

ASC Executive Board Minutes  
March 17, 1989  
Fairmont Hotel - New Orleans, Louisiana

Members Present:

Joan McCord	J. Robert Lilly	Charles F. Wellford
Neal Shover	Joan Petersilia	Michael Gottfredson
Marvin Krohn	M. Kay Harris	Doug Smith
Carl Klockars	P. J. Baunach	Julius Debro
Susan White		

President Joan McCord called the meeting to order and gave special thanks to Carl Klockars for arranging the meeting facilities and hospitality that the Board has been shown. Julius Debro moved the of the Board agenda; seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried.

President McCord called for the approval of the November 8 minutes. Carl Klockars commented on the major upgrade in the quality of the minutes. M. Kay Harris questioned the 20 years payment with income of \$20,000 under the retirement plan for the administrator. **The minutes should reflect at age 60 with equivalent of 20 years of payment. Approved as amended by Carl Klockars; seconded by Neal Shover.**

Joan Petersilia inquired if a report could be prepared by William Chambliss listing the waivers that were permitted at the Chicago meeting.

The November 12, 1988 minutes were corrected to reflect November 12, 1989. On page 4, National Policy Committee, M. Kay Harris reported that she and Wellford gave the report on behalf of Malcolm Klein and not Margaret Zahn. Minutes will be amended to reflect a report of the National Policy Committee was presented. Phyllis Jo Baunach suggested that the sentence be eliminated. Charles Wellford reported that the reason the two rough attachments A and B were attached to the minutes was to make sure that these were the procedures that were approved by the Board regarding the Site Selection and National Policy Committees since there seemed to be some confusion. If the minutes are approved with these attachments, than a more formal version of this will be sent to the chairs of the National Policy Committee and Site Selection Committee.

President McCord noted that the Board meeting was being recorded for discussion and action taken so that it will be a record for future and for other Boards to know what we have done substantively--not just what the topics were. Page 2, Advertising & Exhibits Report, M. Kay Harris inquired about the item on the last line stating individual books be charged \$35.00 per books, it should be clarified that it is per title, not per copy. Lilly noted that it has always been advertised as per book so that the statement is correct. Harris also inquired under the Membership Committee report inquired what is the difference between international membership and international members and wondered if it should have been something else. Lilly stated that one is people and one is people belonging to the International Division. Klockars suggested that international membership should be stricken out and insert "who have not renewed their membership and international members". Marvin Krohn reported that Andre Normandeau was not present at the November meeting and should have his name removed from members present.

McCord noted on page 5 there is an addition. The Board talked about sending a letter to Michael Quinlan apologizing for the disruption of his session at Chicago and McCord reported to the Board that she had sent a letter.

Krohn reported on page 4 regarding the Editorial Board report, the last paragraph, the last sentence, instead of publishing CRIMINOLOGY, it should be printing.

Minutes approved as amended by M. Kay Harris; seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. Motion carried.

### **TREASURER'S REPORT:**

J. Robert Lilly called the Board's attention to the revised financial reports distributed (3B, 3C, 3F, and 3G). At the last Board meeting there was the approval of the Minority fellowship which had not been incorporated in the proposed budget. A revised 1989 budget is presented to incorporate the minority fellowship expenditure of \$12,000.

On the original 3A, the results of the 1988 close out of expenditures and income. The budget was \$170,460.00 for expenditures and that actual expenditures were about \$201,000.00, but that is offset by the fact that our income which had been budgeted at \$170,000 was greater than that -- was \$201,000. When I look at the (3D), Balance Sheet, Cash Basis, we began with \$113,770 and we ended 1988 with \$126,526. If I looked at that we made about \$13,000 in 1988. My continuing problem has been that we always seem to end up with balanced income and expenditures, but we always seem to increase in our cash basis. One thing accounting for that could be interest income.

He also expressed concern at the degree of overspending in a variety of categories -- newsletter, Executive Board, etc. Lilly reported that the assets have never been touched and in fact have been increased. Wellford inquired what can we do or what do we do to control expenditures against line items approved. Should the treasurer when the newsletter reaches its budget figure tell the editor that he is out of money. He noted if there was an overrun on the cost of the newsletter or the Executive Board and the money was available, it was paid. He stated it was a guiding principal but not a binding one. Lilly noted that the assets have not been touched, but rather have been increased. Julius Debro inquired if there should be a limit on how much can be spent over the budget before going to the Board for approval, suggesting that the figure might be somewhere between 10-15%. Over that percentage the Executive Committee should make a decision.

Petersilia noted we take a low ball budget and repeat it over and over again, wouldn't it make sense to reflect the average of the last three years and the treasurer's discretion would be to approve over 10%. Our budget should reflect our experience and our budget does not do that. **Wellford offered a motion that no expenditures will be allowed that exceed the amount in the line item of the approved budget without the approval of the Executive Board. No second to the motion.**

Baunach inquired if this was for a single expenditure or no expenditures as a composite across the year. Wellford noted it would be useful to force the Board to be realistic in setting the budget and takes the burden off the treasurer to of making a decision if it is appropriate or in the best interest of the Society and would allow the Board to make decisions to use the excess capital in the Society. We allow the budget to overspend incrementally and serially without discussion in the Executive Board. Klockars stated the motion was too harsh; that is, you can't spend one penny more than the line item says without calling in the Executive Board. You have to allow some range so that if you put

\$15,000 in and it goes to \$16,500 it is not a problem. Agreed with the idea of better estimating our costs and hopefully within 15% of our projected costs. The budget is prepared in November and before the Board suggests new line expenditures. Set a reasonable range of tolerance.

Lilly inquired if the Board was concerned about spending money or going over budget. Debro stated he did not feel the treasurer should have unlimited discretion in the budget. There should be a percentage limit for the treasurer's discretion and anything over that would come to the Executive Board. We still don't understand the budget and should inform our members through the newsletter how to understand the budget.

**Carl Klockars moved that the Board direct the Finance Committee to take up the problem of the apparent discrepancy between projected and actual expenditures in the budget and secondly to develop adequate mechanisms of accountability for exercise of discretion by the treasurer in financial matters. Seconded by Neal Shover. Wellford asked for friendly amendment to drop treasurer from the motion.**

**Carl Klockars moved that the Board direct the Finance Committee to take up the problem of the apparent discrepancy between projected and actual expenditures in the budget and secondly to develop adequate mechanisms of accountability for exercise of discretion in financial matters. Seconded by Neal Shover. Wellford asked for friendly amendment to drop treasurer from the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

Wellford stated he wanted to make it clear in his comments that it was not meant to be critical of Bob's decision about how money was expended but to raise the issue of what's happening in our budget.

Lilly argued against the Board's good intention as the Finance Committee is not equipped to make this overall policy decision because they understand the budget even less than we do. Suggested that the Executive Committee address this issue and see if that committee could come up with acceptable guidelines satisfactory for the Board. The Finance Committee is good in giving advice on specific items in the budget but not in terms of viewing it long term, one year to the next. Would feel better having advice from the Executive Committee and would propose that as an amendment to the motion. Klockars spoke against Lilly's proposed amendment. Shover inquired if the Finance Committee could be invited to ask other members of the ASC or this group to meet with them to make suggestions to the Executive Board.

Klockars suggested as a method of operation that the Finance Committee would make advisory recommendation to the Board and the Board would not be bound to their suggestions and secondly that the Treasurer would make a detailed proposal to the Finance Committee to solve it and would have the benefit of your expertise. The Committee would have a chance to challenge your ideas and then bring back to the Board.

President McCord stated she had some questions and would like Bob Lilly to explain to the Board as he had explained to her privately regarding the difference in Sarah's figures on the journal subscription amount and the budgeted amount and Bob should explain how it came about before turning to the report on the Publications Committee. Lilly explained the difference in the cost of producing per volume such as the volume for 1987 and the amount of money spent on the journal in the same year because some of the expenses can be carried over from the previous year.

**Charles Wellford moved the acceptance of the Treasurer's Report; seconded by Carl Klockars. Motion carried.**

Administrator's Retirement Plan: Lilly reminded the Board that there was not a retirement plan for Sarah and after much discussion the Finance Committee came up with the recommendation which is part of the minutes that we approve tonight. Last year, also, it was brought to the Board's attention that to finance what the Finance Committee recommended for Sarah's retirement would have cost probably to a minimum of \$90-95,000 and the Board asked that the treasurer and the Committee continue to investigate how to deal with Sarah's retirement. This question is probably from the Finance Committee's point of view and the treasurer's experience secondly only to the complications involved in the negotiating of getting out of our contract with Sage and publishing the journal on our own. The Finance Committee recommended that Sarah have a retirement plan paid up equivalent to 20 years contribution at the age of 60. It seems to be that would be very difficult to do financially for us. Sarah does not desire to retire at 60 and would give us another 5 years to work on the plan. I would like to recommend, not by the way of a motion, that the Society agree that we have a goal that Sarah should retire at 65 if she wants to with an income of \$20,000 per year. To accomplish that we have two routes to go: (1) to put \$60,000 lump sum into an annuity or to invest the amount of money it would take to produce that income over the next 15 years. Assuming that the Board would prefer to go the second route, it would cost the Society approximately \$7,000 per year or maybe a little less for 15 years and that would produce at a conservative rate of growth that Sarah would have \$20,000 a year retirement when she retired at 65. at is the Sarah side of the story. There are some organizational implications--we are just not setting up a retirement plan for Sarah--we are setting up a retirement plan for the Society and there are some subthemes which are relatively minor but they represent commitment such as what does vesting mean for us--how long would a future employee have to work before they are vested and how much would they be able to take out of the plan once they become vested should they decide to leave. Those are relatively minor things to take care. Since we started with Sarah as an issue, Lilly wanted to address that first. We are talking about an organizational commitment to a retirement plan which involves written agreement or plan available to anyone who works for us as to what our retirement plan would be for them. McCord asked that it be written in the plan that it must be a full-time employee which Lilly said it would be full-time employees only. There had been a discussion about whether the Society intended in the past to create a retirement plan for Sarah and an obligation to be retrospective. We had no document stating we had a commitment, so Lilly recommended that we not look back and look to the fact that there is 15 years in front of us and decide what we would like to do in 15 years for our employee.

**AT THIS POINT SARAH WAS ASKED TO LEAVE THE ROOM.**

### **ELECTIONS REPORT:**

Wellford reported on the recent elections. Nominations approved by the Board were mailed out and in response to that were some 54 write-in ballots to add Carl Klockars to the ballot for Vice President. The ballots and resumes are being printed and will be mailed out approximately March 27. The deadline for the receipt of ballots is June 5.

### **1989 PROGRAM COMMITTEE REPORT**

Susan White, Program Chair, reported that the deadline for submissions for the meeting was March 15 and had contacted committee members this past week to find that the action was increasing on abstract submission but was not overwhelming. Have been told that in the past this is the way it is and that deadlines do not seem to mean much. White noted

that her instructions to the Program Committee were to recruit panels actively themselves which they have done. We are going to have a number of good panels. The actual overall number she did not know at this time. The Family Violence Lab has come up with 12 different panels that they are organizing themselves or getting someone else to organize. Gary Marx has a panel on Human Rights and is also doing a lot of work on drug panels. White said she would actually see the panel information by April 15 and will be in a better position to see whether we must be able to do a panel on drugs that is more oriented toward politicians or practitioners who are in the field who want to argue legalization or debate it. Jerry Skolnick is going to do our introductory session on Wednesday afternoon instead of the Mayor Reno. Skolnick wrote a book on the Regulation of Gambling. William Well has agreed to come. White reported that she and McCord had been working for some time to get Attorney General Thornburg to come to the meeting but noted that it was very difficult to get through to Thornburg. McCord asked the Board if they had any suggestions for contacting Thornburg. Wellford suggested that James Stewart may be the best way to contact to Thornburg.

