ASC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

February 18, 1978

San Diego Hilton Hotel - San Diego, California

Members Present: Ronald L. Akers
                  C. Ray Jeffery
                  Harry E. Allen
                  Elmer Johnson
                  William E. Amos
                  Donal E.J. MacNamara
                  Paul Brantingham
                  Sarnoff C. Mednick
                  Edith Flynn
                  Barbara Raffel Price
                  Edith Flynn
                  Frank Scarpitti
                  Paul Friday
                  Joseph E. Scott
                  Gilbert Geis
                  Charles Wellford
                  Brian Grosman
                  Benjamin Ward (non-member observer)
                  James Hackler
                  James Inciardi

Guests: John Barbara
        June Morrison

C. Ray Jeffery called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., Saturday, February 18, 1978. President Jeffery introduced John Barbara as a visitor to the Executive Board meeting and as the new president of the Western Society of Criminology. Jeffery also introduced the Board members Sarnoff Mednick.

Joseph E. Scott reviewed the minutes of the Business Meeting from Atlanta, November 17, 1977, and the Executive Board meeting of December 10, 1977, held in New York City, for those in attendance. C. Ray Jeffery moved that the minutes of November 17 and December 10 be accepted. Edith Flynn seconded the motion; motion carried.

Donal MacNamara then suggested that greater care be made as to editing the minutes and more discretion used in identifying comments made by various Board members.

TREASURER’S REPORT (Attachment #1)

Harry E. Allen called the members attention to the Treasurer's Report. He pointed out that there were two minor errors in the report; one of $8.00 and one of $18.00. He reported that the cash on hand as of January 31, 1978, was as follows:
TREASURER'S REPORT (cont'd)

Ronald Akers asked whether, based on the Treasurer's Report, the Society was in good financial condition. Allen responded that we were definitely in good financial condition and there were no major financial problems in the foreseeable future. Akers then asked whether the Atlanta convention had been profitable in the sense of generating additional monies for the Society. Allen reported that it had. He pointed out to those present a preliminary analysis of the Atlanta convention expenses and income on page 3 of the Treasurer's Report. Based on these figures, the Society could possibly realize a profit from the Atlanta convention of approximately $4,000. Akers then asked whether the Society should attempt to generate such profits from our annual meetings or whether we should reduce the costs for those desiring to attend the convention. C. Ray Jeffery commented that he felt each convention should be profitable if at all possible. William Amos agreed with Jeffery and pointed out it was important for our annual meetings to generate some overhead money for the Society to continue to prosper.

C. Ray Jeffery moved that the Board accept the Treasurer's Report. William Amos seconded the motion; motion carried.

Allen suggested that the Society move in the direction of adopting a two-year budget instead of the present year-by-year budget adoption policy. Paul Friday asked how reasonable it was to expect the continued growth of the Society, that we have had in the past. Allen responded that the growth for the last two years had been consistent and that last year's increased membership was as good as the previous years.

Joseph Scott asked whether the number of active members had actually increased since 1977 or if the inflated membership figures were due to the Society's policy of counting those who had not paid their dues for the previous two years. Allen responded that the number of active members had been approximately stable for the last year.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT (Attachment #2)

Harry Allen presented the Finance Committee report and pointed out that the proposed budget for the 1978-1979 year was based on:

1) 20% net growth factor
2) $500 from advertising in the Membership Directory
3) Royalties increasing by 20%, and
4) Profit from the Dallas convention should be 20% higher than the Atlanta profit.

Allen pointed out that the proposed budget for 1978-1979 was $70,700.00.

C. Ray Jeffery asked why the proposed budget for the 1979 convention was only $9,800 when the budget for the 1977 annual meeting had been considerably higher. Barbara Price reported that Alvin Cohn had requested that $2,000 be set
FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT (cont'd)

aside in the budget for revolving expenses to be used by the program chairperson. He had indicated a need for this money to organize things before the 1978-1979 budget went into effect. Jeffery pointed out that Brantingham had also requested expenses a year in advance but the Board had turned his request down. Akers indicated the necessity for some type of contingency fund to prepare the meetings two years in advance so we could eliminate some potential problems in lining everything up for our annual meeting. Jeffery inquired as to whether the Society had ever charged expenditures in one budget year against future budget years' income. Allen responded that we had. Amos suggested that the Executive Board approve the policy of the program chairperson and president-elect of charging expenditures to be applicable toward future budget years' income. He suggested that the Treasurer work out the mechanism for handling such necessities with the president-elect.

