

ASC Executive Board Minutes
November 12, 1988
Chicago Marriott Hotel - Chicago, Illinois

Members Present: Joan McCord, Charles Wellford, J. Robert Lilly, William Chambliss, Marvin Krohn, Joan Petersilia, Carl Klockars, Douglas Smith, Phyllis Jo Baunach, Neal Shover, Michael Gottfredson, Julius Debro, M. Kay Harris, Hugh Barlow, Ruth-Ellen Grimes, Joseph E. Scott, Roland Chilton

President Joan McCord called the Executive Board Meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. There was one recommended change in the Executive Board agenda to move the Affirmative Action Committee report early. **With the exception of that change, President McCord asked for the approval of the agenda which was moved by J. Robert Lilly and seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried unanimously.**

President McCord announced with pleasure that Charles Wellford has agreed to serve as Executive Secretary for an additional three years. Julius Debro moved that Charles Wellford be approved as Executive Secretary for the three year term; seconded; motion carried unanimously.

William Chambliss suggested that the Society have a rule that the positions of Executive Secretary and Treasurer be only permitted two three year terms. He noted that he did not want to bring the matter at this time but suggested for future consideration. President McCord suggested that this idea be sent to the Constitution and By-Laws Committee for their consideration and presentation at the mid-winter Board meeting.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE REPORT

William Chambliss reported that the committee had met and come up with a number of recommendations for the Board's consideration. He suggested that the recommendations be presented and then voted on one by one.

(1) The ASC establish an Affirmative Action Committee as a continuing standing committee of ASC.

(2) The ASC Affirmative Action Committee should develop a 5-year plan to increase the number of blacks in criminology. The Committee specifically talked about it in terms of blacks rather than minorities for several reasons. One of them is because historically blacks have been the most disadvantaged and disproportionately represented in the Society. Secondly, because the impact on them as far as offenders in the criminal justice system has been the greatest and is the greatest in our society. One of the problems that was discussed in our meeting was that if you have programs for minorities, the programs tend to become rapidly dominated by Asian-Americans or landed immigrants from Asia and the potential for black participation becomes much less very quickly because of the differences of all kinds of things we know about.

(3) The third recommendation is that the Society designate \$12,000 for an ASC Minority Fellowship to be awarded by April 1 to a black admitted to a doctoral program in criminal justice or criminology by a procedure to be approved by the Executive Committee. We didn't spell out the exact procedure for that but as most organizations do that have these fellowships, they have a committee that reviews applicants and makes a

that stipulates what Standing Committees are. It's her discretion.

President McCord stated she personally felt it was dangerous to tie the hands of future presidents as time passes, one hopes--this one, me in particular--that we are not going to need Affirmative Action Committees in the indefinite future. I hope that the Committee for this year will immediately begin doing something to

integrate our Society so that we won't need a permanent committee for Affirmative Action.

Debro stated that historically looking at the past this has not been the case. McCord stated she was speaking of the future. Debro stated he did not anticipate any changes in the future. McCord commented that she hoped he was wrong.

Joan Petersilia inquired if she was right in assuming that the committees we assume are standing are at the discretion of the president to appoint every year? McCord stated that was correct. Petersilia stated it has some effect when you become president-elect you are handed the committees that were appointed the previous year and the tradition has been to appoint those committees. McCord agreed and noted that it has been changing through the years. Chambliss noted that in a sense this is out of order because there is no mechanism for appointing standing committees and noted that what McCord is saying is that she has already appointed an Affirmative Action Committee. If the next president chooses to do that they can but unless we change the Constitution to establish committees that have to be appointed by the president, this would be the only one. We have not done that in the past. McCord stated that you cannot make a change in the Constitution. Debro stated there was no precedent one way or the other. Chambliss stated that our assumption was that these were standing committees but apparently Baunach is saying they are not.