White stated that Carl Klockars suggested a massive organization of series of breakfasts where each table would have someone of note and people would sign up ahead of time to have breakfast--25 people on Thursday and Friday setting at 25 separate tables--sessions entitled "Breakfast with ...."; eight people per table at \$10.00 per person would be a break even operation. White inquired for those 25 who appear at these breakfasts, will they be the same 25 or will it be 50 and would it count as an appearance on the program as our present rule states only two appearances on the program are allowed. These appearances could be considered as "waivers". Currently, we do not have near 230 sessions and will probably go through an extension. White noted that she and Sarah decided to do that rather than making any kind of announcement of extension of time. White circulated the red meeting flyer that will be distributed showing her address as to appearing on the program and Sarah's address for registration materials. White noted that she went through last year's program and distributed it into the twelve categories of our program. Each of the Program Committee members will have a list of paper presenters or panel presenters that White arbitrarily states is in their category. White reported that she will be going to Reno at the end of May to meet with Jill Rosenbaum, Local Arrangements Chair, and spend several days making final decision about rooms and hopefully will not have to return again before the meeting. Sending out shortly to three tour operators each of which at my invitation sent materials on what could be done and costs involved and will ask each of them to present a bid for what we want specifically and will then see which is the best bid. White stated she had two problems that she would like to ask advise on:

- 1) Changes that are made--not last minute--but constantly from the time of the preliminary program and participants find out when they are on the program and contact the chair stating they cannot be on the program at the assigned time. Apparently it is an enormous problem, and I don't know what we are going to do. Is the bigger program, the better? At a certain point, say, May 15 I am looking at 150 panels should I go out and beat the bushes? The comment from the Board was yes that we have to hit a minimum number to reach our commitment to the hotel.

Neal Shover commented that if people agree to organize a session they ought to be told that they do so with the understanding that the session will be scheduled at the convenience of the program chair. Certain changes are unavoidable but every effort should be made to discourage them. White stated that she had talked to previous program chairs and they all told her that it was going to happen and the question is when do you cut it off and do you at some point say to them do not come to the meeting.

Doug Smith asked it would be conceivable if each organizer in various areas were told they could have so many panels each day at certain times and they slot them into times. White said she would think about that but in the end it may be more trouble than it is worth and may not eliminate any problems. If people make the request through the process they will try to be accommodated. White reported that McCord had suggested that the registration fees be increased due to the cost of the banquet meals.

J. Robert Lilly made a motion to increase the Reno registration fees from \$45 to \$50 for members and non-members from \$55 to \$60; seconded by Julius Debro. Favor: 1; Opposed: 11. Motion failed.

Carl Klockars reminded the Board that in Reno there will be a \$1.00 per room rebate for every room night sold which will be given to the Society.

White reported that the Reno meetings will begin between 2:00 and 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 8. President McCord reported that the Board meeting will be Wednesday morning, November 8. Wellford noted that this year's business meeting will be important because of the National Policy Committee resolution on the death penalty and suggested that the business meeting time be kept completely free and to give it as much prominence on the program that is possible with relation to time. **White suggested a flyer be sent with the registration materials announcing the business meeting highlighting the business that will be conducted.**

#### **DIVISION ON CRITICAL CRIMINOLOGY**

Charles Wellford moved and seconded by J. Robert Lilly that the Board approve the request from Susan Caringella-MacDonald and the signed 60 petitioners to establish a Division on Critical Criminology. Friendly motion suggested by Lilly that the Board approve the request on the condition that between now and the November meeting that P. J. Baunach and the Constitution and By-Laws Committee examine the proposed constitution and if found acceptable the Board would approve the request in November. With a membership count of 2,162 as of the end of December, petitions totalling 63 would be required to establish the Division and all petitions would need to be verified. Wellford stated he did not feel the Board could vote on the motion until the petitions were verified. A motion was made by Julius Debro and seconded by Carl Klockars to table the motion until Saturday's meeting.

#### **INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY**

President McCord reported that she had received a request from Denis Szabo of the International Society of Criminology to acknowledge the formation of a series of linguistic groups--one that was meeting to begin the study of criminology among French speaking people meeting in Geneva and he asked specifically whether as president of ASC that McCord would express delight at their getting together and interest in the way in which they are going about increasing the utilization of linguistic groups for the International Society and she reported that she did so in French. Secondly the ISC wanted to find out what the ASC wanted to do by way of participation in the International Society. We are an affiliate and they are inviting further participation if the Society was interested in. McCord suggested it was worth bringing up to see if the Board wanted to consider having representatives on their Board, to set up symposiums, etc.

Wellford noted that the current level of involvement as far as paying dues was the appropriate level to be involved with the International Society. Wellford stated that if someone on our Board were to be represented on their Board it was conceivable that travel expenses could be incurred. Shover suggested that we could write to the ISC to see what options were available to the ASC. **Charles Wellford moved that the Society maintain its current former relationship with the ISC by paying dues. Seconded by M. Kay Harris. Motion carried.**

### **AAAS**

President McCord reported that the Society is an affiliate member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and Joe Scott is the Society's current three year representative. McCord spoke with Scott who would like to set up panels for this year's AAS meeting. He is currently suggesting Cohort Studies, New and Old and welcoming other suggestions. He thought this year's meeting was in July. The ASC has budgeted \$200 to cover the dues for ASC's AAAS representative. Carl Klockars moved that the Society continue its present representation with the AAAS by paying representative dues, but travel funds for the representative would not be allocated by the Society. Motion withdrawn. **Carl Klockars moved that the Society rescind travel funds for the AAAS representative. Seconded by Marvin Krohn. Motion carried.**

Ideas suggested by the Board members for possible AAAS panel sessions were: Biology and Crime; Drugs and Crime; Twinkies and Crime; Nutrition. Wellford suggested that Scott might want to use the emerging violence panel and have Jeff Roth help him organize a session.

### **50th ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE**

President McCord reported that she had sent letters out to the four members of the 50th Anniversary Committee to try to make plans for the Society's 50th Anniversary and the Committee will meet during the Reno meeting. The Committee is inviting the Board's suggestions on what the Board would like the Committee to do. McCord reported she had asked J. Robert Lilly to do a history of the Society from the treasurer's point of view. Petersilia commented that Gerhard Mueller made a good presentation at the annual meeting two years ago which might be considered. Wellford asked Sarah if it was possible to determine who the Society members were in 1941, especially the founding members, and determine if any of them were still alive to make sure that they are invited to participate in the meeting. McCord asked Wellford to prepare a list and send to her who might have been members during the founding of the Society. Wellford suggested that August Vollmer's picture be placed on the program as the first president of the Society.

### **NON-SEXIST LANGUAGE**

Charles Wellford reported at the last Board meeting the Board voted to inform NIJ that the Society was concerned about their use of non-sexist language in their publications. Wellford contacted Paul Cascarano and Dick Linster at NIJ to raise this concern with them and both informed Wellford that it was already the policy of NIJ to use non-sexist language and they were aware of the APA guidelines on use of non-sexist language. Wellford informed them of the one report that consistently to "he", and they said they would look into this report. They also asked if any further problems were found to please inform them.

## MINORITY FELLOWSHIP

President McCord reported that the Executive Committee had a conference call and sent out to many places as were known in generic language announcing the minority fellowship with the deadline of May 1, 1989. Also announcements were placed with the dues requests for donations from the members. As of February 28, five people responded to the request for donations to the minority fellowship for a total of \$90.00. Two large items to decide: (1) what to do about the decision made at the last meeting of who would be eligible for the fellowship and (2) what to do for next year.

McCord suggested that the items be separated, first discussing this year's fellowship where \$12,000 was set aside where the committee recommendation was for it to go to a Black and where the amendment was for it to go a Black or Hispanic and where the Executive Committee agreed to advertise for an ethnic minority.

Baunach noted that at the last Board meeting it was agreed that the fellowship would be given to a Black or Hispanic and raised the issue of the Executive Committee to broaden that and make a statement that it would be advertised for an ethnic minority which might not be one of those two.

Baunach reported that Wellford had contacted her to see what the powers of the Executive Committee were. Since Robert's Rules of Order are followed (Article 9), the Executive Committee is a small group of the executive body. They have all the powers of the Society between meetings of the Society except that the subordinate body cannot modify any action taken by its superiors. In essence, the Executive Committee has overstepped its bounds stated Baunach.

McCord noted that the advertisement does not obligate in any way the Board to change its plan; it only does not say which of the ethnic groups it is applicable to. The question is whether the Board wants to modify their decision. Shover inquired if the flyer had been distributed. Wellford stated that the issue had come up in the Executive Committee because he raised it for the very reason that P. J. referred to because it is very important that the Executive Committee not change things that the Executive Board has enacted. Baunach noted that the Board had decided that the fellowship should go to one of two groups--Black or Hispanic--and if the Executive Committee has broadened that it opens the door to add orientals, etc. and is that not modifying the Board's decision. McCord noted that the ad itself opens up the door for applications; the winner will be one of those. The question is whether the winner can be Oriental or if the Board wants to stay with the decision that was made really under tremendous pressure last year; at least three on the Executive Committee felt had not been carefully enough considered, and want to bring up for reconsideration. Baunach inquired if this was why the Executive Committee decided to broaden the definition to say minorities rather than the two that the Board had mentioned specifically.

McCord replied that the Committee wanted to be able to reconsider but didn't want to delay advertising for this year because of the May 1 deadline. Debro stated that the Executive Committee does not have the power to reopen it after it had been voted by the entire Board to go to a Black and then to Blacks and Hispanics. McCord stated that four people on the Executive Committee disagree that it was not a pressured discussion at the last Board meeting. Debro noted that it was very clear that the Board voted it would be a Black or Hispanic that would receive the fellowship. Klockars stated that the advertisement was incompatible with what the Board had authorized. If the advertisement



is sent, the idea would have to be broadened and make a change in what was decided earlier to cover all ethnic minorities or go forward with it with a hidden agenda that it is only for Blacks and Hispanics, then the Society is acting in bad faith to other ethnic groups who may wish to apply. Klockars said either the decision is changed from Blacks and Hispanics to ethnic minorities or redo the ad.

McCord noted that it was specifically stated at the Board meeting that this matter should be left to the discretion of the Executive Committee and the discussion was cut off with no clear stipulation on who should get it, how it should be brought about, but rather than we should in fact do it this year. There was a lot of time pressure on the Committee.

Lilly reiterated some of the comments by McCord regarding the pressure as he distinctively remembered trying to asking questions about the financing of the fellowship--one year, two years, to one person one year, another person the next year, what the exponential growth and financial obligation of the organization was and the attitude expressed at the Board meeting was that it was not important we don't have time to talk about it, a decision was made by the Committee and the Board should take it and go with it. There was a great deal of pressure and hurry up and do this quickly and we did not have much sense of reflection in examining what the Society was committing itself to financially and he still did not know what it means financially to the organization.

Marvin Krohn moved that the minority fellowship be tabled until the Saturday Board meeting. Seconded by Carl Klockars. Motion carried.

Marvin Krohn moved to adjourn the meeting.

## SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1989

### MINORITY FELLOWSHIP

President McCord called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., Saturday, March 18. The first item on the agenda was the tabled motion on the minority fellowship and in order for President McCord to express her opinions, according to Robert's Rules of Order, the appropriate thing for President McCord to do was ask Vice President Krohn to preside over the Board meeting. Krohn entertained discussion on what the Board should do regarding the Minority Fellowship and noted that at the November meeting the Board decided to award the scholarship to a Black or Hispanic. The Executive Committee in the interim decided to present the advertisement that would allow for more diverse ethnic groups to also apply for the award which was discussed at last evening's meeting.

McCord spoke for the reason she did what she did stating that whether democracy votes it in, racism is wrong, feeling the Board made a racist decision last year. She stated she went through the membership directory to see if the Asian race was overrepresented or equally represented in the ASC and are practically nonrepresented with three possible Asians which does not make a dominant group in the Society. She did not feel that her move through Robert's Rules of Order could be considered illegal, it would give the Board a chance to reconsider what she believed to be a very bad decision. Debro stated that if the fellowship is for ethnic minorities, that Jews, Indians, Native Americans, Indian Indians born in America and would open the fellowship to a wide range of people as well. What the Committee was trying to do was get more Blacks in the system as they are overly

represented in correctional institutions of America. He stated there are specific grants for women, Japanese -- you can make it specific and it does not need to be open for everyone. He stated there were less than 10 blacks in the U.S. with degrees in criminology or criminal justice and it's been that way for 20 years and will not change unless something is done to change the situation.

Michael Gottfredson questioned the attribution of racism, also. He offered a suggestion that not only do we need an advertisement but also a policy for selecting the particular recipient for the fellowship. Gottfredson moved the intent of this fellowship is to award to it a educationally underrepresented minority member and not change the advertisement but pass on our intent to the committee that has to make the decision. Seconded by Neal Shover.