Jeffery then inquired as to the advantages of having a biennial budget versus the present policy of a yearly budget. Allen reported that a biennial budget would allow better planning and a more realistic picture of the financial conditions of the Society. Harry Allen moved that the Executive Board approve the Society setting up a biennial budget. C. Ray Jeffery seconded the motion; motion carried.

Brian Grosman suggested that the Society consider forming a policy planning committee to prepare budgets based on growth and Society service. He pointed out the need for some type of management team to look at our present policy and procedures and to suggest long-range directions that the Society should be taking. Akers indicated he had prepared some information on that topic and if it were not out of line, he would like to discuss it at this time.

Akers then proposed a task force be set up to look at the possibility of selecting a permanent office location for the Society. In conjunction with this, the task force should look at staffing needs, as well as plans and guidelines to come up with the necessary money to support such an executive office, and bring a proposal back to the Executive Board regarding the best location for such an office. Amos indicated that if the Society took this action, he would like, as part of the office, to set up the archives of the Society for future use. Akers indicated that he had already identified seven people that he would like to nominate to serve on such a task force. He indicated that the selections were based on (1) people who would be good at planning such an operation and had insight into the feasibility of generating grant money for setting up a permanent office, and (2) members that were located in physical proximity of one another so they could get together with minimal expenses. The seven people he suggested were: Nicholas Kittrie, Gerhard O.W. Mueller, William Amos, Charles Wellford, Alvin Cohn, Don Gottfredson, and Ronald Akers. He pointed out that this proposed task force should be appointed and approved by the Board before anything further was done in this regard. Paul Friday indicated that he had some reservations concerning the selection of such a task force without clear guidelines as to what they would be doing, why they were doing it, and what implications it might have for the Society. He pointed out that such a task force's decisions could have long-range consequences for our Society. Because of this, he felt that representatives given such an assignment should be representative of the Society and that selection of members not be restricted to their physical proximity to one another.

C. Ray Jeffery moved to table the matter until a more complete statement was available regarding what such a task force should do, how, when, and the procedures the Executive Board should follow in selecting members. Motion carried. Eight in favor; two against.
Jeffery then requested that Ron Akers prepare a complete statement as to how the Society should proceed on this matter for the next Board meeting.

NEW EXECUTIVE COUNSELOR

C. Ray Jeffery introduced Dr. Benjamin Ward as the replacement for Duncan Chappell for this year. He then read a letter from Duncan Chappell in which he resigned from the Executive Board and a second letter requesting the Executive Board not accept his resignation as permanent, but rather accept his resignation only until he returns to the country this summer. Considerable discussion took place concerning Constitutional guidelines and whether the By-Laws allowed the Board to replace an Executive Board member for a short period of time. The Executive Board then approved the appointment of Benjamin Ward to replace Duncan Chappell as a member of the Executive Board until the November 1978 meeting.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT (Attachment #3)

Harry Allen reported that at the present time there were 2200 paid-up members. One hundred twenty-three individuals had joined the Society at the Atlanta meeting and that the Society appeared to be continually growing. William Amos indicated the need to clarify whether the Society should continue to grow. He pointed out that the policy in the past had been to recruit members, but that many of the members we have been acquiring had strong feelings that the Society was not providing them the services or the opportunity to participate as they desired. He indicated a need to stop and take a look at our growth and whether we should continue to recruit practitioners and policy administrators as we have been doing in the past. Edith Flynn pointed out the importance of the Executive Board considering what type of Society we want to be and what type of members we should recruit in order to reflect those desires. Amos pointed out the need to have approximately 3,500 to 4,500 active paid-up members before a permanent office is located. Elmer Johnson seconded Amos' position that we should not be too anxious to acquire a permanent home for the Society until we determine how large we intend to be and what type members we intend to continue to recruit. Johnson indicated the need to assess whether we wanted all kinds of criminal justice practitioners as members and if we could provide them the services they expected. Frank Scarpitti proposed that a committee carefully look into the present growth of the Society and potential growth in the future and report back to the Executive Board short- and long-range goals in this regard.

McNamara reported that the Society, based on its Constitution, had an obligation to accept people for membership that were involved in criminal justice and desired membership in our Society. Barbara Price responded that if a task force were set up to consider the possibility of a permanent office, this same group should look carefully at the size of the Society and its realistic growth potential for the future. Bill Amos pointed out the necessity to consider the ideological and philosophical orientation of our Society in deciding growth patterns and recruitment policies.