Baunach reported that according to Roberts Rules of Order which we are following, a standing committee is one that is appointed for a specific period of time, like a year as you have done. A special committee would be one appointed for a special kind of project, so when you are saying that we should appoint a standing committee, it sounds like to me that you would like one appointed for a year which you have just done. Chambliss agreed that the issue was settled. **McCord noted she would appoint an Affirmative Action Committee on her list for this year which was not previously on her list. She agreed to do it and it is her privilege.** Debro commented that it also assumes that other committees we have do not necessary have to be appointed. Wellford noted that for the record there is one exception to that--the Editorial Committee has to be appointed and is described in the Constitution; the second is that while the president can select the committees, the Board has to approve them. McCord stated that she would come prepared with a proposal for an Affirmative Action Committee for this year at the mid-winter meeting and inquired if she was empowered to have an ad hoc committee in the interim. Wellford stated he was sure she could or could ask the Executive Committee to approve it as they can approve committees or do anything in the interim.

Chambliss said the second recommendation is that the ASC Affirmative Action Committee should develop a five year plan to increase membership, but that is also at the president's discretion, Chambliss noted. That can be done when the committee is appointed he noted.

Chambliss reported the third one, then, is the major recommendation of the committee that \$12,000 be set aside for the ASC Minority Fellowship to be awarded by April 1 to a black admitted to doctoral program in criminal justice or criminology by a procedure to be approved by the Executive Committee. Seconded by Neal Shover.

Marvin Krohn agreed with the sentiment of the motion and I think it is money or the notion of supporting a black doctoral student is a good one in terms of the use of the Society's money. The question I have is the mechanism to do that. I know for example at Albany if we had a qualified black student apply there, I don't think

there would be any problem whatsoever for that student to get a fellowship or at least an assistantship at the highest rate that we offer the assistantship, so I don't know whether that is going to do what you want it to do and maybe if we could think of perhaps a more creative way to use the money and use the money as a supplement to a fellowship or an assistantship that a student might apply to a university, if my assumption that universities in general are supportive of minority students toward their graduate programs is correct.

Carl Klockars said that he agreed entirely and could speak from the University of Delaware experience that Delaware would provide all of the financial support that any qualified black graduate student wanted so that and I think is replicated in colleges and universities all over the place. My preference would be to see the amount of \$12,000 applied toward Bill's fourth suggestion where resources ought to be applied. In the real world out there, it's not a problem of getting qualified candidates, but encouraging undergraduates to take up that career. At Delaware we are starting the ASA minority program specifically to encourage that and I think that that's going to be a big payoff.

Wellford stated he was a member of the committee that met to discuss this and raised the concern that Marvin Krohn just spoken to in the committee and argued for the fourth item which I think is also very important. What persuaded me as to why we should do both of these things is some statements made by Darnell Hawkins primarily pointing out that we are really doing with this fellowship as much as symbolic activity is anything. One more fellowship is not going to make a major difference for blacks entering the field of criminology, but ASC establishing as all other major professional organizations and intellectual societies have done in the social sciences as far as we can tell, a fellowship designated for blacks will be part of the message that this organization, as an organization, cares about encouraging minorities to enter our field and I was convinced and am still convinced that symbolic value is worth the \$12,000 that this Society has been asked to apply to.

Debro added to what Wellford stated saying that generally it depends on where you go to university. My wife has \$40,000 in loans now and she's at Northwestern and she has scholarships. It's not enough to go to some universities. At some universities it would be sufficient, but the committee tried to look at the ASA model and look at their scholarship program for minorities which has been in existence now for over 10 years and that was just the beginning and was not the question of whether or not the organization would provide the money, but that the money would be funded in some way by the organization--whether it's from foundations or whether it's from the organization. The committee felt that the Executive Board should make the decision to do it and then they should come up with the money.