Carl Klockars stated it was not just that a group has a minority status but has been the target of a fairly long history of discriminatory practices against them which has had the effect of keeping them out--that's the defining characteristic. The racism argument is an argument which has to be meshed with an idea that there are particular groups whose history and pattern of discrimination against them warrant the Society making the extra effort, and I would think you could open it fairly widely to many kind of groups that have suffered in that way and consequently underrepresented and not in the field. It's not just underrepresentation, but it's suffered some kind of pattern of discrimination which makes this extraordinary behalf which excludes other people competing for it. Would include American Indians, for example, a clear history of the example of discrimination.

McCord stated that in fairness to her it should be noted that she donated to the scholarship and was very much in favor of the thrust of it. If the Society is going to make any difference, the good part of it will come through more broadly advertising the scholarship, not giving one scholarship.

Wellford noted that the recommendation from the Affirmative Action Committee which was to be awarded only to a Black was motivated by reasons discussed by Julius as well as a belief and a recognition that academic units around the country have had very difficult times meeting affirmative action quotas for hiring Blacks. The universities that we talked to and are involved with are not under the same degree of pressure to hire Asian, American Indians, even Hispanics. As a Society that aids the discipline and provides some kind of assistance and service to the discipline, the Committee felt a second kind of justification was the real practical need to stimulate and encourage Blacks to enter the field. That was the original limitation, but it did get expanded to include Hispanics. Wellford agreed with those who last night said that the procedure Gottfredson is suggesting is a little misleading to membership. If we intend the award is to go to a Black or Hispanic, then that is what should be said in our advertising and selection criteria. To say that it is open to ethnic minorities, but really means for Black or Hispanic, is not worthy of this Board of the Society.

Lilly commented that he saw very little interest from the Society that the membership wants this with regard to their willingness to contribute to the fund. Inquired if this is something that should be integrated into the Board's conversation at this point. Are we going to consider the membership's interest and whether the membership perceives there is a problem. Lilly said he was not convinced yet that there is a lack of funding for Blacks or Hispanics to go to graduate school in criminology.

Krohn suggested that issue be held off at this point. The Board needs to know whom to present the first year award to at this time. Harris said that the Board had this discussion at the last meeting and the question of whether financial aid was not available and this

fellowship is symbolic of the Society's recognition of strong need to take affirmative action steps. She noted the increase of Black male incarceration in the last three years has more than doubled. Harris suggested that the advertisement be redone to go with the policy that was adopted in November by the Board.

Wellford commented on Lilly's inquiry regarding the membership's interest in the fellowship. There are two ways to interpret that donations received thus far from the membership: (1) the membership isn't terribly interested in it, or (2) the membership may think out of a \$170,000 budget \$12,000 is a reasonable amount to spend.

Debro commented that ASA went through this. They have minority fellowships which were initially started off with Blacks and then changed to all minorities. The list is expanding each year as some professors tend to donate the royalties from their books to the fund. Debro stated the Executive Committee was entirely wrong in putting out an announcement and expecting the Board to accept it when a decision had been previously made as to how it should be worded. The minutes had stated Blacks and Hispanics which the ad should have reflected. Debro stated he was in favor of doing away with the ad and preparing new advertisement stating Blacks and Hispanics.

Gottfredson noted that the affirmative action preference varies in terms of the country. In his part of the country, the pressure for Hispanics and Native Americans exceeds that of Blacks. Gottfredson stated he would like to still endorse the motion on the floor as it is extremely difficult to articulate all the groups. We should recognize that we are unlikely to receive a large number of applications and suggest that we send a message to the group, yet to be decided who they are, that the intent is to give the scholarship to an undereducationally minority and then when the applications come in people can decide which of them are educationally unrepresented minority of not as a delegation to that subcommittee.

McCord stated the Board would be taking action and agreed with Gottfredson that it depends on which part of the country you are speaking as the nonrepresented minority. Klockars suggested an operationalization of the amendment--mainly that you stay with the ad pretty much as it is but under the section of eligibility say the fellowship is designed to encourage Black, Hispanic, or Native Americans to enter the field. **Wellford suggested to encourage minority students, especially Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans. Krohn asked if this could be seen as a friendly amendment to the motion and Gottfredson agreed. Seconded by Neal Shover.**

Debro stated that the Black Caucus had met to improve the lot of Blacks and were concerned primarily Blacks saying they were vastly underrepresented in the system and what they wanted the Society to do is to endorse scholarships for Black. The pool continues to expand and Debro said we did not have the representation from the other groups as a pressure group to do that and he must return to the Caucus and tell them it is now ethnic minorities and there will be a lot of hassle and felt it should still be Blacks and Hispanics and North American Indians which is palpable but when you say ethnic groups you are including everyone, and we are not saying what we really want.

**Wellford moved and it was seconded that the advertisement announcing the ASC Minority Fellowship for Ethnic Minorities be written, but that we should tell the committee selecting the scholarship that it is the sense of the Board that the fellowship should go to an educationally underrepresented minority. Amended that the ad itself would be edited to say the following. Eligibility: The fellowship is designed to encourage minority students, especially Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asian Americans to enter the field. Favor: 9; Opposed 2: 2 Motion carried.**

Gottfredson asked a question about the ad. His recollection was that the committee would not limit the recipient to a person who was accepted in a program that grants a doctorate in criminology or criminal justice, but that we had a broader connotation. Wellford stated the committee talked about it at some length and also in the Executive Committee and what they hoped to do by not placing doctorate in criminology or criminal justice in capitals, we are talking about a program that has a focus and emphasis in the committee decided they would have to look at them and see if there were one when they saw it and the University of Arizona would clearly be eligible. Mccord asked for the rewording since the ad will be reprinted. Klockars suggested "in a program of doctoral studies which grants a specialization in criminology or criminal justice". Wellford inquired if grants a specialization meant a program that doesn't have it as a specialization but that's the entire program wouldn't be eligible? Wellford stated it could say "the winner must be in a program of doctoral studies that will lead to a career in criminology or criminal justice". Klockars suggested a program of doctoral studies in criminology but not saying doctorate. Gottfredson suggested adding a sentence saying individuals studying in such programs as sociology, psychology, public policy and interdisciplinary studies are eligible to apply.

Wellford asked if the following was acceptable: "The winner must be accepted in a program of doctoral studies with an emphasis in criminology or criminal justice. Mccord added individuals studying in programs of sociology, public policy, psychology, etc. Wellford noted that criminology and criminal justice should not be left out. "Individuals in programs of criminology, criminal justice, sociology, psychology, etc. are encouraged to apply".

Mccord stated the motion as follows: "The winner must be accepted in a program of doctoral studies in criminology or criminal justice. Individuals studying in social sciences or public policy are encouraged to apply."

Mccord noted the second part of the minority fellowship is what to do about continuing the award. Krohn inquired if the decision must be made at this time as we do not have any track record and know how many applicants we will get, or feedback from the membership and stated he preferred to wait until at least the Board could see the applications that are received which could be done at the November meeting.

Debros stated he thought the Board was trying to set up some type of subcommittee to deal with funding as well as trying to look at ongoing funding over a period of time. Mccord agreed and said the report was under Grants and Contracts \_\_\_\_\_ and they have been unsuccessful.

Klockars stated that we are not deciding if there is a poor showing of applicants this year, that the Society will stop the fellowship. We want to decide on how to go in this area--we need more information. His own personal feeling is that this is the wrong way to spend \$12,000. Qualified Black students can get into most universities with all the funding they need. The best strategy for the ASC in the long run is to fund summer kind of development programs where you recruit people out of undergraduate school, give them summer fellowships and get them into the field and would like the Society to work on this.

Petersilia agreed with Harris that the Society's experience with this particular application should not necessarily inform us of whether we continue. We need to have more input from the membership about the relative things that we could be doing in getting minorities involved. Go to the membership through the Ethical Issues Committee and get something brought before our Business Meeting. The membership should be informed of this issue in

terms of whether we decide for longer term commitment of the scholarship, would want to consider all options before deciding. She reported that being in a program herself she has had at least five notices stating if you are a Black or minority apply for this particular grant. Qualified people who get to a graduate program don't have a problem--we have to get to the point to have people who want to apply to a graduate program. We may do more entering in a little earlier. She suggested that this be tabled at this time not necessarily because the fellowship will not receive applicants, but we need more thought if this is the best way to go and she would like to hear from the membership about that. Table the decision about continuing the fellowship and also to figure out through the Ethical Issues Committee and the membership.

Wellford made a motion that the Board direct the incoming president to establish and appoint with Board approval an Affirmative Action Committee which would become a standing committee of the Society. Seconded by Julius Debro. Baunach offered a friendly amendment that the first charge of the committee would look into the issue of continued minority fellowship and other alternatives to encourage participation so that they have a direction right away. Agreed by Wellford and Debro.

Wellford noted the committee could begin work immediately and have a report ready for November addressing many of the concerns that people have raised at the meeting and provide a committee forum to talk these things out and produce a more coherent and full report than if we make decisions at this meeting.

**A motion was made by Charles Wellford and seconded by Julius Debro that the president-elect be directed to appoint an Affirmative Action Committee which would become a standing committee of the Society and that the Committee be directed to review and make recommendations to the Board on the issue continuation of the Ethnic Minority Fellowship and to consider whatever mechanics might be utilized to encourage participation by minorities in the field. Motion carried.**

President McCord called the Board's attention to the request for a Division on Critical Criminology which was tabled from last evening's meeting. She reported that Sarah went through the list of names and came up with 6 definite non-members and questions regarding another six or seven names she could not verify. **Wellford moved to table the request from the Division of Critical Criminology and refer it back to the originators so that they can assemble a proper package. Seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach.** Neal Shover suggested an amendment to the motion that the Executive Board is receptive to the idea but notes that the materials submitted did not comply with the requirements and that it be tabled until such time that they do. Accepted by Wellford and Baunach. Baunach suggested that an amendment also be included that would require at least a two week lead time to receive the material to review. Baunach volunteered the Constitution and By-Laws Committee to review the application and provide feedback if there are problems. Krohn inquired if the Executive Committee could handle this matter in the interim before November as one of the intentions of this group of people that they be on board prior to the November meeting so it might be important to them to be sanctioned sometime in the near future in which case the Executive Committee could deal with it assuming everything is proper. They could be informed that once everything is together the Executive Committee could get together and deal with it if it is important to them. McCord stated this would have to be offered as an amendment.

**Charles Wellford moved that the Executive Board table the proposal for the creation of a Division on Critical Criminology but convey to the proposers that the Board has reviewed it favorably but notes certain deficiencies in the proposal and is returning it to them for corrections of the deficiencies. Seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. Motion carried.**

## **ASC POLICY AND PROCEDURES REPORT**

Phyllis Jo Baunach reported there are two different related matters. The Policy and Procedures Manual has not been developed as fully as she had intended. Simply incorporated the decisions the Board had made at last November's meeting. Interested in the Board's feedback either now or the direction the Board would like her to follow. She stated she was working under the operational assumption that the Society's policies are the most recent decision on an issue that has been made. If that is the case, Baunach will draft a policies part of that in conformance with that notion. Several comments she noted she had received was do not make the manual that is so restrictive that it ties the hands of future boards and future presidents. The report presented is a draft of where the Society has been.

Wellford stated it would be more helpful if Baunach found clearly contradictory policies in different points of time they should be brought before the Board for determination of which is controlling in the future or whether any of them are. Shover suggested that whatever is done it be circulated sufficiently far in advance so that there is time to read it and to think about it so that we don't get into a situation in valuable limited time.

Harris suggested descriptive guidelines, historical more than trying to bind, as far as committee assignments. Baunach stated she would like to include the purpose of the committee or as it has evolved in the manual. Debro suggested that when new members come on the Board the president get together with them and brief them on the by-laws, rules and committees and regulations, etc. They could have a manual given to them as they come on board.