Jeffery suggested that the Board table this discussion and that Akers, in his report at the next Executive Board meeting, outline that one of the goals for the task force to consider be Society growth and its recruitment policy. James Hackler responded that he felt this issue was so important and vital to our planning that the Executive Board should deal with it now in order to give such a task force some guidance as to our feelings of proper policies and procedures for our
Society. Jeffery responded that it would be utterly impossible to solve the question of what is criminology versus criminal justice in an entire day and that to deal with this at the present time was out of place, given the long agenda the Board had to consider. Hackler responded that the issue was so vital that he would like to make a motion that the earlier motion to set up a task force be taken from the table and be discussed at the present time and that we resolve how such a task force be selected and what their objectives and goals should be. Gilbert Geis seconded the motion. Six in favor; six opposed. Motion failed to carry.

1978 PROGRAM CHAIR REPORT

Paul Brantingham reported that the number of abstracts received by individuals interested in participating at the Dallas meeting had been very poor. One of the reasons for this was the misprint in THE CRIMINOLOGIST as to the deadline date for abstracts to be received. Because of this, he reported that he had asked the Executive Office to send out another Call for Papers with the deadline date of March 15. As of February 15, he reported he had received 50 abstracts and had organized 58 panel sessions. He reported that Atlanta had had 71 panels and that they were prepared to have that many in Dallas if response increased. Brantingham reported that there had been no paid-for announcements concerning the meeting in various journals and he was considering the possibility of such an announcement in various criminology journals. He reported that Geoff Alpert had been working on the local arrangements in Dallas but had subsequently moved to Oregon and that he would identify other individuals in the Dallas area to help him and Jeffery work out local arrangements.

He reported that the sheriff in Dallas had indicated he was no longer willing to host the barbecue that he had previously indicated his willingness to do. The meeting in Dallas, Brantingham reported, will be divided into three general areas, with a plenary session to be the highlight of each day's activities. The first plenary session will be Biological and Psychological Approaches to Crime. A number of individuals have been contacted who may participate on this plenary session. The second plenary session will focus on Social and Economic Conditions of Crime and the third, the Legal and Political. Brantingham indicated that Jeffery was attempting to solicit a number of international foreign criminologists to participate in the meeting, to make the meeting more international in orientation.

Hackler inquired as to why we were trying to make the meeting appear so international in orientation. Jeffery responded that the theme of the meeting was CRIMINOLOGY: INTERDISCIPLINARY AND INTERNATIONAL. Akers expressed his feelings that care should be taken in not committing Society money to bring foreign scholars to our meeting. Friday indicated that the International Liaison Committee would like to work closely with Brantingham and Jeffery in helping to coordinate selection and travel of foreign criminologists. Elmer Johnson inquired as to when we will know which foreign criminologists would be attending. Jeffery responded that he hoped to have that information by early summer.

William Amos indicated that in looking over the preliminary program he was concerned that some of the big names in criminology were missing. Brantingham indicated that he was sensitive to that issue and that the number of sessions could be considerably expanded from 59 panels up to potentially 90 sessions if sufficient interest were generated. He responded once again that from his analysis of the Atlanta meeting, there were 71 panels, 3 plenary sessions, a
1978 PROGRAM CHAIR REPORT (cont’d)

mean number of participants in each panel equalling to 6 and that 429 individuals had their names on the program as participants. This equaled 2/3 of those in attendance participating on the program. Charles Wellford reported that he had received numerous complaints at Atlanta from people in attendance that there were not enough sessions for practitioners and that most sessions were academic. Akers commented that if the big names were on the program, he felt there would not be as many complaints. He indicated his feeling that well-known criminologists should be discussants or session organizers in order to draw additional interest and attendance. Edith Flynn reported that in 1974 she requested VIP people to organize sessions and was embarrassed when many of them cancelled out the last day.

