

Date: Wed, 30 Jun 2004 13:01:41 -0600
From: Gary Ellis <Gary.Ellis@health.utah.edu>
To: g7g@psu.edu
Cc: mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca, llc7@psu.edu
Subject: Re: ALS Fellow eligibility

Thanks, Geof. I appreciate your insight on issues that were discussed when this item was considered previously. It seems to me that our challenge at present is to confirm existing policy so that we may proceed with the immediate matter of election of new fellows. Following that process, we may wish to reconsider our current policy. We should respect the integrity and outcome of the process that preceded our current circumstances. I am pleased that you remember the debate on this issue so that we may act in accordance with our policies (after, of course, we have confirmed what those policies are!).

Are you fully certain that the previous vote on eligibility of non North American scholars pointed to a change in our policy and should have been recorded in our constitution?

Gary

Gary D. Ellis, Professor and Chair
University of Utah
Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism
1901 East South Campus Drive Room 1085
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0920
(801) 581-4511 (phone)
(801) 581-4930 (fax)

>>> Geoffrey Godbey <g7g@psu.edu> 6/30/2004 3:31:38 PM >>>

Thanks for the communication. While I agree that membership should be international, I want you to think about the repercussions a bit before concluding that because it makes intellectual sense, it should be done. If membership is to be international:

1. Should the same criteria be used to judge potential members when they are from countries that have different educational systems--or no leisure studies curricula?
2. Should members from China or other soft currency countries be requested to pay the same amount of dues, when doing so would be thirty or forty times as much in real dollar terms? Should they be excused from paying dues?
3. Should the future scholars program be international and should the criteria for such students be the same for all countries? Does it matter if they speak English?
4. Should membership nominations seek to correct the imbalance of members to make the organization truly international within ten years?
5. Should the business meeting and the awarding of membership always be done at a US NRPA meeting?

There needs to be lots of thought about this. Perhaps some give and take by members via e-mail might be useful.

Geof
--
Geoffrey Godbey, Professor
Recreation, Park and Tourism Management
124 Mateer Building
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802-1307
814-863-8985; 814-237-2575 (home)
FAX: 814-863-4257

[Part 2, "HTML" Text/HTML (charset: ISO-8859-1 "Latin 1") 48 lines]
[Unable to print this part]

Date: Wed, 30 Jun 2004 10:19:19 -0700
From: Geoffrey Godbey <g7g@psu.edu>
To: Mark Havitz <mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca>
Cc: llc7@psu.edu, gary.ellis@health.utah.edu
Subject: Re: Academy of Leisure Sciences - New Fellow Election Ballot

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Mark, Linda, Gary:

This is actually a big issue. The decision made some years ago to make the organization a North American organization was taken after lots of discussion and controversy. There were a number of international scholars that many of us wanted to nominate and could not. If we can now do so, there are perhaps as many outside North America as inside. Can we expect them to attend meetings, contribute to future scholars (all of whom are from North America) and otherwise contribute?

This issue needs to be addressed; otherwise people may be voting for someone who cannot be admitted to membership. I think the membership needs to be polled or some other means to find out if we have collectively changed our minds on this issue.

Cheers.

Geof

>Geof - Thanks for your note. It appears that we need a better way of
>passing on institutional memory to newer members. I checked with about a
>half dozen people regarding the international membership issue but the
>only limitation mentioned was that those in academic positions normally
>must have achieved full professorial rank.

>>I'm not sure what we can do at this point but let the nomination stand and
>>we'll see how things play out. Based on early returns I'll be somewhat
>>surprised if the full slate of seven candidates garner the requisite 2/3
>>vote so an unsuccessful candidate will not necessarily stand out too
>>dramatically. I'll make sure that the issue is raised at the meeting this
>>October. - Mark

>>-----
>>
>>Mark E. Havitz, Professor
>>Associate Chair for Graduate Studies
>>Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies
>>University of Waterloo
>>Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1

>>email: mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca
>>phone: (519) 888-4567 x3013
>>fax: (519) 886-2440

>>-----
>>
>>On Tue, 29 Jun 2004, Geoffrey Godbey wrote:

>>> Mark:
>>>
>>> Thanks for the message. The academy decided some time ago to limit
>>> membership to North Americans. I have no strong feeling about this,
>>> but since there are many other potential candidates that us old guys
>>> might have nominated who are outside North America, I think there
>>> needs to be some clarification about Fred Coalter.