Last year at the New York Board meeting Baunach noted that she had come up with guidelines which were approved with the minor suggestions that two things occur: (1) something was listed about having a quorum to hold meetings but it seemed inappropriate for the Society's purposes since some matters are handled by mail and she reported that she had deleted that from the guidelines at the Board's request. (2) in terms of the year-end report, she had arbitrarily set October 1, but it was suggested that possibly mid-October be set because it is difficult to pin someone down to a specific date. She stated she was presenting the guidelines to the Board which had been approved for implementation and suggested that they be used this year which would be helpful for next year's committees. Would like the information disseminated to the chairs of the ASC committees, Board members, etc.

Klockars noted the guidelines are general enough that the Board could live with them. It does say that the president will make the appointments and the committee chairs will verify that everybody is willing to serve. **Michael Gottfredson stated that if these are a summary of what was approved last year, he moved that Board received the report and allow it to be distributed. Seconded by Joan Petersilia. Motion carried.**

**Debro moved on behalf of the Executive Board to thank Phyllis Jo Baunach for the tremendous work she has done for the Board and Society. Seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried.**

## **CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS REPORT**

Phyllis Jo Baunach reported that she had been asked by the Board to go over the Constitution and By-Laws to see if there were any items that needed to be revised and specifically asked the committee to look at the concept of members in good standing and to look at the elections. She reported that last November she did distribute a document which had additional information about the selection of the editor of THE CRIMINOLOGIST and CRIMINOLOGY and at that time because there was so much concern about who should be deciding how that should be selected and worded, she deleted all of that. These were decisions made by the Board last year and upon Board discussions and are intended to By-Laws amendments which after the Board agrees to them, would go to the membership for vote. The By-Laws are agreed to at two consecutive meetings and then are incorporated.

1) Elections: The Board had previously decided that nominees for officer of executive counselor of the Society should be ineligible to receive any awards from the Society during the pendent of the election, and it was suggested that it be incorporated into the Constitution.

Wellford moved that the Board approve the By-Laws and table the Constitutional amendments since they were just received. No second made.

By-Law Amendments: Article 1, Section 5. Executive Board Meetings: Not less than ten days prior to scheduled Board Meetings, any documents to be viewed at the forthcoming meeting and the agenda shall be mailed to all Board members by the Executive Secretary or **Administrator**.

Article 3, Section 1. Annual Meetings: A registration fee may be assessed for participants at the Annual Meeting and other Conferences of the Society. The fee shall be set by the Executive Board and the membership shall be notified by the Executive Secretary or ~~conference director~~ **Administrator**.

Article 7. Disbursements: Payments from Society funds may be approved by the Treasurer or by the **Administrator** up to a sum of \$500.00. Payments in excess of \$500.00 must have approval by both the President and the Treasurer.

Article 8. Officers: The President and President-Elect and Vice President and Vice President-Elect cannot be nominated for or receive any ASC awards, except for selection as a Fellow of ASC, during their tenure in office.

Neal Shover made a point of information that it seemed to restrict the decision made at the last Board meeting that the Bloch award could be given to one who is currently an officer or candidate. McCord noted that at the last meeting it was stressed for the Fellow and Bloch award. Harris suggested that nominated be changed to "receive".

**It was moved by Carl Klockars and seconded by Neal Shover that Article 8 be amended as follows: The President and President-Elect and Vice President and Vice President-Elect cannot receive any awards except selection of Fellow or recipient of the Bloch Award of ASC, during their tenure in office. Motion carried.**

**Charles Wellford moved to table the Constitution & By Laws Committee report that it was not received in time as prescribed by the By-Laws and none of the proposed constitutional amendments are of such urgency that delaying them for a few months will affect anyone. Seconded by Carl Klockars. Motion carried.**

Baunach stated she would incorporate the suggestions by Marvin Krohn and present them 10 days in advance of the November Board meeting.

### **CRIMINOLOGY REPORT**

Douglas Smith commented on the Editor's Report dated March 1989 containing some of the now familiar form material that he had putting in the report in terms of submission data, the status report which gives some input on acceptance/rejection rates and a new table which essentially is a cumulative distribution of decisions by day and week received, an update of the agreement/disagreement of viewers, and the contents of the May issue and information for the August issue. Smith pointed out the two highlights of the journal--submissions continue to trend upward; quality of papers are better. The second item is the issue of broadening; have invited four pieces on feminist, biological, psychological and economic contributions to the study of crime and criminal justice. Currently two are in and in review; the other two are still in the works.

President McCord noted there were a couple of discrepancies and asked for an explanation as to last year there were 149 submissions. Smith replied there were 147 this time because two arrived on April 15. In the old count it was as of April 15; the way the program is written now, it was cut off at April 14. McCord asked why there were only two revised and resubmits this year. Was it by policy? Last year there were 22, and this year for a total of two years there were 24. Smith replied these were accumulative totals. A lot of them are revised and resubmits percolate into acceptances; some percolate into rejections, so there haven't been just two this year but a cumulative total from the conception.

Krohn commented that the Board asked him to put out an announcement in THE CRIMINOLOGIST asking for any comments regarding CRIMINOLOGY and THE CRIMINOLOGIST. To date we have received none and said he felt that if there was any dissatisfaction among the membership it is not very salient.

Michael Gottfredson moved to accept the editor's report on CRIMINOLOGY; seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried.

### **AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT**

Chairman Neal Shover reported that the Awards Committee had been asked to submit the names of two individuals for each award which the Committee has done noting that the asterisk by the nominees names indicates the highest ranking received and moved acceptance of the report. Seconded by J. Robert Lilly. Motion withdrawn by Shover.

**A motion to accept the report was moved by Neal Shover; seconded by Michael Gottfredson. Motion carried.**

President McCord requested that the awards be taken up as they appear on the report and asked Phyllis Jo Baunach to leave the room while discussion was held on the Herbert Bloch Award. Shover reported that the Committee did not make choices for the various awards other than by the Committee's ranking for information.

**Charles Wellford moved that Phyllis Jo Baunach be selected as the recipient of the Herbert Bloch Award. Seconded by Julius Debro. Motion carried.**



**Michael Gottfredson moved that Josine Junger-Tas receive the Sellin-Gluck Award; seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried.**

**Charles Wellford moved that Marvin Wolfgang be the recipient of the Edwin Sutherland Award; seconded by Carl Klockars. Motion carried.**

Krohn inquired of something he had heard regarding Wolfgang receiving the Vollmer Award. At the time he received the Vollmer Award in 1960, it was defined much more broadly than it is now and essentially he received the Vollmer Award for his research contributions. If true, the Society would be giving him a second award for basically the same thing.

Gottfredson stated he felt it was a major oversight that Wolfgang had not received the Sutherland Award.

Klockars argued for Larry Sherman noting his contributions were superior to the other candidates listed. Wellford noted that the Vollmer Award has been a strange one for the Society and there was a period that the award only went to academics and then there was a period it was given to people who were exclusively administrators and in recent discussions we have tried to understand an award that recognizes contributions to administration through research. That as a research organization, as a scholarly organization what we would best see the Vollmer Award is not to someone who has run the best prison in the world, but who has made research contributions that have resulted in the operations of prison. Wellford spoke against Breed. Both Todd Clear and Larry Sherman better fit the understanding of the Vollmer Award which is going toward the impact of research on public policy. Harris spoke in favor of Breed stating he had made incredible contributions and has been willing to speak out in the last several administrations the move to concentrate all information in the federal government. Gottfredson stated that Breed is well within the historical understanding of the Vollmer Award and has made significant contributions to research at NIC, at the California Youth Authority in terms of his career and feel he is a fantastic candidate. Petersilia agreed that Breed is the ideal recipient of the Vollmer Award.

**Michael Gottfredson moved that Allan Breed be the recipient of the August Vollmer Award; seconded by M. Kay Harris. Motion carried.**

## **FELLOWS COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Charles Wellford moved the selection of Norval Morris as ASC fellow for 1989 which is consistent with the Fellows Committee recommendation; seconded by Neal Shover. Shover withdrew his second due to a pattern of Morris' indifference to the Society. Seconded by Carl Klockars. Motion failed.**

Discussion revealed that Morris had been elected to the ASC Board but never attended a Board meeting and has not been a member of the Society for a number of years.

Wellford agreed to the statement that Morris had not been an active and strong member of ASC, but that was not what the Fellows award was meant to recognize. We are recognizing people that have achieved distinction in criminology and the committee was right in selecting Norval Morris. The matter of his being a loyal member is not germane to the award. Baunach inquired if this is done should the Constitution and By-Laws Committee to revise that portion of the Constitution pertaining to Fellows that requires that the title is

available to members in good standing. Was told to leave the Constitution as it is. Baunach stated she felt a Fellow means commitment to the Society and it's a honor to be a part of this Society and would vote against him receiving the award.

Carl Klockars stated he would nominate Larry Sherman as a Fellow of the Society if the motion is defeated. Julius Debro recommended that the Board look at the other names in the Fellows Committee report. Krohn spoke against the motion that there was not any further information provided from the Committee and should not preclude the Society from giving the award this year. Wellford noted that when committees give the Board good reports, there should be the expectation that the report will be accepted. The Board did that just now with the Awards Committee which was well represented, moved quickly and was accepted. The same procedure should apply to the Fellow report. The Committee worked hard, followed the procedures, presented its rationale, and the Board rejected it. We are not in a position to duplicate the process of the committee in this Board even though we have a lot of knowledge of people, we cannot go through that process and therefore I move that we not award any Fellow this year. Petersilia said she would like to nominate Malcolm Klein and disagreed with Wellford's comments. Gottfredson stated he agreed with Wellford whole heartily that each Board member may nominate a different individual, and its really a subcommittee obligation to survey the field and come up with some candidates--not the Executive Board. Also agree that the Board should pay attention to the committee reports, otherwise people will not want to serve on the committees.

**Julius Debro moved; seconded by Joan Petersilia that the Board consider the other names presented in the Fellows Committee report. Favor: 3; Opposed: 8. Motion failed.**

**J. Robert Lilly moved that the Society not give a Fellow award for 1989; seconded by Charles Wellford. Favor: 7; Opposed: 4. Motion carried.**

### **EDITORIAL BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT**

Chairman Marvin Krohn noted he had three items to present before the Board. (1) Referred to memo dated March 9--selection of newsletter editor. Krohn reported that we do not have a new editor. A solicitation was published in THE NEWSLETTER and several people had been contacted but have not been able to have anyone submit or are willing to submit a proposal for being editor of the newsletter. Krohn asked for the Board's help to encourage anyone who was interested in becoming editor to have that person contact Krohn and feel free to call anyone that might be interested in doing the job.

(2) Presidential Address: Krohn noted the Board's policy of 5/2/86 was that the presidential address should be published. However, it has not been published in the last two years. Some ambiguity as to whether the editor is committed to publish the presidential address. The Editorial Board wanted to clarify this ambiguity and to obtain clarification from the Board to see if they indeed want the presidential addressed to be published each and every year unless the president does not want it published. It would put a lot of burden off the editor of CRIMINOLOGY and potential embarrassment. McCord reported that Don Gottfredson's address was published in Theory--Journal of Advances in Criminological Theory and Lloyd Ohlin was president when they made the decision and noted he was elected without a policy and did not think it would be appropriate to change while he was president. The issue was brought to a head because William Chambliss had submitted his presidential address. He was elected with the policy in force and gave his presidential address in force. McCord noted it was expo facto that Chambliss was operating when the policy of the Board was enforced about publication. Krohn reported

that it was consistent with the editor of CRIMINOLOGY that the presidential address be published but it definitely be understood that it be published every year.

Doug Smith reported that he had received correspondence from Chambliss including a copy of his presidential address and asked for Smith's comments. Smith replied that he would be happy to publish it as a presidential address if it was clearly designated as such and that was in fact the Board's policy that all presidential addresses would be published as a matter of policy. Chambliss indicated that Smith's reading was right. Smith stated he felt better presidential addresses would be offered if they knew they would be printed and noted his only concern was that they be published timely and that he had just received Chambliss' address so it would not appear minimally until August. Smith stated he would like to see some mechanism developed that the president would send to the editor the presidential address at the time of the meeting so it could be published in the February issue and be clearly designated on the article that it is a presidential address without peer review, reflecting the policy of the ASC. Debro inquired if the address should be published in the newsletter versus the journal. Wellford noted that one of the problems in securing a editor for the newsletter is that people don't want to take on a job because there is no prestige in it. If we begin to think of THE CRIMINOLOGIST as a forum for discussion of ideas that aren't necessarily in the form of scientific papers, it might become a more attractive kind of position. Hugh has moved in that direction by pieces by people prominent in the field but it could be moved even further by saying that the newsletter is a legitimate outlet for this organization and would include the presidential address.