Hackler suggested having a number of roundtables in order to facilitate participants interested in attending and giving a paper. Jeffery reported that roundtables would be available. Joseph Scott suggested that papers should be available for purchase at the meeting. This would be an excellent way to generate additional funds for the Society and it would provide those in attendance an opportunity to read papers that might be presented the same time that they were attending other sessions. In addition, he pointed out, that given the panel set-ups this year, there would undoubtedly be considerable interest in a number of papers being prepared for the meeting. Jeffery responded that he agreed the topics this year might generate more interest and that he and Brantingham had made a concerted effort to get away from topics that have been discussed for the last 20 years. Wellford reported that he had received over 800 abstracts from individuals interested in participating in the Atlanta meeting and still had a difficult time selecting the 400 good papers to be presented. Grosman suggested that an effort should be made to have good papers at the meeting, good organization of the sessions, and that roundtables should be scheduled in advance so that those interested could take advantage of attending.

CRIMINOLOGY EDITOR’S REPORT

James Inciardi reported that 157 manuscripts had been submitted for publication consideration in CRIMINOLOGY since June of 1977. He reported that 16 of these manuscripts had been accepted for publication; 6 as research notes and 10 as articles. He pointed out that the rejection rate was approximately 85% of the manuscripts submitted. Inciardi reported that under his editorship one or two issues of CRIMINOLOGY per year will be devoted to some special topic in criminology. The November 1978 issue will focus on radical conflict criminology and will contain papers by Quinney, Turk, Toby, Voss and Chambliss, with comments by Ronald Akers.

Inciardi reported the status of the proceeding volumes from the 1977 meeting were on schedule. He identified three editors for the forthcoming volumes as: John Conrad, Charles Wellford and Ronald Akers. He reported that as of January 31, 1978, a total of 125 papers had been received from convention participants. Procedures for selecting papers will begin February 21, 1978, by dividing them into general topic areas. The volume editor will then be forwarded the papers in those topic areas relevant to their expressed interest. Inciardi reported that he has developed a timetable in order to have the final volumes available for the 1978 convention in Dallas.
CRIMINOLOGY EDITOR'S REPORT (cont'd)

Inciardi reported that the volumes from the 1976 convention have been published in hardback and paper-bound copies. Hardback copies are selling for $10 and paper-bound for $4.95. He reported that ASC will average in royalties about 80¢ for hardback and 39¢ for soft-bound copies. He reported that George McCune of Sage had sent 3000 flyers advertising the volumes to ASC members in December. The response had not been outstanding. An additional mailing of 35,000 to 50,000 flyers is planned for February.

Inciardi reported the status of the 1974-75 proceedings was still in the state of flux. Jeffery suggested that all '74 and '75 volumes not prepared and submitted to Praeger within six months be reassigned or dropped. Grosman reported that his volume with Wilson had been dropped because of the quality and age of the papers. Scott reported that he had been unable to contact Nicholas Kittrie with regards to the two volumes that he is supposed to be preparing.

Inciardi reported that an alternative publisher for THE CRIMINOLOGIST and CRIMINOLOGY had contacted him. The Hennage Creative Printers indicated their interest in publishing the journal and newsletter. He provided their proposed costs in comparison to Sage and the Board agreed that we should stay with Sage based on costs and their service in the past.

JOINT COMMISSION ON CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION AND STANDARDS

C. Ray Jeffery reported that the Joint Commission had unanimously agreed to offer Julius Debrow, Ph.D., from the University of Maryland, the job of Principal Investigator for the Joint Commission's research. He reported that all agreed Debrow would do an excellent job, but that there was some concern that he might not accept the Commission's offer. He also reported that the ground rules established by the Commission were that any accreditation standards must go beyond traditional criminal justice programs. Jeffery reported that if Debrow accepts the job as Principal Investigator, he will have the responsibility to bring to the Commission recommendations and the credentials of the top three people who apply for the job as his assistant. The Commission will then have the final say as to whom the job offer will be given. William Amos reported that Larry Hoover and Gordon Misner will submit their credentials if Debrow does not accept the Commission's offer. He pointed out that three of the four ASC members on the Commission must agree on the appointment of a Principal Investigator before proceeding with the project.

Amos suggested that Commission members consider appointing two part-time Principal Investigator's rather than one full-time person if Debrow does not accept the offer. Jeffery indicated that the meetings thus far had been most cooperative and that some progress had been made in getting the Commission started in outlining the scope of their efforts.