Chambliss said there was a distinction to be made between qualified and best qualified. At Delaware where I set on the admissions board for about ten years, it's true that a black student who was equally competitive with a white student would get a teaching assistantship, but it wasn't true that qualified black students always got teaching assistantships and at George Washington University it is the same way. Last year we had a black applicant whose grade point average was not as high as the 3.7 average of the white applicant we had and the white applicant got the teaching assistantship. That black applicant would have gotten it had we had one set aside for a black applicant. And at Delaware, year after year that happened to. Highly qualified black applicants would not get the teaching assistantships because they were not as highly qualified as the white applicant and that's the problem and that's why I don't think it's true as Marvin says that there are plenty of things. It is right. Other things being equal, i.e. grade point average and GRE's, black students will get teaching assistantships when compared with white students, but other things are not equal and what we need to do is to encourage more black membership by

having black students who can come to graduate school are fully qualified but are not as qualified as competitive white students.

Michael Gottfredson asked the committee to speak to why hispanics are not included. Chambliss said it would be quite possible to do that and said he felt the Board could easily make that recommendation. Gottfredson suggested a friendly amendment.

President McCord said that if she understood rather than saying \$12,000 for an award from ASC for blacks, it would read for minority candidates? Chambliss replied no, it would be for blacks or hispanics. Chambliss said he would accept that amendment; the seconder agreed. Lilly inquired if it was assumed that if this passed that the Society will contribute \$12,000 out of its current budget or is the Committee going to propose ways of raising \$12,000? McCord stated she believed the recommendation is that the Society will commit \$12,000, but not necessarily out of the current budget. It could be through grants or contracts. Initially Debro stated it could be out of the current budget, but from then on the Committee could seek additional funding. The minority fellowship from ASA is funded by NIMH primarily and from other funding sources. Also they receive monies from professors who donate money to ASA for the minority fellowship program so there could be a check-off on dues, for instance, or in addition to dues if you would like to give a certain amount to the minority fellowship fund, you could do it that way. Petersilia inquired if the Board was passing a motion that this was not a one time but a continuing commitment of the ASC? McCord asked that the wording of that be read as her understanding was continuing but we might want an amendment that's for some number of years.

Chambliss read again the wording--to designate \$12,000 a year for an ASC Minority Fellowship to be awarded by April 1 to a black and now black or hispanic admitted to a doctoral program in criminal justice or criminology by a procedure to be approved by the Executive Committee -- so it is a permanent commitment. Of course a permanent commitment doesn't mean it can't be changed. Next year you vote to not do it ever again, but the way it is worded and the intention is that this will be an established fellowship of ASC.

Baunach raised a question for clarification for the procedures established by the Executive Committee not the Executive Board? Chambliss stated it did say the Executive Committee but it could certainly make it the Executive Board and he would have no objections to that. Baunach stated she would prefer the Executive Board. Wellford pointed out to the mover that if you do that the Board doesn't meet until next year, it will not have procedures approved in order to make April 1. It will be delaying it for one year. Chambliss noted that was the reason for making it the Executive Committee this year. Baunach stated that it seemed to her if we were developing policies and procedures the entire Executive Board ought to be involved in doing that for whatever purpose and that was her concern.

McCord asked if Chambliss was speaking to the proposed amendment or something else. Chambliss asked if she would be willing to make the amendment that the Executive Committee could do it this year but in the future the Executive Board would be the appropriate body? Baunach replied that she hoped that once a policy and procedure is developed on this we consistently use it, so perhaps if the Executive Committee came up with guidelines for this time and then referred to the Executive Board to develop a policy for perpetuity that seemed reasonable to her so that the process could be expedited for this year. Chambliss stated it would be acceptable to him.