Smith noted that when he took over the editorship of the journal, he did not know that it was a policy of the Society to publish the presidential address in the journal and asked that it be confirmed that all presidential addresses be published in CRIMINOLOGY.

Petersilia noted that previously the presidential address had been given in a plenary session rather than the banquet. Baunach noted that the minutes of May 2, 1986 meeting, stated that there had been a tradition of a presidential address at the banquet but the motion that was passed indicated that the Society reinstitute the presidential address at a plenary session.

Krohn noted the issue of the presidential address comes in a committee report and thought there was a motion in that report as follows: **"The Board reaffirms its policy to publish the presidential address and to instruct presidents and editors of that policy. The presidential address would be published in CRIMINOLOGY without going through the peer review process and the manuscript would be clearly labeled as a presidential address when published so as to clearly distinguish it from articles that have gone through the peer review process". Krohn stated he would like to present that as a motion; seconded by Neal Shover. Bauanch noted that it did not need to be presented as a motion again as it already exists. Motion carried.**

3) Publisher Proposals: Krohn noted that all members had received the publisher proposals and a summary of the proposals in tabulated format. Krohn stated he was instructed by the Board to seek out proposals from selected publishers to see how the Society could do relative to how the Society is doing now with the publication of CRIMINOLOGY. He noted he requested from the six publishers listed that they submit proposals addressing specific points. All six publishers submitted a proposal and it should be noted the California proposal came under rather a strange situation because the head person was not in the country and it was his assistant that submitted the proposal and he did not feel it was a complete proposal. Informed the Board that all editors suggested this was an opening bid and was open for negotiation.

Lilly reported that he had talked to Tom Hood who was treasurer of SSSP for some time about the contract with the University of California Press, although Lilly had not received a copy of the contract to look at in detail. An additional part of the contract provides that every member of SSSP receives the journal free, thereby making their membership fee clear to use as the organization felt they had to. Learned that they had costs that they had to pay for publishing of the journal to the Press and the minimum \$60,000 per year guaranteed has been exceeded every year in terms of payment to SSSP and they are quite happy and satisfied with the Press. Lilly noted the details need to be explored further as to what they are paying for in publishing Social Problems versus what ASC is paying to see what the cash benefit would be. Lilly commented he was encouraged, as opposed a month ago, after talking with them. Opposition was primarily looking into the contracts, how to get out of Sage, and to get into another way of publishing our journal. Lilly stated he was not convinced that we should change our present policy but was encouraged that he was before.

Krohn reported that President McCord had also asked him to contact the editor of Sociological Forum, the flagship journal of the Eastern Sociological Association, Robin Williams. That journal is in a different type of financial situation that Social Problems was. ASC seems to be somewhere in the middle. They were under the situation where they do not have a large subscription rate. In addition, Cornell University subsidized \$25,000 a year since its inception and that funding being withdrawn. They rushed into the contract with Plenum and indicated that there had been nothing from an editorial point of view but disadvantages to the contract and felt they had gotten a poor contract financially as well. The editorial disadvantages he identified were turn-around time, how much lead time to the journal, certain concerns with copyediting and the quality of the copyediting, quality of the appearance of the journal. The editor thought that the experience was very bad from his perspective and suggested that the only way that he would recommend that a society consider going with a publisher that has been printing their own journal if they were in the kind of situation that the Eastern Society was in needing upfront money to insure the continuation of the journal.

Lilly commented that Tom Hood of SSSP felt the editorial advantages was one of the main reasons for going with the Press because it did free up their executive office in not having to deal with certain kinds of publishing responsibilities that the editor had been responsible for. Felt it was opportunity to shift some administrative responsibilities for the journal out of the office into the publishers house.

McCord noted the Board minutes of November 16, 1985 where Joe Weiss points out that he didn't have time to do promotion because of the editing job. McCord also brought with her the report of Albert Cohen during his tenure as vice president and the difficulties of the old contract so that if Board members have any questions the contracts submitted today are significantly better than in many respects before the Society went into the publishing field.

Krohn said the journal is seen as a hot commodity and had received calls from the publishers noting that the contracts were open for bids and better contracts could be obtained. McCord asked Krohn to add to his chart the field of promotions--California Press says they will cooperate with the editorial office; Chicago University Press said they will do separate mailings and have budgeted \$6,000 for promotion; Guilford has an European distribution center and would put in the initial budget \$4,000; JAI Press has a worldwide distribution center and suggests discount coupons for ASA and APA; Plenum has an international network and did not specify any particular amounts, and Springer-Verlag would display at approximately 20 meetings worldwide and would print 2,000 copies as part of their promotion and distribute those.

Smith stated that in going through the proposals he was puzzled why the Society is doing this and wanted to know how much the Society currently makes from the journal which he figured between \$55-60,000. Smith noted that if we are running a cash surplus in through the journal of \$63,000 per year --to evaluate these proposals it is necessary to allocate something out of the dues for subscriptions. If we didn't have the \$63,000 per year the budget would be in the red each year. Lilly noted that portions of the subscription income were for future revenues. Wellford noted that this was a yearly expected income and is a reasonable expectation for future years even though some of those funds are obligated, others won't be next year. Smith wanted to know if we are running a cash surplus of say \$63,000 per year which he felt was conservative. The difference in terms of what the Society makes from CRIMINOLOGY now supports a lot of things that the Society wants to do--minority fellowship. If we didn't have the \$63,000 cash surplus there would be no balanced budget.

Gottfredson said he felt the journal was superb and vastly improved that he felt if it wasn't broke, don't fix it and inquired if there was anything in the editorial process that Smith would see any advantage in the proposals presented to the Board. Smith said in looking at the proposals he had hoped it would not be until his editorship was over and saw no gain in going with a publisher.

McCord asked Smith to address the issue that the original board in 1984 and 1985 repeatedly said the marketing issue and that is where a cost would be incurred against the budget and asked if Smith was willing to undertake that it wouldn't matter. McCord noted that no marketing had been done of the journal. Smith replied that the cost structure would not make it sensible for someone to subscribe to the journal and not just join the Society--the difference is \$5 or \$10. Smith stated on the issue of marketing he did not know what the potential market was or how many more people would have to be recruited in. He reported that he went over to the library and looked through history, geography, economics and other journals and prepared a list of authors who had published crime or criminal justice papers in the last two years. The list was sent to Sarah and asked her to check against membership and since there was a surplus of one issue of the journal to send these people a letter and a complimentary journal copy as that would be surgically narrowing in on a group of people that you knew were active writers and were interested in crime and criminal justice, but noted that he had no way of knowing what the yield was from th effort.

Lilly asked Smith to consider that he was being supported by a wealthy university and that Smith's answers would not be the same as another university. Smith noted that ASC could take the \$9,000 that the University of Maryland is contributing to support the journal and still end up with \$50,000.

Wellford stated that none of the publishers making the proposals are non-profit organizations and have to assume that they will be making some money off the contract and that Smith's point of what's the total income of the Society is extremely important; the Society will make less no matter what publisher they go with unless there is an extremely large market out there that the Society has not been able to tap and by their promotion and other activities are able to generate lots and lots of new subscribers. Wellford said the thing Sage did best was promote journals, but felt that the Board's collective thoughts were when they left Sage was that most of the effective marketing had been done by the Society through our own efforts to increase membership since we sold membership rather than journal subscriptions because of the cost structure that Smith referred to. Wellford stated his hypotheses was that if the Society goes with any of these (1) the Society will make less money for the organization, (2) we will not lead to a significant number of new subscribers

because that has not been successful in the past. Wellford noted that there is a concern on some people's part that we really kind of cut off some people from applying to be editor because we don't have the support or required institutional support. He stated he felt it was true but the Society could always offer a subsidy and any university or any organization that will get the journal is getting something very valuable and the University of Maryland felt it was important to have the journal there as a way of bring attention to their program. An assistantship dedicating a graduate student to work on the journal is not too much to expect any organization to come up with in order to have the honor of editing the journal.

Krohn noted that Wellford was talking of more than one assistantship as Smith gets release time from the university to which Wellford replied was not a direct cost. Krohn noted that some universities might want or need to have that subsidized also. In terms of marketing, Krohn felt it should not be talked about in terms of individual membership--that's not where we really make our monies from the journal--it's the institution subscriptions. He stated in talking with Bob that he indicated Social Problems has an institutional subscription rate twice the size of ASC. Krohn did not know what that means in terms of how likely ASC would be to tap the market and we need to focus our attention when we talk about marketing in this arena. Wellford noted that our institution subscription rate twice that of ACJS and larger than Law and Society; they requested our listing to increase their subscriptions. Lilly reported that Tom Hood indicated the reason the University of California Press was interested in our journal was because they real had a fat list of subscriptions from institutions and that is what they were after.

Klockars suggested separating out the question of promotion and set aside an amount that we want to try to invest in promotion for a period of time. Let's find out whether to our advantage in terms of increased subscription rates--either institutional or individual--to give somebody \$4-5,000. If we find out at the end of the year that we come out ahead, we know it will be money well spent. We could contract with someone for promotional purposes, we could do that independently. Baunach stated she would echo that if that was the Board's primary point but did not like the idea of two of the proposals stating they wanted to approve the editor of the Society's journal. Baunach stated that was a function of the Board and did not like someone else making that decision. Petersilia stated that she did not feel there was any sentiment around the Board for supporting going with a private company.

**Motion made by Michael Gottfredson to stay with the current practice of the Society publishing the journal; seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried .**

Regarding the promotion of the journal Klockars asked where the motion should be directed as to whether it should be given to a Publications Committee, ad hoc committee. Wellford noted there are financial implications that the Finance Committee or treasurer might want to be involved in. Petersilia stated that she had been with the publication issue for ever it seems that the Society has pretty well tapped the market that exists and do not need a promotional effort at this time and would not be willing to spend \$4,000. Lilly stated as treasurer he would encourage the spending of \$3-4,000 to find out what libraries are subscribing and what libraries are not, what police institutes and academies are or are not, etc. and find out what the institutional market is. Petersilia suggested obtaining the Social Problems list. Lilly replied it was a different journal--talking about libraries that have an interest in a more general, social problems topics instead of a journal that is a more narrow, specific journal for a smaller audience and whether that smaller audience in terms of college and university libraries is saturated is not know. Lilly noted that we have never approached selling the journal to academies--50 states have them. Would like to look at that before spending the money. Krohn inquired if marketing businesses wouldn't have some of that information available to them and submitting the proposal to us for

being the marketing agent for the journal wouldn't they be able to identify and give a rationale for why they think it would increase our subscriptions.

Sarah reported that lists are now in the ASC office from ACJS, Social Problems, Social Justice and Law and Society. The office is checking the Society's library subscriptions against the library subscriptions from these journals and promotion information is being sent to them.

Petersilia noted there is a computerized list of agencies involved in criminal justice--NIJ, etc. Suggested letters to those people, the New York Training Academy for Police, for example. The lists and could be done through Sarah's office and would be worth a letter and a complimentary copy to their members.

Petersilia suggested obtaining other association mailing lists, criminal justice agencies and academies and sending them a letter and possible table of contents from the last issue and brochure.

**Motion made by Joan Petersilia to obtain association mailing lists and lists of criminal justice agencies and academies for the purpose of promoting the Society membership and journal. A letter, possible table of contents from the latest issue of CRIMINOLOGY and brochure could be sent with the letter. Seconded by Carl Klockars. Motion carried.**

## **ETHICAL ISSUES COMMITTEE REPORT**

Chairman John Hagan's report of the Ethical Issues Committee was discussed. The Committee has devoted most of its time developing procedures for the selection of a minority graduate fellow. They also have begun to circulate materials on the access and protection of privacy issues and will continue to engage in a dialogue on these issues that began at the Chicago meetings and it is possible that proposals will be brought forward at the meeting in Reno. The Committee noted they had very little expertise on the matter of "fairness to women and minorities in criminal justice agencies" and asked for clarification and advice from the Board how they or future Ethics Committee could proceed. McCord noted that the Committee was asked to originally work on two issues: (1) fairness to women and minorities in criminal justice agencies, and (2) protection of privacy and may be coming up with a panel on protection of privacy at the Reno meeting. McCord inquired if the Board did not want the Committee to do anything further .

