin Wolfgang should be contacted before such a letter is written and suggested that President Chambliss telephone him and talk to him about it.

Chambliss stated he was not in favor of this and would not like to sign the letter. He had heard nothing from either Wolfgang or Figlio and suggested that the Executive Secretary could continue with the matter. McCord noted that nothing should be done without having all the facts. Debro offered a friendly amendment that the Society get in touch with Marvin Wolfgang and listen to what he has to say. Charles Wellford withdrew his motion.

A motion was made by Don Gottfredson that the Executive Secretary write the president of the University of Pennsylvania to report at the Executive Board meeting of the Society the Board noted the considerable contributions of the criminology and criminal law programs and complimented and encouraged the university for continued support of the program. Seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried. Favor: 7, Opposed: 6.

McCord suggested that an external review committee review the matter. Chambliss asked that a ruling be made that the president has the right to cast a vote not just in case of a tie. Is consistent with what has happened in the past.

Terry Thornberry made a motion to overturn his ruling; seconded by Carl Klockars. Favor: 2, Opposed ; Abstained: 3. Call for revote. Charles Wellford withdrew is second to the motion. Don Gottfredson withdrew his motion.

President Chambliss stated that there is still a discussion on whether we want to look further at the issue because we did not have enough information. We don't want to wait until November. Suggested that the Board members look into it and then contact the Executive Committee to determine whether a letter should be sent. If they find on further

investigation that there is justification to send a letter, the Executive Committee can decide whether to send the letter or not. Dr. Chambliss asked the Executive Secretary to contact Marvin Wolfgang and if he thought it would be useful send a letter noting the importance of the Penn program to the field.

JOURNAL NAME CHANGE SURVEY

Charles Wellford reported that the journal name change survey was sent out to the membership and 492 responses were received. 362 votes opposing the change were received; 129 in favor of the change were received, and one with no opinion.

ADMINISTRATOR'S POSITION

Charles Wellford reported that he and Bob Lilly had been requested to look into the matter of the Administrator's position with regard to the issue of salary and the need for additional assistance. A thorough analysis was prepared of her job description. He noted that she carries a tremendous burden for the Society. A formal survey of salaries for comparative positions had not been done. They looked at ACJS and there person is paid a lower salary than Sarah, but that person has not been working at the position that long. He reported they hadn't gotten very far in terms of salary and in their opinion after looking at the job and at other organizations, the Society needs to give her an exceptional boost. Lilly and Wellford concluded that the salary is where we can have it but not where it should be. It is reasonable given the location of the Society and they did not recommend a large catch-up salary but encourage 7-8% raises on a yearly basis. Another issue concerns the staffing of the office. Wellford reported that previously Al Reiss had asked him to review the office. Equipment and part time assistance has been added, and we have talked about adding a full time assistant. There is still a need and we should begin planning in our budget process for that shortly. Wellford reported that based on their casual analysis they do not recommend a huge catchup but maintain what we have been doing for the past few years. Include in the next budget for another position for the office as an assistant.

Gottfredson stated that he favored a full time person to assist Sarah. There is a need to have someone learning the procedures and learn what Sarah knows. A full time person is in order and suggested that this position be included in next year's budget.

The Board approved a bonus for Sarah Hall of \$1,000.00 and asked that Lilly review her retirement plan.

NATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Margaret Zahn reported that the committee had addressed the four major issues: (1) Recommendations regarding the resolutions on capital punishment and on hate violence; (2) Procedures which ASC should follow to develop and implement substantive policy stands; (3) National Policy Committee structuring to facilitate policy work, and (4) Procedures for implementing non-substantive policy issues, especially those concerned with advancing the interests of criminological research and training. They also developed a set of procedures so that the Society can regularize the way it takes policy stands.

Don Gottfredson thanked Marge Zahn for the superb report she presented dealing with issues that the Society has gone over for years and commended the Committee for their report.

President Chambliss noted that one of the questions raised was whether or not the membership should be given the resolutions through a mail ballot or at the Business Meeting. The Committee recommends announcement through the newsletter.

Wellford noted that the constitution makes it clear that the only body to establish policy is the Executive Board. Do we propose a Constitutional amendment to alter that? Gottfredson noted that proposals for policy could come to the Executive Board by any route. They are all proposals and the Executive Board will decide. We do not need a ballot or business meeting. He stated that the Board would be well advised to retain approval on policies on national statement of policies.