Lilly stated that Chambliss asked him and the Finance Committee to consider how money could be generated for this and only one person was available, Merry Morash, chair of the Finance Committee, and she and I talked about this and their conclusion was that this year's budget has only increased about \$3,500 and that is to cover the commitment we have made to begin Sarah's retirement, so we don't feel that we have \$12,000 that we can take out of incoming income because we don't anticipate it being there and what was recommended is that if the Society wants to make a \$12,000 commitment, the Board should decide where they want the money to come from and we have five recommendations which should be considered and included--one of them or any or none of them in this discussion. One is to use money from our interest. There is a little bit of money right now in the budget that we are not sure whether or not it will come in, but it's under \$500. We are that close, we think, for this next coming year. We could raise dues, except for students, \$10-\$15 perhaps to make enough money for that purpose. We might also increase the amount of money we are taking in at registration and designate it for the proposal or dip into our reserves. We might want to address those issues to see what you want to do.

Klockars inquired if there was an issue about a specific check-off on dues. One would get a dues application and then a promotion with that for the existence of the minority scholarship fund and members then invited to check off an extra \$5,10,15,20 or whatever it is to specifically designate it toward that. That was my understanding of what Merry Morash had recommended from the Finance Committee. Lilly replied it was his understanding that it was recommended back to the Finance Committee to discuss the whole real of how to raise money and that was to be included in it. I don't think that was approved as being a way in which we would actually implement.

McCord noted that she believed he was remembering an earlier report, I remember it also from last year. Lilly noted he had one follow up on that. I would like to see the Society raise the \$12,000 and then decide how to spend it rather than to decide to spend it and not have the \$12,000. We haven't gotten past the issue of how to raise the money yet. Wellford stated that if we passed this motion then undoubtedly the Finance Committee will come back and recommend what Carl has just said that we add that to the dues at a minimum. At the same time I think we should recognize we have done already what Bob Lilly has asked us to do and that is to raise the money before we commit it. Remember at our Board meeting on Tuesday I asked if it was the case that last year we had a "profit" of \$16,000 and the answer was yes. The year before that we had a "profit" of about \$16,000. We have been accumulating a profit of that amount for the last few years. Now, when we project income and expenditures they always marveously come out equal. Everybody knows how you do that, but in fact, we should anticipate since we are not increasing, we have the preview already, expenditures very much that we should be next year facing a \$10,12,15,000 income surplus and what we are saying is that since we have had a record of doing that for a couple of years, let's anticipate that it will happen again. Even if it doesn't happen we have had profits for the last few years that we could "dip" into, but if we anticipate what's happened in the past few years we will in fact make the money that we are asking you to commit to the fellowship.

Baunach stated that they were both raising a concern which she would echo when you raised the idea of the scholarship although in theory it is an excellent idea, can we afford this on an annual basis. I would be concerned that we might not at some point have the funds to do something like that. I would be very concerned about that.

Wellford stated that as the mover suggested this could be reconsidered each year. If it turns out next year that we in fact incur a \$30,000 deficit then that year we probably will say that we don't want to take a chance on the fellowship.

Klockars proposed an amendment to this which would encourage the Executive Committee this year to use and institute on this year's membership solicitation a check-off specifically for this. That is a line underneath on the dues form which says that we have created this scholarship and ask and invite the members to add some additional amount for specifically designated as that purpose. Let's see what kind of response we get.

It can't hurt and I would like to offer that as an amendment to the motion. The amendment is that we attempt to fund as much of this as we can through a check-off on the membership which asks for specific donations to it.

McCord inquired that when we request the dues this year it will have a mechanism for adding that but it is not a condition? Klockars noted that it could be considered next year or at the winter Board meeting when we consider the full procedures for implementing this but for the present time, this would bind the Executive Council who will be considering the procedures for this to this mechanism as a fund raising mechanism.

Chambliss stated he was not sure and asked Carl if what he was saying is that the funds must be raised through this procedure. No. This procedure should be implemented simultaneously. That's right. Chambliss stated he would accept that, as did Shover. **Chambliss read the motion as it stands: That the ASC designate \$12,000 per year for an ASC Minority Fellowship to be awarded by April 1 to a black or hispanic admitted to a doctoral program in criminal justice or criminology by a procedure to be approved by the Executive Committee for 1989 and by the Executive Board thereafter. That the dues statement be immediately altered to include a voluntary contribution by the membership to this fund.**

Ruth-Ellen Grimes asked to interject one practical idea. I empathize with Julius' wife with the amount of loan, but if you only give it for one year what happens for the second year of that individual's residency. Most doctoral programs are at least two years and I think it would be awful if all of a sudden you didn't have another year of funding and you might not get through the program.