A.A.A.S. REPRESENTATIVE

Joseph Scott reported that he had received correspondence from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) requesting that an ASC representative be appointed to AAAS for the period of February 18, 1978 through
A.A.A.S. REPRESENTATIVE (continued)

January 8, 1981. The Executive Board, after some discussion, agreed that Edith Flynn would be an ideal appointment inasmuch as she was a member at the present time and actively involved in their internal affairs. Gilbert Geis moved that Edith Flynn be appointed the ASC representative to AAAS. Seconded by Barbara Price; motion carried.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON NOMINATION COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Barbara Price reported that the Nominations Committee had been unsuccessful in contacting Nicholas Kittrie for his participation. She suggested that the Executive Board consider appointing someone else to fill his position on the Nominations Committee. After some discussion, the Executive Board concluded that it would be appropriate to replace Kittrie. Donal MacNamara was asked by C. Ray Jeffery if he would be willing to serve on the Nominations Committee. He accepted and the Executive Board gave their approval.

Barbara Price reported that a memo had been sent to the membership requesting suggestions for nominations for ASC offices. She indicated that the Committee hoped to have a slate of officers prepared to be sent out by April 1. The procedures the Committee plans to follow are to send out the slate of officers to the Executive Board on April 1 for their consideration and approval, and to have a final slate of officers prepared on a ballot to be sent out to the membership by the latter part of April, 1978. She indicated this would allow more members to receive ballots before they left campus for summer vacation. It was her opinion that this would substantially increase the response rate.

Scarpitti suggested that candidates be asked to write position papers that would be sent out with the ballot to avoid some of the fiasco of previous years where candidates sent out position papers individually at substantial costs to themselves and where other candidates who chose not to send out such papers were at a disadvantage. The Executive Board agreed that candidates for ASC office would be requested to submit position papers which would then be sent out with the ballot.

ESTABLISHING A MEMORIAL FOR GENE CARTE

Barbara Price reported that she had been in contact with a number of Professor Carre's colleagues at the University of Cincinnati and considerable discussion had taken place in regards to setting up some type of memorial in honor of Professor Carre. She reported that she and Cyril Robinson of the University of Cincinnati had six suggestions for such a memorial:

1) Naming of the annual student paper award after Gene.

2) Providing some money for a senior or retired professor to spend some time at some university department of criminal justice in a chair named after Gene.

3) Dedication of one publication of the proceedings of the 1977 meeting in honor of Gene.
GENE CARTE MEMORIAL (cont'd)

4) Publication of Gene's unpublished writings, either in CRIMINOLOGY or if in book length with Praeger with which ASC has a continuing relationship.

5) A talk or panel at the next convention on Gene's work.

6) A special award in his name to members of ASC involved in community work.

After considerable discussion, the Executive Board agreed that the annual student paper award would be entitled the Gene Carte Student Paper Award.

DISCUSSION OF THE CRIMINOLOGIST

Barbara Price indicated that Alvin Cohn had requested that she ask all Board members to keep in touch with him in regards to their activities and Society events. She asked all Board members keep in mind their responsibility of providing information for the membership through the newsletter.

EQUAL RIGHTS RESOLUTION TO BE SUBMITTED TO MEMBERSHIP

Barbara Price reported that she had prepared a statement for the Executive Board's consideration to be submitted to the membership to vote on whether they felt the Society should officially go on record as supporting the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment.

The proposed ERA (27th Amendment) states:

Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

Section 3. This Amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

It is appropriate for ASC to take a stand on this Amendment because

...it provides that sex should not be a factor in determining the legal rights of men and women

...it would require equal treatment of individuals under the law

...it will affect criminal laws.

State laws which provide greater penalties for female law violators than male violators committing the same crime (and vice versa) will be nullified by the ERA. On the other hand, the ERA will not invalidate laws which punish rape. Laws which are based on a unique physical characteristic of one sex -- whether criminal laws prohibiting rape or civil laws governing medical payments for childbirth -- will continue to be valid. Furthermore, the ERA will affect only governmental action; private relationships of men and women are unaffected.
IN SUMMARY, THE EXECUTIVE BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY GO ON RECORD AS SUPPORTING RATIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT.

Grosman reported that the Society should be more responsive to relevant issues in criminology rather than issues of another nature. In addition, he pointed out, the Society is composed of members outside the United States, and for the Society to become involved in one's nations' politics might be out of line with our charter. Edith Flynn reported that this issue was extremely relevant, had a direct bearing on the operation of criminal justice systems and that she felt it was a question for the membership to determine, not solely for the Executive Board.

Barbara Price moved that the Executive Board adopt her resolution and submit to the membership for their consideration on whether we should go on record in support of the adoption of the ERA. Edith Flynn seconded the motion; motion carried.