I. Resolution on the Death Penalty: The committee unanimously agree that the resolution regarding the death penalty, with some changes in language, should be adopted by the ASC as its official policy. Furthermore, the stand should be distributed to a variety of agencies and media as detailed in their attached implementation plan.

Motion failed on a vote of 7-7.

The Hate Violence Resolution: Motion carried to refer to National Policy Committee to following the procedures set by the Board for policy procedures.

Charles Wellford proposed three amendments to Section 2 of the report as follows:

1) Paragraph 3: Insert or Executive Board

2) Page 4, 3rd paragraph: Delete two sentences, "If that committee desires to proceed with the position they may. It would also be sent to the newsletter but would be clearly labeled as being sent without Board approval."

3) Page 4, 5th paragraph: Delete "The committee had extensive discussion of where the final authority for official action should rest. A mail ballot as well as vote at the annual Business Meeting were discussed. While our committee did not have full consensus on this latter point, the majority were willing to let the Business Meeting vote stand as the basis for official policy. It was felt that the annual Business Meeting is an appropriate public forum for the discussion of such issues and that this may well increase attendance at such meetings." Final approval of all such policies would be with the Executive Board. Seconded by Terence Thornberry. Motion passed as amended.

Baunach inquired if the membership would be able to vote. Wellford commented that it was advisory and useful especially through a mail ballot.

Debro noted that emergency resolutions come up at the Business Meeting and need to be responded to quickly. Wellford noted it could be handled by ballot or at the Business Meeting. Klockars stated that nothing comes out as policy unless it comes out from the Executive Board endorsement.

III. Structure of the National Policy Committee

The committee also recommends some change in the composition of the NPC to better facilitate its work. Specifically, it recommends increasing the membership from six members to seven, thus, prohibiting tie votes on policy matters. It recommends that the chair become a non-voting member of the Board who would attend the mid year meeting to present the positions and their rationale to the Board. It also recommends most strongly that the committee consist of members who hold staggered to year terms. The work of this committee requires more continuity than the current structure allows. It is recommended

that the incoming president appoint four members, with three from the preceding year remaining for a second term. (It might be advisable that the chair from the preceding years' committee be one of the three continuing members.)

Klockars commented that he was not concerned about the raising of the membership of the committee to 7 but to recommend that the chair become a non-voting member of the Board he had reservations about. In those organizations where policy positions are brought forth there was no hesitation to bring that chair to the meeting. May be years when it is not necessary to have them at the meetings. Makes them second-class members of the Board. Wellford noted that all committee chairs are non-voting members of the Board. Riedel stated that they would attend at the discretion of the president or Executive Board.

A motion was made by Julius Debro and seconded by Carl Klockars that the wording that the chair may be invited to attend the mid year meetings at the discretion of the President to present issues and that the membership of the committee be increased from six to seven.. Motion carried.

Section 4. Procedures for Implementing Non-substantive Policy Issues was accepted as presented.

Discussion of hate violence resolution: Wellford inquired if Zahn could explain why we have this resolution without going through the process for recommending resolutions in general. National Policy Committee would present a resolution, background paper and there is little membership involvement.

Zahn replied that it would be sent to the National Policy Committee and the NPC for next year would develop a rationale and collect more systematic evidence and deal with the language. Debro stated he would like to see the Board take some position on hate violence and the death penalty.

Wellford stated he favored the resolution and supported the committee's recommendation that the resolution goes through the process -- background paper developed and full discussion. Wellford proposed that with the hate violence resolution it should go through the process, document developed and submitted to the Board, public debate and then the Board would approve it.

Klockars commented that the basis for the recommendation as stated in this resolution is that their objection to the death penalty. it has been applied in a discriminating fashion and no consideration of evidence of crime, deterrence through execution. Is it more deterrence versus long prison term sentence.

Zahn replied that there were two sources: Pat Lauderdale developed a small paper for the committee's consideration. MW developed some previous information for the committee's consideration.

Debro commented that the Society should take a stand on this policy that is critical to the welfare of people in this country. It is very clear that courts are against the death penalty. We have to take a position.

Gottfredson stated that there were two arguments that he would like to respond to. (1) Background paper should be developed--we are making a Social statement of position and the proposition is presented by Social scientists who are aware of the literature. Other argument that we would be taking a moral position. Proposal does not take a moral

position. Paragraph is well phrased and speaks to our social science role. Either to be applied now or go to next year's committee.