Wellford noted that the Committee did discuss this and one of the things we will recommend in the criteria I am sure unless the Committee changes its mind is that the school receiving this award has to commit to the second year. That there will be a matching arrangements. There is two years of support with us initiating it with the one year.

McCord noted that she understood from Chambliss that the funds would go to the individual, not the school. Chambliss said this was correct. Debro noted that basically you would talk with the university at that time for committing for the time to finish up, so if the student is still in good standing on a year by year basis then that university will continue to give the fellowship. ASA commits as I understand it and Darlene has had one of those for one year and they give you the amount of money for one year and generally involve themselves in seeing that there is a year by year commitment until the person finishes all the course work. McCord inquired if they were envisioning that we would know before giving the award what school the person would be in. Debro said yes. The person would have to be accepted at one of the universities before you get support.

Chambliss said motion specifically states "who has been accepted into a criminal justice or criminology course". Petersilia questioned about being accepted into a

criminal justice or criminology program. What does that mean? I am in Social Ecology would somebody be eligible? Is that a criminal justice criminology department? The language is rather restrictive. Debro stated that what you are looking at is that sociology commits to sociology programs. If you want criminal justice people, there are criminology and criminal justice programs.

McCord stated she shared the concerns that her counterpart Joan mentioned--that you don't want to rule out social ecology, political science, public administration. We want the people who will study the fields, not the programs to be named. Don't you agree? Chambliss stated that this was discussed and there was sentiment on the Committee that it should not be opened to students to go to sociology to get a Ph.D. with a specialty in criminology or to go to social science to get a specialty in criminology. I myself do not agree with that but the Committee did specifically want that. McCord asked Petersilia to propose that as an amendment so that the Board could discuss that particular issue before we vote on the main proposal?

Petersilia amended the motion to say that a criminal justice or criminal justice related program, and I don't know exactly what the wording is. Klockars inquired if we could leave criminology broadly understood at this point and wait until we are going to work out all of these fine details later. That is, let us be understood that criminology is for this first round between now and the winter Board meeting is to be broadly defined and then let us work out all these fine details later. McCord noted that criminology is not currently in there, though. Klockars noted criminology or criminal justice broadly defined and leave it at that and worry about all the fine detail at the mid-winter meeting when someone has had a chance to really study it.

Lilly noted that he just wanted to be clear on what was happening here. If this is passed, it means that the proposed budget for this year will be increased on the expenditure side by \$12,000. Is that correct? Yes, that is correct replied Chambliss. Lilly stated that the proposed budget that we came in with balanced will be unbalanced by \$12,000. The question I want you to consider and to give the treasurer and Finance Committee direction to, is how shall we pay for that \$12,000 if we do not have income -- which source of income or do we use reserve funds? If we don't have a \$12,000 increase in cash flow as Charles says we have had and probably will have, do you want this to be paid for out of reserves. Smith stated he did not study the budget but that he was familiar with one aspect of it and that pertains to the journal. It was his belief that the operation of CRIMINOLOGY by itself would make the money to cover this thing and he said some of the projected printer costs seemed to be \$10,000 above last year's. Christensen has not raised it's page costs and we do not intend to ask for more money noted Smith. There is a \$10,000 increase in projected expenditures, but it's a paper increase and there is \$10,000 of the \$12,000 needed.