Debro inquired about the employment opportunities in the field as there are very few women and minorities in key positions and that the Committee should at least begin to look at this problem and obtain data on where people are and what they are doing. Wellford said they should be told to do their charge. Baunach inquired as to the procedures that the Committee developed for the selection of a minority graduate fellow. McCord stated that she thought the report had been submitted to the Board for its consideration and read the report as follows: (1) an announcement appear in THE CRIMINOLOGIST advertising the availability of the minority graduate fellowship and inviting nominations of suitable graduates; (2) the fellowship will go to a minority student who is admitted to a Ph.D. program and is concentrating in criminology or criminal justice; (3) This announcement encourages nominations that include commitment of matching funds from the host institutions; the announcement requests copies of undergraduate and/or graduate transcripts; at least two letters of support will accompany each letter of nomination along with an up-to-date curriculum vitae for the nominee which was modified by the Board at this meeting; (4) a subcommittee of the Executive Board of the Society is appointed to rank order candidates with authority given to merit and consideration given to

matching funds and needs, and (5) the rank-ordered list is submitted for consideration and approval by the Board with the Board assigned responsibility for making the final decision. This procedure is suggested on a one year trial basis to be evaluated and revised subsequent to its first application.

McCord noted there was a deadline of April 1 and had a decision from the last Board that the Executive Committee would make the first recommendation. All the Committee has added to their recommendations is adding the approval of the Board which McCord noted could not be if the Board is going to give the award this year. Wellford noted that everything that has been done makes the report mute because all have been addressed earlier and approved the advertisement. Baunach inquired if it had been decided that the Executive Committee would develop the procedures to implement the fellowship since there is a deadline. Baunach commented that the Board "lucked" in saying they were good procedures when the Board did not have an opportunity to read them before the meeting. McCord noted that at this morning's meeting the Board approved an ad that gave procedures to submit certain materials to Sarah by a deadline; last November the Board approved the Executive Committee would select the winner and would go to the university to try to get matching funds which was in the original minutes. Baunach noted that it was not in the minutes and Wellford noted that it had not been put in motion form and was part of the discussion. Baunach moved given the urgency of doing this to refer the matter to the Executive Committee for their consideration of the set of procedures and a determination of a set of procedures for this year only.

President McCord noted that the Ethics Committee report is recommended procedures and that the present policy is that the Executive Committee will be implementing the first year awards. Baunach noted that it was never decided that the Executive Committee would implement the first year awards but made a motion that this be done; seconded by Julius Debro.

Phyllis Jo Baunach moved that the Executive Committee determine the procedures for the selection of the ethnic minority fellow.

Debro noted that he had mentioned briefly before that the president could appoint a committee from the Board to look at the nominees and said he had some problems with having all the Executive Committee, and their being only one minority on the Board not included on the selection committee. Would be upset to have a Japanese or Indian student get the award and would like to have some input in the selection of the winner. Baunach stated that she did not say for the Executive Committee should make the selection but develop the procedures to make the selection because the Board cannot do it without previously seeing the report.

Petersilia wanted to make it clear what the Board is suggesting in giving authority to the Executive Committee because it seemed like the Board was doing the same thing they got in trouble for doing the last time we are getting the authority to go and develop procedures for awarding the Board and if that Executive Board in fact decides it can award it, she inquired if that would be all right with everyone on the Board as it needed to be made clear. She inquired if the motion which states developing procedures also includes the Executive Committee making the award.

Wellford noted the point of discussion at last evening's meeting and this morning was to make it clear that the Executive Committee had the power to act on behalf of the Board in decisions that the Board had already made. The Board has made a decision to give an ethnic minority fellowship; we have established the basic criteria, and now all we are saying is that the Executive Committee will not change the rules in any way but will follow the



approved procedures to select the winner of the fellowship if there is one. Baunach inquired if the Executive Committee was actually serving as a selection committee because that was not what she was saying in her motion. McCord stated that they would have to if the Society is to implement what was approved last year because the Board will not meet unless you are going to have completely different people apply--the implication of the ad is that we are talking about next year students. Debro stated it was his impression that the Board would develop the procedures and that the president would appoint a subcommittee from the Board for the selection of the winner. McCord replied that the idea of a subcommittee was never brought up last year. Wellford noted that the Executive Committee could make a decision that a committee be established; the Executive Committee could make a decision that the Executive Committee did it. Neither one of those would be inconsistent to make a selection unless they make a deacon to use some other ad hoc group. They have the power to award or not award the fellowship. Harris inquired if there was a reason for saying the Executive Committee as opposed to the president appointing a committee to handle this issue. Baunach noted that in her motion she was thinking of the most efficacious thing to do but given the discussion she requested her motion be withdrawn stating it might behoove us to have the president to appoint a committee to do just that. Wellford noted that due respect to Debro and support fully the notion that the fellowship should have been restricted to Blacks and hasn't been, if we are going to put a Black on the committee because there is an interest in having Blacks, then to be consistent we should have at least a Hispanic, Asian American and Native American since they are specified in the ad as being given special consideration and felt that was silly.

Phyllis Jo Baunach moved that the Executive Committee determine the procedures for the selection of the recipient of the Ethnic Minority Fellowship. Petersilia made a friendly amendment that the Committee will develop procedures and develop criteria. It is up to the discretion of the Executive Committee to make the selection itself or to appoint a committee. Seconded by Neal Shover.

Baunach inquired if the Executive Committee does not make the selection would we be able to do the fellowship in time. Wellford noted that the Executive Committee could say they wanted A,B,C,D to be the ad hoc committee to make the selection if they wished to do that. There has been no direction to the contrary and if you leave the procedures open you could do that. Either one is fine. If you take Petersilia's amendment then it is stated that the Executive Committee will do it. Baunach stated she did not want to accept Petersilia's amendment.

President McCord called for the voting on the amendment to Baunach's motion. Wellford read the full amendment: Move that the Executive Committee determine the procedures for the selection of the recipient of the Ethnic Minority Fellowship, and furthermore that the Executive Committee will use these procedures to select the recipient of that fellowship.

Harris stated she thought Petersilia's amendment would include the authority if they chose to exercise it to select the winner themselves but they could come up with an alternative procedure.

**The motion was substituted to: Move that the Executive Committee develop and employ the procedures and criteria for the selection of the Ethnic Minority Fellow. Favor: 9; Opposed: 3. Motion carried.**

**NATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT**

President McCord called the Board's attention to the National Policy Committee report. The committee has arranged for a special panel covering the death penalty resolution to be held prior to the Business Meeting at the ASC annual meeting in Reno. The Committee also prepared a National Policy Committee procedural guidelines statement to be published in THE CRIMINOLOGIST. **Charles Wellford moved for approval of the National Policy Committee report; seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried.**

### **GRANTS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE REPORT**

President McCord read from the progress report she received from Robert Meier, chair of the Grants and Contracts Committee. Primarily through Jeff Roth, the Committee has been pursuing funding for the position papers and scholarships and at this point have identified four private foundations that may be interested in the position papers. Are continuing their conversations with them but are encouraged that something can be eventually be worked out. They reported less than encouraging news about the scholarships noting their contacts with foundations have disclosed that these places, or the ones contacted to date, have indicated that they are not virtually funding fellowships of any kind. The financial term is too long for them to make that type of commitment. The Committee reported they will continuing looking, but are beginning to hear the same story from these places over and over again.

**Neal Shover moved the receipt of the Grants and Contracts Committee Report and urge them to continue for definitive report by November; seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. Motion carried.**

### **SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT**

President McCord called the Board's attention to the Site Selection Committee Report from Chairman Marc Riedel.

Wellford raised a question noting that in the past when locations have been considered one criteria sometimes used is whether the site is in the state that has voted to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. It has been considered in the past and did not know if it had ever been adopted it as a policy of passed a motion to that effect but it we are going to use it, it should be decided up front and if not or people do not think it is a critical issue anymore, we should decide that also as it would affect a number of recommendations in this report. Wellford noted that Florida, Louisiana and Texas have not passed the ERA. Wellford stated he called NOW and there general advice was they have lost the first battle, they plan another battle and do not want to upset people by boycotting at this point. Their recommendation was that we not follow what we have done in the past to which we are not bound. Baunach stated there was no policy to the effect that the Society would not go to states that have not adopted the ERA.

Klockars noted that originally he was charged with looking at the 1992 because 1991 was given over to the special 50th Anniversary Meeting. He noted he previously had done a site visit in New Orleans for 1992 but brought in a 1991 contract at the last meeting as an alternative to the San Francisco site which was later chosen. We have a fairly close to bottom line contract offer from the New Orleans Fairmont and felt there was a strong case to be made for the city and hotel given that it was the number one choice in the survey of members, hotel fits the needs of the Society, and have a competitive rate. President McCord instructed Marc Riedel to make some calls around to see if there are other places you want to put on the table as well which he did with the understanding that it could be

done as 1992 alternative option or we could work on those sites for 1993. Klockars recommendation to the Board is that the Society consider New Orleans and the Fairmont Hotel in particular for the 1992 meeting. Klockars distributed a firm 1992 contract for the Board's information. President McCord noted that a decision did not need to be made at this Board meeting but would be required by the November Board meeting.

Klockars stated that the Fairmont Hotel contract is a very good one and unless there were some good reasons to do so, he stated he would not want to wait because as time gets closer the hotel will be able to sell the space at more money than Klockars has negotiated.

**Michael Gottfredson moved to accept the site of New Orleans and the Fairmont Hotel for the 1992 annual meeting; seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried.**

Wellford noted the Board had approved procedures regarding the Site Selection Committee as follows: **Decisions on the selection of sites and hotels and the signing and modification of hotel contracts must be approved by the Executive Board. Wellford stated that the motion is to authorize the Board to select the site and the hotel but have not yet approved the contract until it is written and distributed to the Board. Wellford noted that it also states in case of emergency the President may in consultation with the Executive Committee choose an alternative site or approve contract signing or modifications.** If the contract had to be signed before November, it could be done through the Executive Committee.

**Klockars moved that the Board authorize President McCord to sign the present contract with the Fairmont Hotel or with consultation with the Executive a contract that is better in terms of what it delivers to the Society; seconded by Neal Shover.** *Committee*  
**Motion carried.**

Petersilia requested a friendly amendment that President McCord is authorized to sign the final contract once it has been approved by the Site Selection Committee. Klockars suggested to make it more efficient by having a smaller group, say composed of Bob Lilly, Sarah Hall, Joan McCord and himself. Wellford stated that we already have a policy to do this and did not see any reason to create an ad hoc committee and suggested the motion be approved as stated.

Debro expressed concern that the Board ran into major problems with the San Francisco contract and there was enough time for the Board to see the New Orleans contract in November and unless there was an emergency there is no reason to sign the contract until the Board has had an opportunity to read it. Klockars responded that this contract has taken him a lot of time to get to the present phase and has been dealing with the hotel for over a year on the contract and did not feel it was unreasonable to give Joan the capacity for closure on the transaction. Did not see any risk to the Society--\$95.00 single/double flat rate guaranteed in 1992 with no escalators of any kind; 1 per 50 comp room; provides 2 suites and will guarantee it will be 3 suites, and may be able to get some other items in the contract.

Wellford noted the contract did not address limitation of food costs; audio-visual equipment; program outline requested 6 months in advance of meeting; any hidden fees built in such as union fees. Klockars noted the hotel subcontracts out the audio-visual equipment to a private company and would not be included in the contract. Klockars noted that most groups the size of the Society work three years out, so they are presently signing 1992 contracts.

Klockars noted that Riedel has looked at Phoenix and Tucson and felt that the Site Selection Committee should be instructed to give the Board informed judgments to give it a general direction, say, look at several cities and have the committee do a full study of places for the Board to look at with the best contract negotiated, full brochure on the hotel, pictures of meeting space which would help the Board make a decision. The Board cannot decide to go to a city unless they know a lot more about the hotels in the city, the rates that are available, etc. We have been doing site selections backwards. First suggest that you give Marc some guidance as to three or four cities to look at and hear reports on in November.