Riedel noted that this is a statement by scientists about what they found and upon that basis they are making a statement on public policy.

Doug Smith stated it was a good idea that we as an organization disseminate what we know. We have to be sure what we are disseminating has gone through a critical review. Would members have an opportunity to review and evaluate the material before asking to take a vote. Baunach suggested that the resolutions go through the same procedure as suggested for the others.

Gottfredson stated he did not think it was inconsistent to adopt the death penalty and request for the information on hate violence.

President Chambliss asked for all in favor of the death penalty resolution as proposed by the National Policy Committee to vote: Favor: 7; Opposed: 7; President votes "for". Motion defeated.

Move that the resolution be returned to the National Policy Committee for development to follow the procedures set for in their report and that the Board's vote be reported to the Committee. An alternate option would be to distribute Lauderdale's report to the Board. The National Policy Committee will present their report at the November Board meeting.

A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Joan McCord to refer the death penalty resolution to the National Policy Committee to follow the procedures adopted by the Board for policy procedures at this meeting, along with the indication of the vote and further to give a straw vote on the substantive issue. Motion passed.

Straw vote: How many people favor the resolution as presented to the Board. Opposed: 1.

Thornberry suggested a probable way of getting membership involvement. Mail ballot provides a broader base for the membership to be involved. The committee did not make a strong effort in this area and he stated that he would hope that the committee would deal with this issue.

Wellford stated that the National Policy Committee develops background and presents to the Board. The Board decides what to do with this information. Subject matter and timeliness would go into the Board's decision. Baunach noted that if the Society had a regularized procedure to get the membership involved it would provide the Board some guidance.

Chambliss stated that the Executive Board has the sole power to make the decision and decide one way or another. Wellford stated that the National Policy Committee reports to the Board. The Board will decide if it wants to approve or to disapprove. Will decide how to involve the membership. The Board can do what they want to do.

Baunach made a motion to commend the National Policy Committee for outstanding and exemplary job they did in developing the procedures and providing the information to the Board. Seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried unanimously.

ETHICAL ISSUES COMMITTEE REPORT

President Chambliss thanked the Ethical Issues Committee for their efforts but stated it was not necessary to take up the resolutions issue raised by the Ethical Issues Committee as they were in agreement with the National Policy Committee regarding resolutions.

President Chambliss reported that he would like to appoint an ad hoc committee to look at the drug policies and present recommendations to the National Policy Committee for the Society to take a stand with respect to the drug policies in the U.S. He noted that he had nothing specific in mind other than getting people involved for the future. This committee will communicate with the National Policy Committee.

1988 PROGRAM COMMITTEE AND BUDGET REPORT

Michalowski reported that he had reviewed the actual expenditures for the 1987 meeting in revising his 1988 meeting budget. He stated he would stay with bottom-line projections. The printing and banquet expenses would remain the same--\$9,000 and \$13,000, respectively. He will also stay with the projected income of \$39,750.00 as previously reported. He noted he was projecting a lower attendance at Chicago as it may not be the same draw as Montreal and proposed several changes for the Board's consideration: (1) Change audio visual expenses from \$1,500 to \$3,000; (2) \$2,050.00 for clerical and student assistance be changed to \$1,050.00 and the extra \$500.00 be placed in travel expenses, and (3) additional \$500.00 be added to postage for a total of \$1,700.00.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the 1988 meeting budget. Motion carried unanimously.

Michalowski reported that there are enough meeting rooms, but how many panels will determine how late the program is scheduled each day, and sessions may have to run to 6:00 p.m. As of April 25 there were roughly 204 sessions and roundtables and he noted that this compares to 226 actual sessions not counting poster sessions.

ONE PAGE GUIDE FOR COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

Phyllis Jo Baunach again presented the One Page Guide for Committee Guidelines for the Board's approval. She requested input from the Board regarding the Guide.

Marvin Krohn raised two minor issues: (1) Section IV, No. 2, "the committee may act only when a quorum (majority of the members) is present. If business is conducted by correspondence, the committee may make decisions only when a majority of the members agrees.

McCord suggested that quorum be changed to "opinions represented" or "when a quorum has expressed opinion" and delete second sentence. Shover stated that these are not binding rules.