>>> Sorry.
>>>
>>> Geof

--
>Geoffrey Godbey, Professor
>Recreation, Park and Tourism Management
>124 Mateer Building
>Penn State University
>University Park, PA 16802-1307
>814-863-8985; 814-237-2575 (home)
>FAX: 814-863-4257
>

(801) 581-4511 (phone)
(801) 581-4930 (fax)

>>> Mark Havitz <mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca> 6/30/2004 2:38:26 PM
>>>

Geof/Gary/Linda - I appreciate all of the thoughtful responses that you have provided regarding this issue. I agree with Gary that it would be quite helpful to have some input from Ben or whoever else might have some written documentation regarding whether or not the past ALS discussion and subsequent vote was intended to amend the constitution before making a decision on this matter, however. I want to ensure some sensitivity to the nominators (Sue & Karla) and candidate (Fred) as part of this process and I think that any decision to revise the ballot at this point should only be made with some constitutional backing. Failing that, if the "no international" issue is simply an unwritten heuristic, then it seems to me that the nomination should stand and the candidacy pass or fail based on individual member's interpretations. Indeed, as noted earlier, the short-term issue may be a relative mute point should a 2/3 majority not be forthcoming and based on Geof's recollections it seems likely that many folks might be pre-disposed to vote no on Fred's membership.

Complicating the issue (ironically, this results directly from me living north of the border), tomorrow is Canada Day. Our University and Departmental offices will be closed and I have a fairly extensive list of family plans and events scheduled over the next four days so I won't be able to act one way or the other until Monday. Perhaps this will provide some time for Gary to get in touch with Ben. Should changes be made in the ballot, I believe that it is also important that the issue is first brought to the nominators' and nominee's attention.

Either way, once the short-term issue is resolved, it looks like we have an interesting agenda item for the October meeting.

Mark E. Havitz, Professor
Associate Chair for Graduate Studies
Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1

email: mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca

Date: Thu, 01 Jul 2004 08:30:01 -0600
From: Gary Ellis <Gary.Ellis@health.utah.edu>
To: mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca, g7g@psu.edu
Cc: llc7@psu.edu
Subject: Re: elections

Greetings, Geof, Mark, and Linda!

Given that Geof recalls this matter as an informal discussion and not formal action with implications to our constitution, I would like to propose that either Mark, Linda, or I (given that Mark is away for a few days, probably I should do it) post a statement like the following (please suggest revisions that you think are appropriate) to the ALS listserv:

An issue has arisen with respect to the current ballot for election of Fellows to the Academy. At one point in the history of the Academy, focused and thoughtful discussion occurred on the question of whether individuals who are not North American scholars should be eligible for membership. Arguments in favor of the organization being international in membership were founded in the significant scholarship on leisure that is occurring in many countries around the world and the universal nature of the phenomena that is at the heart of the intellectual and scholarly interests of members of the Academy. Those who argued against international membership pointed to significant logistical concerns. Our annual membership fee (typically \$50) is largely incidental to most North American scholars but might represent compensation for several weeks of work for scholars in some "soft dollar" countries. An international membership would also suggest the need for annual meetings to be held in countries other than those on the North American continent and it might also give rise to issues of quotas. Some might argue that standards for the quality and quantity of contributions might require attention, given international membership.

The earlier discussion resulted in informal agreement that membership be limited to North American scholars. That agreement, however, did not indicate change in formal policy. Our current constitution does not limit membership to North American scholars. Further, a number of new Fellows have been inducted since the discussion occurred. These individuals, of course, have not had opportunity to engage in discussion about membership eligibility. As such, we consider all nominees on the current ballot to be eligible for election, but we also believe that it is important for all members of the Academy to be aware of the history of our organization with respect to this issue. Membership eligibility will be an agenda item for our meeting in Reno this fall.

A precedent for this action exists. It parallels the approach that we took to discussion of the eligibility of individuals who had not been promoted to full professor. Following nomination of one such candidate, an email discussion followed. The candidate did not receive sufficient votes to be inducted.

Please let me know your thoughts on this. Thank you for reminding us of this very important issue.
Gary

Gary D. Ellis, Professor and Chair
University of Utah
Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism
1901 East South Campus Drive Room 1085
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0920