Lilly inquired how the Board can be sure that the procedure would not be abused. Klockars stated that is what the procedure is for. Any member of the Site Selection Committee must have the approval of the president to go to a site and must supply a full and detailed site evaluation report. Lilly inquired if the Society or hotels were funding the trips. Klockars stated you could go anywhere you want on fam trips at no cost to the Society.

Wellford noted that as far as directing the Site Selection Committee for its work between now and November, it seemed to him that the 1993 meeting should be on the east coast, if we follow the sometimes practice of going over third year to the east. Klockars reported that he thought the Society had abandoned the east-west rotation which was originally decided to do to distribute air costs equally among members. Klockars noted that airfares are roughly equal, it depends more on whether you choose a hub city of it is 500 or 1500 miles away, you alleviate that need to distribute east-west rotation and noted the Board should go to cities that they felt would be fun cities to go to. Wellford noted that the Board passed at last November's meeting that the Site Selection Committee should also consider regional pattern of sites over time reflecting distribution of cost and convenience of travel equally among members from different geographical areas. Klockars stated that the north east is almost impossible for the Society; writing off Philadelphia, Boston, New York City because they are first tier cities. Wellford suggested Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Memphis as possible sites. Klockars suggested there were 15 or 20 cities that the Board should think about as being within the Society's means.

Harris suggested San Antonio, Phoenix, Tucson are more attractive cities. Petersilia suggested Phoenix, San Antonio, and San Diego. Wellford reminded the Board that when Chicago was mentioned there was the same reaction received for Memphis, Nashville and Cincinnati, and the meeting was the largest in the Society's history. The membership cannot afford the prices to go to Phoenix, San Francisco, San Diego, etc. and important to find the second tier cities where we can afford the hotels and minimize travel costs for people by selecting something of kind of middle in the country. Baunach presented a friendly amendment to include the cities of Minneapolis and San Antonio. Klockars suggested adding San Diego and Houston to the list. Petersilia suggested Los Angeles. Gottfredson suggested Phoenix.

Charles Wellford moved Nashville, Cincinnati, and Memphis as the target cities for the 1993 annual meeting. Seconded by Marvin Krohn.

**Amended motion to move Memphis, Nashville, Cincinnati, San Diego, San Antonio, Minneapolis, Houston, and Los Angeles and Phoenix as target cities for the 1993 annual meeting. Seconded by Marvin Krohn; motion carried.**

President McCord stated that she would be the one to authorize the fam trips and the Board has to approve the final site selection, so that the Board cannot authorize the Committee simply to go wherever they feel like going. The Board has to have some sense

of the places the Board is willing to consider. Since the Board will be approving the final place, it is reasonable to ask the Board to select what cities to consider. Klockars stated the Committee has to come back with the understanding to negotiate something that will give the Board a sense of what we would be getting. Klockars said that when the proposals come in to the November meeting, to have the president-elect decide where she might want to hold the Executive Board meeting and to possibly look at the site for a future meeting. Wellford suggested that if the motion is approved, that the Board take a straw vote on the list of cities.

Following a straw vote, the following cities were rank ordered: (1) San Antonio, (2) Memphis, (3) Nashville, (4) Phoenix, (5) San Diego, (6) Cincinnati, (7) Los Angeles, (8) Houston, and (9) Minneapolis. President McCord said at this point we do not know if some of these cities have hotels large enough for our meetings but will direct the Site Selection Committee to look into these cities.

Klockars reported he had a contract for 100 overflow rooms in Baltimore which would be next to the Omni Hotel connected by a walkway to the Lord Baltimore Hotel. Contract for 100 rooms Wednesday through Saturday evening at \$80 flat, single or double which is the same rate as the Omni, and we do not suffer anything by it. If we do not sell any rooms, there is a 30 day release time.

**Phyllis Jo Baunach moved the approval of a 100 overflow room contract with the Lord Baltimore Hotel for our 1990 meeting in Baltimore. Seconded by Michael Gottfredson. Motion carried.**

Klockars reported that he would also like to obtain 100 overflow hotel rooms in New Orleans noting there were some very nice small hotels that we could get 25-30 rooms in possibly three or four hotels and would bring the contract to the November meeting.

### **MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT**

The Membership Committee has engaged in a number of activities: 1) contacted a number of primarily Black organizations to which social scientists, criminologists belong and have arranged to secure their membership list to send out invitations for membership to the ASC and call for papers for the 1989 annual meeting. Membership lists have been secured from Law and Society, Social Problems, Social Justice, and ACJS to send non-ASC members affiliated within these organizations membership information on the Society and invitations to participate in the Reno annual meeting. Committee members have reviewed the ASC brochure with a number of changes instituted and new brochures will be printed within the next month and will be widely distributed to potential new members. A letter has been drafted to send to major departments that have criminology and/or criminal justice students to seek the assistance of faculty members in both encouraging colleagues and graduate students to consider membership in the ASC.

**Charles Wellford moved to accept the Membership Committee Report; seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried.**

### **STUDENT AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT**

President McCord read the report of the Student Awards Committee provided by Ora Simcha-Fagan, Chair. The deadline for the student paper competition was revised to April 15 noting that seven papers had been received--5 graduate and 2 undergraduate.

Preliminary phone inquiries suggest that at least one to two additional submissions can be expected. A preview cursory reading of the papers indicate that the graduate papers clearly meet expectations for entry; they reflect advanced graduate work and cover a wide range of topics. The undergraduate papers are not only less sophisticated as expected but at times lean toward a subjective, personal mode. All papers will be entered and reviewers comments provided. The first meeting of the Committee convened at the 1988 annual meeting in Chicago and methods to increase submissions were discussed in light of the relatively low rate in 1987 and 1988; members present agreed to review each entry notwithstanding a sharp increase in the number of papers. Solicitation for the 1989 awards began with a statement by Ronald Akers, the past chair, at the 1988 banquet on behalf of this year's committee. Several informal meetings aimed at encouraging submissions were held with groups of students at the 1988 conference. A Call for Entries was published in each issue of THE CRIMINOLOGIST since November 1988. A letter of solicitation was sent to chairs and deans heading programs in criminology.

In reviewing the papers committee members will rate each entry obviously blind to school and personal identification. On a scale of 1 to 10, guided by a prespecified criteria, using total scores across reviewers, the top 3 to 5 papers will be identified, committee members repolled as to their nominations for first, second and third awards. Although submissions have been low for at least three successive years, the awards should be continued with the option that currently exists that the committee may decide that no papers sufficiently qualify to receive an award. In communicating with the deans, chairs, and other faculty, she found them to be responsive to the goals of the award. There is reason to assume that enthusiasm is on the rise. To understand current patterns of participation and simultaneously increase submissions, some of the following actions may be taken:

- 1) Survey the ASC conference abstracts over the past three to four years as well as those of key criminology journals to establish the extent to which papers authored by students are represented. This will give the committee at least a preliminary impression of graduate student participation in the production of knowledge and the potential submissions which have been or are being missed.; 2) Carry out a mail survey of ASC student membership with the intent of understanding both sentiment and decisionmaking regarding submissions. Student comments on the current structure of the awards should also be solicited; 3) Continue communication with department chairs and program directors to convey the Society's emphasis on promoting early excellence, and (4) continue recent tradition of enhancing the awards visibility at the conference. The Committee will provide another report at the November meeting.

**Neal Shover moved to accept the report of the Student Awards Committee; seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. Favor: 10, Abstentions: 2. Motion carried.**

Wellford suggested that the Board address the motion and have copies of the Student Awards Committee distributed to all members of the Board and if they have any comments or suggestions on what the committee is doing, they may communicate with the committee directly.

### **STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT**

Wellford recommended that the Board refer the attachment to the Student Affairs Committee Report in article III of the letter to the Student Awards Committee and ask them to comment on it for the November meeting and second seek the clarification that is requested by Chair Ruth-Ellen Grimes to the issue of the legal liability of the Society if we in fact establish some type of housing for students.

**Charles Wellford moved that we accept and refer to the Student Awards Committee the attached letter to Wellford referred to under Article 3 of the report by Ruth-Ellen Grimes; seconded by Julius Debro. Motion carried noting one abstention.**

This matter will be discussed at the November meeting.

With regard to the matter of legal liability, Sarah reported that one lawyer told her that anyone can sue you, but a disclaimer notice could be placed on our reservation forms which the hotel do, and also any of the travel companies also use disclaimers on their forms.

**A motion was made by Phyllis Jo Baunach and seconded by Julius Debro that the (the) Omni Hotel, site of the 1990 annual meeting, prepare a reservation/confirmation card, to be included in the annual meetings mailing packet, which would allow for shared accommodation and set up separate billing accounts for each room occupant. Motion carried.**

### **ADVERTISING AND EXHIBITS REPORT**

**Neal Shover moved; seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach to accept the Advertising and Exhibits report prepared by Chris W. Eskridge. Motion carried.**

### **EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGE COMMITTEE REPORT**

The Employment Exchange Committee requested that the Board approve two adjacent rooms for the Exchange, one to have cubicles where candidates can meet with employers and/or review notebooks in privacy.

**Charles Wellford moved acceptance of the Employment Exchange Committee report for two adjacent rooms for the Exchange at the annual meeting; seconded by Neal Shover. Harris said she would endorse the sense of the request but would not state that the Society would provide two rooms as there may be some better arrangements available in a facility. Liked the idea of a private setting, but is not sure that two rooms is the best option. President McCord noted that the motion does not obligate anything other than the next meeting. Gottfredson offered an amendment to the motion that at the discretion of the President two adjacement rooms for the Employment Exchange would be provided. Klockars suggested at the discretion of the Program Chair. Klockars expressed concern that the Society is a very hot group to fit into a single hotel, given the block size we want and the amount of rooms we need make an enormous demand on virtually any hotel's meeting room space and this means to constantly take out two rooms and there could be situations where hotels are tight on meeting space that we may want to do something like have the Exchange take a large suite and use that for their purpose. Do this in the spirit that really advices the program chair to try to accmmodate this as best as possible--it doesn't mean you shut down sessions to do it.**

**Charles Wellford moved acceptance of the report of the Employment Exchange Committee with the modification that the Board approves, at the discretion of the program chair, two adjacent rooms will be provided for the Employment Exchange, one to have cubicles where candidates meet with employers and/or review notebooks in privacy. This will apply for Baltimore to be considered and after that by the Board to determine whether it should be continued in the future. Motion carried.**

## INTERORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Julius Debro reported that all Board members have been given a report of the committee and reported that he had met with ABA and also with the SSSP in trying to get them to present panels at Reno and hope to have it finalized within the next two meetings. *months*

Charles Wellford moved to accept the report of the Interorganizational Committee; seconded by Phyllis Jo Baunach. Motion carried. *weeks*

## FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

J. Robert Lilly reported that part of the financial report had been distributed at last evening's meeting which was the retirement plan for Sarah. The Committee was also asked to work on other possible benefits for the members of the Society such as supplemental medical health insurance programs, life insurance programs. Also the issue of should we/could we/or how can we raise the membership dues as a financial consideration. Had not received written committee reports from his subcommittees, but did have a report from Merry Morash on the topic of medical issue and possible benefits for our membership. From her research she concludes that we are too small of an organization with the membership changing too rapidly to provide any kind of group supplemental insurance policy for our members. Any organization with less than 5,000 members seems to be much too small to work up a program. Don Gottfredson is looking into life insurance as a possibility; Joan Jacoby is looking into some way of obtaining reduced hotel rates for our members. On the issue of raising membership dues, Merry Morash was involved last year, and the conclusion then was that we should <sup>not</sup> change the dues on any basis of a tiered structure. Secondly, there is no need to raise the dues because we have no clear need of money, and the Committee still feels until the Board decides that the Society needs money for something specific, we should not be raising the membership dues. The Committee did not discuss raising the dues for journal subscriptions to libraries, organizations. They haven't been raised in five years.

President McCord asked if the Committee would be looking into raising subscription dues. Krohn stated he is to find out what comparable organizations are charging for institution subscriptions so that we can have some benchmark and decide where we want to go. Krohn said this information would be available at the November meeting. Gottfredson inquired if there was any Board sentiment to increase the subscription rates now. Klockars spoke against raising the subscription rates as libraries have problems in retaining large amounts of money for subscriptions. If \$15-20 were added, it might hurt many libraries, and until we have a need for the money, he did not think the Board should take the increase subscriptions from libraries funds.