(2) Section V, No. 1, "On or before October 1 of the year following the appointment of the committee, the Chairperson shall submit to the Executive Secretary a report of the work of the committee during the year. Krohn noted that the committee may not be able to present the information by that date. Baunach stated that the committee should provide information by that date and provide additional information later.

A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Marc Riedel to approve the Guide with the wording to be worked out regarding Section 4, No. 2. Motion carried.

POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

Phyllis Jo Baunach reported that she had gone over the Policy and Procedures Manual report presented at the November meeting and is coming up with ways to enhance the manual. Topics are under consideration. Selection of the newsletter and journal editor and committee guidelines would be included. Site Selection Committee were previously asked for criteria from the Board in selecting sites for annual meetings. Suggestions have been made by the committee how we should memorialize the annual meeting--designing panels, criteria for selecting papers, advertising and exhibits, the banquet--in general, how the annual meeting is put together. Periodical review of administrator; develop selection of third world countries would be additional areas to cover. Baunach said she would like to try to have a more definite report at the November Board meeting for the Board's consideration. What she comes up with in November would be a starting point and would appreciate the opportunity to continue working on the manual.

Riedel noted that the annual meeting is different. The most appropriate format would be a loose leaf notebook that each program chair contributes to.

FELLOWS COMMITTEE REPORT

President Chambliss reported that the Fellows Committee Report had not been received and asked Neal Shover, a member of the Committee, to report on what work had been done. Shover reported that all committee members had received a list of nominees with a request that the information be returned to the chair by the 27th of April, but he had heard nothing further as of this meeting. President Chambliss asked the Executive Secretary to try to reach the chair during the Board meeting to see if a report could be obtained. If this is not possible, the Executive Committee will obtain the information from the Fellows Committee and will make the decision regarding the Fellows award.

Ray Michalowski suggested that the Board might want to consider some other designation rather than "Fellow".

SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

Roland Chilton reported that in response to the Executive Board's decision in Montreal, questionnaires were sent to all ASC members asking about factors that influenced their decisions to attend annual ASC meetings. He reported that although not all those who returned the questionnaire answered all questions, 483 useable forms were returned to the ASC office. Most of these forms (398 or 82%) were from active members. Fifty (50) were sent by student members, and 35 were sent by members who did not indicate their membership status. Chilton reported that air fare and total cost were the two most important items in the survey; city and quality make the difference. Room rates were not a problem and there was a lack of interest in going to resorts. Most of the membership like to go to an interesting city and this is something that future Site Selection Committees should keep in mind. Half the membership are not interested in going to Puerto Rico, Mexico or Hawaii.

With regards to the 1991 meeting, Chilton said since the Society was founded in Berkeley in 1941, that San Francisco would be a good location for the 50th anniversary celebration and it might be possible to find some of the founders or students of founders of the Society.

The new Marriott which will be ready in 1989 expressed some interest but would not come down under \$132.00 for their room rates. The Westin St. Francis could give better rates the third week in November and are suggesting a three-tier rate starting at \$89.00. This is an excellent opportunity to go to a beautiful city and stay at a 5-star hotel. There is also a tremendous overflow opportunity at many of the smaller hotels.

Carl Klockars commented that he had been in contact with the Fairmont Hotel in New Orleans which has 20 meeting rooms and 800-850 hotel rooms and are located one block out of the French Quarter and two streets to Bourbon Street. The Fairmont has guaranteed the ASC a \$85.00 single or double rate for 1991. In 1992, there is a city-wide convention in New Orleans.

Chilton suggested that the Board decide on the basis of the city they want for the 1991 meeting: San Francisco or New Orleans. **There was a motion and a second for the ASC to hold their 1991 annual meeting in San Francisco. Motion carried.** Opposed: 3.

It was suggested that the Committee might follow up the work that Carl has done in New Orleans as a possible site for 1992. New York City was also suggested as a meeting site.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

A copy of the Finance Committee's report was distributed noting that they were asked to review budgets and spending for the past few years, and to provide some general recommendations. Also, they were asked to consider the special need for funds for increasing racial, ethnic, and national diversity in the patterns of participation in ASC.

The Committee recommended the increase of dues by \$10.00 per year and this amount to be set aside to encourage international and racial/background diversity in participation in ASC activities, including receiving the journal and attending meetings.

