

ACJS GENERAL BUSINESS MEETING
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2010
San Diego, California
Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, California Ballroom

The meeting began at 9:10 a.m.

Introductions (Marquart)

- Welcomed and thanked everyone for attending this year's annual meeting.
- Next year's meeting in Toronto:
 - Will be at the Sheraton in Toronto
 - Local arrangements are well underway
 - Any ideas for the meeting are welcomed
 - Reminder: bring passports next yearReminded members that next year they will need to bring their passports to Toronto.

Second Vice President Report (Barlow)

- The chairs for the 2011-2012 standing committees will be:
 - Affirmative Action = Delores Jones-Brown
 - Assessment = Elizabeth Quinn
 - Awards = Joycelyn Pollock
 - Constitution and By Laws
 - Membership = Lorenzo Boyd
 - Publications = Charles Crawford
 - Student Affairs = Angela Crews
 - Program Committee = Heather Pfeifer
- The Budget, Finance, and Audit Committee oversaw the external audit of the Academy and is pleased to report that it went well and no problems emerged.
- The 2012 meeting in New York City is starting to be planned. The theme for the conference will be "Sustainable Justice."
- The next editor of *Justice Quarterly* will be Cassia Spohn from Arizona State University.

Treasurer's Report (Southerland gave on behalf of Chandler-Ford)

- The Academy has successfully completed both an internal and external audit.
- The Academy's next assesses have grown over the past four years.
 - We have substantial reserves. As the end of December 2009 we had \$870,000.

President Report (Joseph)

- This year's conference has been a success with over 1600 participants.

- Thanks was extended to the executive board, program chair, and local arrangements committee.
- This year's award ceremony will honor past journal editors as well as give out for the first time mentors awards. These awards are given on a non-competitive basis and were gathered by letters nominating mentors for their years of hard work and guidance.

New Business

- Christopher Schreck read a prepared statement speaking on behalf of the Academy's four editors (Schreck, Tewksbury, Maddan, and Worley) and editorial boards of both *Justice Quarterly* and *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* (with 2 exceptions) who were present. The statement concerned the process of selecting the next editor of *Justice Quarterly* and asked for transparency behind the Executive Board's decision to overturn the selection committee's recommendation. The claim was also made that the Executive Board's decision will (1) tarnish the new editor of *Justice Quarterly* and (2) will make it difficult to find members willing to do committee work because of this new precedent to overturn committee decisions.
 - Wes Johnson responded: This was the first time the Executive Board was hearing the concerns raised in this oral statement. The board would like to address each of the many issues that were raised but in order to do so will need to have a copy of the letter so they can issue an official response.
 - Gordon Crews asked the Executive Board if they could quell the rumors that at the Tuesday Executive Board meeting that one unfounded remark by one person is what swayed the decision of the entire Executive Board.
 - James Marquart answered the question, "why did the Executive Board overturn the Committee's decision?" by noting that the Executive Board did what was in the best interest of the journal and of the Academy and noted that both of the applicants were well vetted at Tuesday's Executive Board meeting and that there was no behind the scenes game playing.
 - Chris Gibson asked if the same criteria was used by both the Executive Board and the Selection committee.
 - The answer was unanimously yes.
 - Chris Schreck queried "did the Executive Board use a dart board?" and demanded to know the specifics as to why the Executive Board decided the way they did. He also noted that an explanation is what the members are looking for and that the Executive Board owes the Academy that explanation.
 - Craig Hemmens responded that the criteria used by the Executive Board was the same criteria used by the selection committee and the same as listed in the policy that is available on the website. In addition, he pointed out that the 7 members of the Selection Committee are not elected to that office but rather appointed and as such their decision is only advisory to the Executive Board whose members are elected and makes the final decision. That decision was made by a unanimous vote of the Executive

Board based upon the entire packages of both candidates. Personal and political discussions did not come into play during the Executive Board's vetting process.

- Libby Mustaine (President of the Southern Criminal Justice Association) stated that the SCJA executive board wrote a formal letter two days ago and delivered it to Janice Joseph and James Marquart asking why the Executive Board went in a different direction than the *Justice Quarterly* Selection Committee.
- Richard Tewksbury asked why will the Executive Board not provide any information on the decision noting that the *Justice Quarterly* selection committee provided a rationale for their decision-making process and wanted to know why the Executive Board hasn't done the same?
 - Janice Joseph responded to both Mustaine and Tewksbury that she had only just this morning given the letter to Marquart because it was the first time she had seen him since receiving the letter and noted that the rest of the Executive Board hadn't yet seen the letter. The Executive Board will respond once they can look at the letter.
 - Richard Tewksbury queried, "how will the members know the outcome?"
 - Angela Crews told the Executive Board that they need to review their own code of ethics.
 - Craig Hemmens responded by asking her if she was suggesting that the Executive Board acted in an unethical manner.
 - Angela Crews responded that the Executive Board should just review the code of ethics.
- Libby Mustaine stated that the regions want more support from the Academy (such as credit card processing) especially since it was reported to them by the Executive Board representative that the Academy is financially solid. She asked if the Executive Board would further support the regions because they are small.
- Angela Gover asked the Executive Board why she and others were appointed and approved by the Executive Board to a three-year term last year but was just informed at the Justice Quarterly meeting that she was off the Editorial Board after only one year.
 - Craig Hemmens explained that the policy regarding journal Editorial Boards was revised last July so that Editorial Board members would rotate off with the editor who appointed them and noted that the last round of appointments made at the Executive Board's mid-year meeting held in September were approved under the new policy meaning that those appointments were for only one year the duration of the current editor's term.
 - Wes Johnson also noted that the transition of Editorial Boards will be revisited by the Executive Board at today's Executive Board meeting.
- Barbara Todish asked can a person who is despised and hated ever be on an ACJS committee and wanted to know why people are so uncomfortable with being vulnerable?
- Melissa Barlow asked people who were interested in serving on ACJS committees to please come sign up!

The meeting ended at 9:52 a.m.