Julius Debro stated the Society should keep some kind of balance with other organizations. Lilly suggested a motion on what the Committee had presented orally and the raising of journal subscriptions was not part of the Committee discussed. Lilly felt it should be separated from the fact of not raising membership dues, medical insurance not being a viable benefit, and that we don't know about life insurance. The Committee has not reported anything from the perspective as to what we ought to do or could do with subscriptions.

A motion was made by Michael Gottfredson; and seconded by Julius Debro to accept oral report of the Finance Committee. Motion carried noting one abstention.



Lilly reported that the Committee will be looking into and will make a report at the November meeting investigate what is involved in remodeling, expanding and cleaning up Sarah's office. It's a very unpleasant place to work, holes in the wall, worn carpet, etc. We will try to redouble our space in the same building or spend some money with private contractors that would give Sarah a pleasant place to work.

Smith inquired if issues regarding member benefits fall within the domain of the Finance Committee and wonder if the Society has ever thought of what ASA does--where people who are in good standing of ASC might get a discount on certain other journals, discount on certain volumes, etc. Almost certain that JQC or Plenum would kick back \$5.00 for every one. Establishing as ASC as more of a core society where there is an additional member benefit of some reductions on volumes out of certain publishers. He noted that it might be possible to have a reciprocal agreement between Law and Society Association, etc. and do not know how far it would go or what the options would be.

**President McCord asked if Marvin Krohn, on behalf of the Editorial Board, would explore the possibilities of discounts to the Society from other associations.**

### **NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT**

President McCord read the report of the Nominations Committee noting that in addition to the formal call for nominations to be made later in the year, the Committee specifically requested nominations from the Executive Board and invited the Board members to place names in nominations by writing to Steven Gottfredson at Temple University indicating which nominations are for president-elect, vice president-elect, and executive counselor.

Klockars suggested that in the materials handed out to the members at the annual meeting that we have a nominations form for officer positions and for award positions and a drop box. Wellford noted that prior to the meetings every member receives a request for nominations and that's what Steve will send out and by the time he gets to the meeting he will have a list of the committees nominations for the Board.

**Julius Debro moved the acceptance of the Nominations Committee Report; seconded by Charles Wellford. Motion carried.**

### **BITNET**

Charles Wellford reported at the November Board meeting in the Membership Committee's report there was a suggestion to include one's Bitnet identification in the membership directory and while the Board accepted the report, we did not specifically authorize and approve that and are now seeking the Board's approval to include in the next solicitation of information for the membership directory an option for members to supply their Bitnet identification and would include that as the last line in the directory.

**Motion was made by Julius Debro and seconded by Neal Shover that the next request for information for the membership directory will include an option for members to supply their Bitnet identification to be included in the membership directory. Debro requested friendly amendment to also include members' FAX number. Motion carried.**

### **THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES MAILING LIST**

Charles Wellford noted that at the last Board meeting William Chambliss volunteered<sup>e</sup> and his volunteering was accepted to develop the criteria for the third world mailing list and to develop a specific mailing list. Wellford reported that he had spoken to Chambliss prior to the meetings and reported that he had not been able to have a report at this meeting but asked that the Board allow him to continue working on the assignment and that he guaranteed that he will provide a report on both issues at the November meeting.

### **1989-1990 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

Joan Petersilia reported she began her process of selecting committee appointments by contacting current committee chairs that might be engaged in matters that would require more than a one year appointment. Would give an opportunity for chairs to continue if they could provide justification for the continuation and specific items that they wanted to have reappointed. Wrote to six chairs and have reappointed three. She reported that she placed an announcement in *THE CRIMINOLOGIST* requesting members to contact her directly if they would like to participate on a committee and received approximately 35 responses and everyone that responded was placed on some committee. The Division on Women and Crime also provided a list and selected from those and sent the list to Michael Gottfredson for his correction or addition.

Since sending in the listing, there is one change to make. Kay Harris has been asked to serve as chair of the new Affirmative Action Committee and has accepted the assignment. Therefore Kay will be removed as chair of the Employment Exchange Committee. Was not presently prepared to choose a chair of the Employment Exchange. Was not aware that there was a policy stating that there are certain chairs that should be Executive Counselor members--Nominations, Fellows, Awards. McCord noted that Chambliss argued strongly when he was president that he did not want to follow those procedures and there was no objection from the Board. Baunach noted that on 2/23/85 on page 4 of the minutes the Board did state that was a policy.

Klockars stated that using the Executive Counselors in that way should be a policy and will remind the Board that one rationale for that is that it gives the Board feedback from a person that is involved in what exactly went on and saves us or certain kinds of committees of bringing that person into a winter Board meeting. Petersilia stated she was trying to follow the policy of appointing an Executive Counselor to chair the Fellows, Awards and Nomination Committees or member of the Board.

**Carl Klockars moved that the chair of the Nominations, Fellows and Awards Committees be Executive Counselors of the Society for now until eternity. Seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried.**

Harris inquired for point of information if that applied to what the Board was now reviewing. Neal Shover noted that he would be leaving the Board in November and could not be chair of the Awards Committee. Petersilia noted that that was what had been confusing as she had been trying to place the current Board and not the incoming Board and they are not presently known. Harris reported that when she served on the National Policy Committee the Committee asked the Board to regularize more overlap and have staggered terms--Klein and Goldkamp were on previous committees--and inquired if the policy had been adopted. Petersilia stated it was reflected in there; three members appointed by McCord were reappointed by Petersilia. There are no clear guidelines--that the Site Selection chair should have been a former program chair. Wellford noted that another area that the same type of problem applies to is the Editorial Board and inquired if Petersilia's appointments captured the staggered terms as the policy states the four

appointed Board members shall serve staggered two year terms so the president only is able to appoint two new members to the committee and the non appended members. Wellford noted the Editorial Board shall consist of the Vice President as chair, Vice President-Elect, and four members appointed by the President on staggered terms (two from McCord and two from Petersilia) along with the editors of the journal and newsletter.

Petersilia noted that in looking at McCord's appointments, she would need to reappoint Margaret Farnworth and Simon Dinitz to the Editorial Board. Petersilia also stated that she wanted to have the new editor of THE CRIMINOLOGIST as one of her appointments to the Editorial Board which would an ex-officio member of the Board. Harris suggested that since the chair of the Fellows Committee must be an Executive Counselor, that Barbara Price might be moved to chair of the Employment Exchange Committee.

Wellford inquired if she had a sense of the number of minorities on the committees to which Petersilia replied that she placed any minority she knew of on the committee and anyone that had written to her were placed on committees plus she received names from Debro. Also, she reported that she had told Kay Harris that she could constitute in conjunction with her to see how she sees fit and any minority names submitted could be placed on this committee.

**Michael Gottfredson moved the acceptance of the 1989-90 committee appointments given the mandatory changes that are required; seconded by Neal Shover. Motion carried.**

### **FUNDING FOR THE CRIMINOLOGIST**

Joan Petersilia noted that it came to her attention when she was trying to find people to apply for editorship of THE CRIMINOLOGIST that there was no line item in our budget for any funding for the newsletter and some of the smaller universities who had potential candidates did not feel they could come up with the dollars required. In checking into it further, it appears that there are basically no dollars really required and turned out a pretty mute issue. Less than \$500 is spent by the editor on the newsletter because all of the expenses are incurred by Hugh's university. She stated it seemed to make sense to include some line item so that the next person that comes in would have access to dollars permitting him to hire a student in paste ups and proofreading primarily of the newsletter. \$1,000 at most a year was discussed to fund, photograph, film, developing, postage, telephone and the student that would help. Hugh asked that the issue be raised before the Board and the figure raised to \$3,000.

Wellford suggested that this may be the time to have a review done of the newsletter and particularly its financial situation. As was discussed last evening, in last year's situation the newsletter overspent by about \$5,000. The newsletter has grown without the Board's careful review and monitoring. Originally a 12 page limit was set for the newsletter and it has now about doubled that without approval from the Board and has gone to glossy, color and pictures which add up to a make a very good newsletter, but again the Board has not reviewed it. Wellford stated that he felt the newsletter was becoming a significant drain on the Society and felt the Board should now take the opportunity to review it and in doing so look at the cost and come up with what the Board feels is a reasonable budget for it and not act on it until we have done a more comprehensive review. ACJS has gone to four issues a year now instead of six for similar cost considerations and Wellford suggested that this might easily be done without any great loss to the membership to go to four issues a year. Wellford suggested that the Editorial Committee to review the full operation of THE CRIMINOLOGIST and report back to the Board at the November meeting with recommendations on the frequency, size, and budget for the publication.

**Charles Wellford moved that the Editorial Board is directed to review the operation of the Criminologist and report back to the Board at its November meeting that this report would give special consideration to the frequency of publication, the size of the publication, and the cost of publication, and any other matters they thought appropriate to consider. Seconded by J. Robert Lilly. Motion carried.**

### **EXCHANGE OF MEMBERSHIP MAILING LISTS**

President McCord noted that the Board has already heard of the exchange of membership lists to other organizations and have received more than one request for our mailing list. She noted that her own policy had been in the absence of any policy by the Board to exchange whenever the ASC had a benefit--for example to get more names than we pass out or equal names--but to turn down any requests for lists for free that have policy implications to them. The most recent request of that type was from the Drug Policy Foundation. The Society did sell them our list but received a letter asking the Society to waive the fee. The Foundation wanted to send out a drug letter that has a position that would legalize drugs and increase medical treatment but has a political position and on the grounds of political position President McCord stated the list should be sold and not give free and thought it was an appropriate topic for the Board and inquired if the Board would like to set policy or leave it to the President which has been done before.

President McCord reported that the Society had given to its mailing lists to Social Justice, trade with Social Problems, and sell to Drug Policy Foundation. \$150.00 is charged for our mailing list. Debro suggested that the policy be left to the discretion of the President. Lilly noted that the treasurer has also been involved in this matter in the past.

**Phyllis Jo Baunach moved that the policy of giving away the ASC mailing list be left to the discretion of the President; seconded by Julius Debro. Motion carried.**

President McCord reported the General Accounting Office had requested help from the Society as to input on looking at discrepancies in salaries and requested names which were provided. It was brought to President McCord's attention that CRIMINOLOGY was not listed in the Criminal Justice Periodical Index and a letter was sent from President McCord requesting that this be done. Debro reported that he talked to New Jersey two years ago about putting about putting criminal justice in as part of the GRE's and it is now in there.

President McCord reported that she had written <sup>St. Francis contract</sup> to Joe Scott thanking him for his help in the resolution of the San Francisco hotel. She reported he had obtained standard rooms \$5.00 lower; medium rooms \$10.00 lower, and 20% guarantee of standard; 60% of medium, 3% instead of 7% for two years instead of three years; two complimentary suites, and the program is due but not a final program; renegotiate if we fall below 65% which used to be 75% and no bartender costs if we have \$500 in sales.

President McCord reported the November meeting will be Wednesday morning, November 8, at 9:00 a.m. Joan Petersilia reported her Board meeting will be Sunday morning, November 12, 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Julius Debro requested that the Vollmer award matter be tabled until the November Board meeting.

President McCord asked Wellford to contact William Chambliss to have a report on the registrations that were waived at the Chicago meeting.

Harris noted that next year's high school debate is on prison reform and they will be doing research. Petersilia reported that they adopt one topic a year and all high schools throughout the country get resource material. Four full time staff do nothing else for the next six months but pull together in a bound edition all the resource material collected and every student joining a debate team receives this book of resource material. All through the year at the local, region and state they continue to debate the topic and the winners are flown to Washington, D.C. and debate the final issue in the Senate and its televised.

Gottfredson suggested that this might be a good session for the Society. Petersilia noted they had contacted NIJ and the Clark Foundation and would like to get other people interested in serving as judges, to help put the resource materials together and what the students should be reading. President McCord asked if there was a way to get the ASC involved in the materials. The National Association of High Schools are linked to the debate. President McCord requested M. Kay Harris to take on the task to see how ASC can get involved and the Executive Committee can be active in time to do something. Julius Debro offered to help Kay.

Petersilia noted that President McCord should be authoriz + d to write the head of the committee saying the Society is excited about the topic and are available as a resource. The Society can make them aware of the relevant publications that are available.

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.