Lilly noted another issue has come up at this meeting that needs to be placed at the top of the list and that is there is no retirement plan for the administrator and has not been for 10 years. The Board will have to do something about this and it could be expensive. We have also discussed allocating funds for full or part time assistance and in the past we have purchased equipment with possible equipment purchases in the future. Some serious consideration about increasing revenues is overdue.

Debro suggested a graduated dues increase as other organizations use for their dues structure. ACJS has pro-rated their life membership dues over three years.

Riedel suggested keeping for salaries under \$35,000 keep it at \$35.00 and graduate it up to \$100 for people who make \$65,000 or more. Keep the lowest income level at the level we have now and graduate it up.

Wellford inquired how the Society looked financially at this time. If last years figures were correct than the Society made a \$16,000 profit and have done so for the last couple of years and are accumulating excess funds. (1) retirement issue will not be a major commitment of funds; (2) fellowship has a committee to recommend ways to increase minority participation, and (3) participation by individuals from other countries. Earlier we decided to set up criteria before committing money. We may have a request for a dues increase and couldn't justify it to the members with what we are currently providing them.

Thornberry suggested that registration fees could be reduced or eliminated for the annual conference; surplus funds could be used to support minority fellowship programs, adding a permanent assistant for the administrator and additional equipment for the executive office.

Klockars commented that before the Board makes a commitment to raise the dues there should be some schedule for what is to be spent with the increase and inform the membership why we want to increase the dues.

Baunach suggested that the Finance Committee draw up a membership dues schedule with the lowest income being \$35.00 per year and not going any higher than \$100.00 per year and submitting this information to the membership in a survey format showing how much money this would increase our income and prepare a list on the items for which the money would be spent and request the membership's feedback.

Lilly commented that he would like some feedback from the membership. Expenses will need guidelines as we don't know what it will cost to construct a retirement plan for Sarah and the salary for a fulltime assistant. Need to do an investigation on a retirement plan and make up for past omissions. Take some of the money we have now and make a large initial payment to start what we have only 15 year to complete in a retirement plan for Sarah. Lilly asked for some time to research retirement plans, how much money will be needed and the impact of a new employee and then we would be in a better position to take care of these matters and also any new policies that the membership would like us to endorse.

A motion was made by Julius Debro to raise the membership dues as proposed by the Finance Committee an additional \$10.00. **Motion was made to tabl until additional information is obtained. Motion carried unanimously.**

Nicole Rafter moved that the Board ask the Finance Committee to prepare a graduated dues scale from \$35.00 to \$100.00 and set priorities for Discretionary Fund Committee in conjunction with the ASC treasurer and for the treasurer to prepare preliminary figures on the administrator's retirement plan and project the annual increment that this would generate the administrator and salary figure for new employee. Seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. MOTION WITHDRAWN.

Gottfredson noted that if the membership tells the Board what they want this would be the responsibility of the Executive Board and not the Discretionary Fund Committee.

Nicole Rafter moved that the Finance Committee be asked to prepare a graduated dues schedule from \$35.00 to \$100.00; recommend to the Board priorities for new initiatives and services and projected costs of those priorities, and this to be done after the treasurer has prepared retirement figures for the administrator and salary figures for the new employee. MOTION WITHDRAWN.

Phyllis Jo Baunach moved that the membership be canvassed on what the graduated dues schedule would look like and indicate why the Board feels a need for a graduated dues. Seconded by Joan McCord. Motion passed unanimously.

Doug Smith inquired if anyone knew how price changes have affected other societies specifically on graduated fee data. **Charles Wellford moved that Douglas Smith be asked to obtain information from other societies on how a graduated dues structure affected their membership and present to the Board at the November meeting. Motion carried.**

The Board asked the treasurer to prepare a simplified plan for the paper budget presentation and the treasurer agreed to have the plan ready for the new Finance Committee's use in preparing next year's budget. Thornberry expressed his appreciation that the reports presented were in a simpler format than earlier ones and suggested that a summary sheet along the lines presented by the Finance Committee be prepared with greater detail given in a secondary report.

Don Gottfredson moved that the Board accept the presentation of budget information and move to the treasurer for his advice. Seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion passed unanimously.

Wellford suggested that each committee chair receive a letter on what was decided at today's meeting.

STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

President Chambliss reported that Ronald Akers, chair of the Student Paper Competition had contacted him shortly before the meeting to inform him that he had received only three papers two days before the meeting and was not sure that any awards would be presented this year. After the deadline, he received several papers and his committee felt some of these papers would be worthy of consideration and would go through the review process. The Committee's findings will be forwarded to the president upon their completion.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS COMMITTEE

Phyllis Jo Baunach noted regarding the Constitution and By-Laws there were three items to consider:

1) Article 7 of the By-Laws: Board decided at the last meeting to add that the administrator could approve checks up to \$500.00. She was bringing this item to the Board's attention the second time so that it could be added to the By-Laws. **Moved by Charles Wellford and seconded by Marc Riedel to allow the ASC administrator to sign on checks up to \$500.00. Motion passed unanimously.**

2) Constitutional amendment to consider: Section 7B: add "shall be entitled to engage in the nominating process". This would require an amendment to the Constitution.

Wellford commented that there are two points in the election process: (1) mailing the Nominating Committee's recommendation to the membership and asking for write-in candidates, and (2) when the ballots go out. Everyone who is a member at the beginning of the nomination process and who has joined up before the ballots returned are eligible to vote. McCord noted that it could be amended to "all members that are in good standing as of such a date." Wellford noted that members that paid the preceding year and who joined between January and March are eligible to vote. That is the issue. A date specified would disenfranchise them. Be sure that both groups are covered. Debro commented that there should be a grace period but that the voting would take place during that period of time.

Baunach stated that the committee also suggested changes in the area of Divisions. The Society says what they can and cannot do. Concerned about the Divisions not being able to make statement on behalf of ASC. They can make operational policy for the Division but not speak on behalf of the Society.

Charles Wellford moved that the Constitution and By-Laws Committee be requested to report to the Executive Board on the advisability of providing voting membership for student members. Seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried unanimously.

AWARDS COMMITTEE

The Awards Committee report was distributed to the Board for their consideration. The Committee's recommendation for the awards is as follows:

Sutherland Award: William J. Chambliss is first choice; second choice is between Ronald L. Akers, Julia and Herman Schwendinger, and Austin T. Turk.

Sellin-Glueck Award: The choice is Maureen Cain.

Vollmer Award: The subcommittee's first choice is Carolyn Wallace; second choice, Gilbert Bonnemaision, and third choice, James McClosky.

Bloch Award: Sarah M. Hall

President Chambliss suggested that the Board consider the committee's report for each given award and opened the floor for discussion.

Debro commented that the Board establishes committees and hopefully will follow the recommendations of the committee. Thornberry stated that the report the committee provided was not acceptable and was a disservice to the Society and the Board.

Gottfredson stated he did not think the committee's recommendation for the August Vollmer Award was a strong one and spoke briefly on the selection of Lee Brown. He also stated that the Society is not obligated to give the award. President Chambliss reported that he had informed the committee that they were to provide vitas, etc. for the Board's use and this was not done.

A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Don Gottfredson to nominate Lee Brown, Chief of Police, Houston, Texas, for the August Vollmer Award. Motion carried unanimously.

Douglas Smith seconded the motion on the floor from the Awards Committee to present the Sellin-Glueck award to Maureen Cain. Motion carried unanimously.

For the Herbert Bloch award the Committee had two names, Phyllis Jo Baunach and Sarah M. Hall, recommending that Sarah M. Hall receive the award. **After discussion, the Board decided to follow the recommendation of the Committee and present the Bloch Award to Sarah M. Hall.**

President Chambliss asked that his name be withdrawn for consideration of the Edwin Sutherland Award and made a motion that the presidents in office and presidential nominees should not be allowed to receive an award.

Marc Riedel moved; seconded by Don Gottfredson to award the Sutherland Award to Austin T. Turk.

Thornberry commented that the Committee has given the Board a first choice that for good reasons should not be honored this year and recommended three additional names and suggested that the Board limit its discussion to Ronald Akers, Austin Turk, and Julia and Herman Schwendinger. Seconded by Julius Debro.

Klockars stated he did not have an additional candidate to offer but since the committee has not given the Board sufficient information on their selections, he did not think the Board should be bound by the directions of this committee. Debro commented that if a committee gives you reasonable names and you know the works of these people, you should stay with these people as recommendations for the award.

President Chambliss asked for all those in favor of limiting the discussion of the award winners to committee nominated candidates to please vote. Favor: 8; Opposed: 5. Motion carried.