Debro stated he felt that Doug had answered Lilly's question. **Shover stated that the motion as it now stands specifies a program in criminology or criminal justice. As a seconder I would feel more comfortable if that were a course of study in criminology or criminal justice, speaking to the question of whether we want to be overly restrictive. McCord asked Shover he would put that in as a proposed amendment to the motion. Shover noted he would be happy with that. Seconded by Debro.**

Chambliss asked to comment on it first. He stated that as he understands the reading of this, and P.J. can be the legal authority on this, it says a doctoral program. The emphasis as I understood it from the Committee was that it be a doctoral program. The issue we were talking about when we said doctoral program was not a master's program. That was the issue we were talking about, so I don't think the emphasis that you are placing on it as a program in criminal justice, in other words

putting the program into the wrong thing as I read it, but then how would you rephrase it to still have it be a doctoral program. Shover replied a course of doctoral studies in criminology and criminal justice. A course of studies leading to a doctorate suggested by Klockars. Debro stated it will not, Joan's program in social ecology is not in criminology or criminal justice, is it?

McCord noted to Chambliss that broadly defined is part of what you are saying there so that when the Board votes on it they will know there is some discretion. Call for the question.

Chambliss was asked to read the motion again: Designate \$12,000 a year for an ASC Minority Fellowship to be awarded by April 1 to a black or hispanic admitted to a doctoral program in criminal justice or criminology by a procedure to be approved by the Executive Committee for 1989 and by the Executive Board thereafter. That the dues statement be altered immediately to include a voluntary contribution from the membership for the fund. Motion carried unanimously.

Hugh Barlow inquired if the Board wanted him to put something in the newsletter about this as people are already applying for 1989. Do you want this in? Wellford inquired if there shouldn't be an agreement on criteria procedures before we place it in the newsletter or you will get people calling Sarah saying where do I apply, etc. Chambliss said the Executive Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee will work on this immediately and as soon as anything is ready it will be sent to Barlow for insertion in the newsletter.

McCord inquired if Chambliss would like to discuss the summer program as proposed by the Committee. Chambliss noted that there are three members of the Committee at the meeting and suggested with their permission to postpone the matter until the mid-winter Board meeting. Debro stated that Marjorie Zatz spoke to him yesterday and informed him that they are starting a program for minorities in the summer to work with students who will be going into Ph.D. programs to do exactly what we were talking about, so we will get information from that program and where they got funded, but they are looking for minority students this summer and they will pay all fees and transportation to Arizona for the summer for about six weeks and they will get credit. McCord requested that all information available be brought to the mid-winter meeting.

McCord directed the Affirmative Action Committee to get in touch with the Grants and Contracts Committee to try to raise funds for the amendment just discussed.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Treasurer Robert Lilly reported that one member of the Finance Committee, Merry Morash, met with him and went over the budget and increased it both in terms of income and expenditures only \$3,900 over last year's budget and we offered you a proposed balanced budget and as treasurer I will accept the responsibility for adding \$12,000 deficit at this time as I haven't had time to consult with the Finance Committee as to how we would change the funds to appear to make it balanced. The Society is in fine financial condition and there are no major changes except we are committing 10% of Sarah's salary to a retirement plan to be devised specifically over the next 6 months.

Debro on an informal question that Coramae Richey Mann said that she was unaware that the Finance Committee was meeting.

Wellford noted that she had ample notice as it was in the program and she was contacted via letter as all other committee members. **Lilly moved that the proposed 1989 budget be accepted. Seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried.**

Debro requested from the treasurer that the budget be distributed a couple of days earlier because none of the Board has had a chance to look at it in detail and he was sure that it was okay but would like to have a little more time to study it. Lilly said he would try to do that.

President McCord said she felt that was a very good point and noticed in going through P.J.'s material, we are suppose to have all these papers 10 days in advance and it makes good sense and you can't digest these quickly.

Unless there is strong objection, President McCord stated the next Executive Board would be meeting at 6:00 p.m. in New Orleans, hotel to be arranged. We

understand the Meridian down there is wonderful if we can get a reasonable roommate, room rate, but you will be notified. Several Board members liked the idea of roommate. McCord stressed 6:00 p.m. Friday night and for Board members to plan on staying through noon on Sunday -- March 17-19.