ASC AD HOC COMMITTEE ON HOTEL FACILITIES

Harry Allen submitted the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Hotel Facilities. He indicated that at the next Executive Board meeting a verbal report on the facilities would be made based on site visits. He recommended that the Society consider initiating formal negotiations with the Sheraton chain for a five-year contract for our annual meetings.

Gilbert Geis moved that the report be accepted. Barbara Price seconded the motion; motion carried.

REPORT OF 1979 MEETING

Ronald Akers reported to the Executive Board that hotel facilities could not be secured in Boston for the 1979 meeting. He reported the survey of the Executive Board members indicated the majority of the Board members favored holding the 1979 meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico. After checking with LEAA and a number of members, Akers reached the conclusion that government monies might not be available to support travel to Puerto Rico and therefore had tentatively selected Philadelphia, as the site of the 1979 meeting. He asked for the Executive Board's authorization to prepare documents and contracts with the Sheraton hotel in Philadelphia to bring back to the Executive Board at the next meeting. Paul Friday moved and Gilbert Geis seconded; motion carried.

Akers reported that no theme had been selected for the 1979 meeting. He indicated a desire to determine the interests and needs of Society members and to have a greater emphasis on the practitioner needs in the 1979 meeting than had formerly been the case in the past. C. Ray Jeffery inquired as to the Board's feeling of moving the next Executive Board meeting from Boston to Philadelphia in order that the Board might review the hotel facilities and be somewhat better acquainted with the city before the 1979 meeting. It was unanimously agreed that the next Executive Board meeting would be held on May 6, 1978, at the Sheraton Philadelphia Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
NEW BUSINESS

Ronald Akers inquired as to the procedures for appointing committees. He pointed out that being President-Elect he finds it necessary at this time to appoint some committee chairs and committees to look into local arrangements. Jeffery responded that he should proceed as he wanted to and identify the committees as standing committees.

Harry Allen called the attention of the Board members to a letter he had sent to C. Ray Jeffery on January 12, 1978, concerning the precedent of presenting to the out-going president a handsome presidential plaque. Allen mentioned that Edward Sagarin was the first president in the current series to receive this symbolic award and that the Executive Board might wish to consider at least honoring the other presidents whose names grace our letterhead.

The Executive Board agreed that previous presidents to Sagarin, whose names appear on our letterhead, should be given a presidential plaque at the next ASC annual meeting. Jeffery mentioned that the Presidential Reception might be the appropriate place for such awards to be presented. The Executive Board agreed unanimously.

Paul Friday called the Executive Board's attention to the international meeting in Stockholm this summer. He mentioned the desirability of having C. Ray Jeffery, the current ASC president, represent the Society at the meeting. He raised the issue of whether the Executive Board was willing to have President Jeffery's transportation to and from Stockholm paid by the Society. Geis responded he felt it would be a very poor precedent to set and pointed out that from previous minutes the Executive Board had gone on record as supporting the international symposium based on the assumption that the Society would not be committing any ASC money. He therefore made a motion that ASC monies not be provided the President, President-Elect, or future presidents for international travel except in exceptional circumstances to be approved by the Board in advance. Frank Scarpitti seconded the motion.

C. Ray Jeffery then responded that he would not under any circumstances accept ASC funds to attend the Stockholm meeting. Paul Friday then withdrew his motion.

Joseph Scott reported that Don Gottfredson had contacted him with regards to the various ASC committees. He reported he had been in touch with committee chairpersons and that with few exceptions, most were uncertain as to their function and purpose. C. Ray Jeffery responded that Gottfredson should be notified to reappoint those committee chairpersons whom he felt had a viable function. Those chairpersons whose committees could not identify a valid reason for their continued existence should be thanked for their previous service and not be reappointed.

There being no additional business, The Executive Board recessed at 12:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph E. Scott
Executive Secretary
CASH SUMMARY  
January 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/1/78 Beginning Balance</th>
<th>$1912.82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Receipts:**
- Dues: Active and Student: 400.00
- Sale of Membership List: 100.00
- 1977 Convention, Atlanta: 610.00
- Misc. Sales: 2.75
- **Total Receipts:** 1112.75
- **Total Cash Available:** 3025.57

**Expenditures:**
- 1977 Convention, Atlanta: 35.00
- Office Expenses: 700.77
- Postage: 500.00
- Administrative Assistant: 1269.86
- **Total Disbursements:** 2505.63

**Ending Balance:** 519.94