Neal Shover spoke on behalf of Ronald Akers and moved that the Board vote on all three candidates and if one of the candidate manages a simple majority the Board can go with that candidate or go with the two top candidates. Each Board member votes for one person. Vote results: Ronald Akers-9; Julia and Herman Schwendinger-3, and Austin T. Turk-2. **Ronald L. Akers was declared winner of the Edwin Sutherland Award.**

A motion was made by Don Gottfredson and seconded by Julius Debro that the president or president-elect may not be nominated for any award, other than a Fellow award. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Don Gottfredson and seconded by Joan McCord that a nominee for any office in the ASC with election binding may not receive an award with the exception of Fellow. Motion carried unanimously.

Wellford noted that it would require a Constitutional amendment if it is binding beyond this Board.

SENATE BILL 225

Charles Wellford distributed a rough draft copy of a letter he proposed the Society send regarding the development of Senate Bill 2205, the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. He reported on March 23 of this year 31 senators co-sponsored the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 with \$2.5 billion for fighting drugs and crime. The money is to be raised through IRS agents that will generate new tax collections, alcohol and fire arms revenues with the monies being appropriated into seven different titles. One to aid law enforcement at federal level to expand DEA's role in narcotics international block grant program for states in improvements in drug and crime rehabilitation and drug treatment; research and development. Proposes .002% of the Defense Department's budget be allocated for 8 research centers basically on hardware to expand training for state and locals. At our last Board meeting we did support NIJ budget and communicated to Chip Stewart (Phyllis Jo Baunach, Nicole Rafter, Julius Debro and Charles Wellford). Assuming the bill is moving ahead, there are two parts germane to the Society. (1) Title 6 proposes the establishment of eight national technology research centers. We recommend the proposed bill be amended to provide for the authorization of at least \$10,000,000 for a ninth center -- the National Institute of Justice to conduct research on the drug/crime relationship, how information about the drug/crime link can be used by the criminal justice system and what programs law enforcement can use to better control drug importation, manufacture, sale

and distribution; (2) Consider an amendment to Title I to require serious evaluation of block grant and discretionary programs authorized by that section.

Wellford stated it seemed reasonable that the Society would support these two aspects of the bill. We support the goals and not speak to the specific initiatives authorized by the bill except for money and research.

Baunach inquired if the Society's support of this letter fall under the same category of the National Policy Committee? Chambliss spoke strongly against the opening sentence, but that the idea of the letter was a good one.

Baunach inquired if the Society's support of this letter fall under the same category of the National Policy Committee? Chambliss spoke strongly against the opening sentence, but that the idea of the letter was a good one.

Charles Wellford moved that the Society support amendments to Senate Bill 2205 to include research by NIJ and to require evaluation of block grant and discretionary programs. The letter to be signed by the president and sent to the committee. Seconded by Don Gottfredson. Motion carried unanimously.

1988-1989 PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

President-Elect Joan McCord distributed copies of the 1988-1989 committee appointments for the Board's consideration.

Don Gottfredson suggested that the Reno Local Arrangements Committee include representatives from the Reno Family Court Judges Association.

McCord noted that the National Policy Committee will be revised in accordance with the new rules established by the Board. She noted she will also subdivide the Awards Committee.

Don Gottfredson moved an exception that the editor of the newsletter be extended for one year. Seconded by Joan McCord. President Chambliss ruled that the motion was out of order.

Marc Riedel moved the acceptance of the 1988-1989 committee appointments. Seconded by Marvin Krohn. Motion passed unanimously.

Marc Riedel moved that the Board accept the 1989 Reno meeting budget. Seconded by Julius Debro. Motion carried unanimously.

McCord noted that tentative plans for the Reno meeting are on paper and the Program Committee has accepted the tasks assigned them.

NEW BUSINESS

Terence Thornberry suggested that the meetings of the ASC Executive Board be smoke free--no smoking during the meeting. Seconded by Nicole Rafter. Motion amended to meeting to be smoke-free with occasional break periods for those members who wish to smoke in areas outside the meeting. Motion carried. Abstained: 2.

NEXT ASC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

President Chambliss reported the next ASC Executive Board meeting would be Tuesday, November 8, at 6:00 p.m. with a buffet dinner. Buffet will begin at 5:30, followed by the meeting at 6:00 p.m. President-Elect McCord reported her Executive Board meeting would be Saturday, November 12, at noon, or when the annual meeting has concluded.

A motion was made to adjourn the business meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles F. Wellford
Executive Secretary