

THE

Forensic

NEW CONSTITUTION ISSUE

ΠΕΙΘΩ ΚΑΛΗ ΔΙΚΑΙΑ

53

SERIES 53

OCTOBER, 1967

NO.1



YOUR NATIONAL COUNCIL

The
FORENSIC
of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 53 OCTOBER, 1967 No. 1

Table of Contents

A Perspective on Debating Changes 3

Secretary's Page 6

Constitution 7

In Memoriam 18

President's Page 19

Salute to Retirees 20

Chapter Notes 23

Chapter Reports 32

Editor Signs In 39

EDITOR GIL RAU

ASSOCIATE EDITOR FRANK T. ALUSOW

BUSINESS MANAGER LARRY NORTON

Published four times a year in October, January, March and May by Pi Kappa Delta. Subscription price is a part of the membership dues.

Office of publication: Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan. Second class postage paid at Midland, Michigan 48640.

Reentry application pending.

Printed by —
Ford Press Inc., Midland, Michigan 48640

**DIRECTORY OF
PI KAPPA DELTA**

- NATIONAL PRESIDENT — Theodore O. H. Karl,
Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma,
Washington
- NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT — H. Francis
Short, Kansas State College, Pittsburg,
Kansas
- NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER — Larry
Norton, Bradley University, Peoria,
Illinois
- NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS — Fred B.
Goodwin, Southeast Missouri State Col-
lege, Cape Girardeau, Missouri; James
Grissinger, Otterbein College, Westerville,
Ohio; L. A. Lawrence, Montana State
University, Bozeman, Montana
- IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT — Georgia Bow-
man, William Jewell College, Liberty,
Missouri
- HISTORIAN — D. J. Nabors, East Central
State College, Ada, Oklahoma
- EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Gilbert Rau,
Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant,
Michigan
- ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Frank
T. Alusow, MacMurray College, Jackson-
ville, Illinois

PROVINCE GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS — Richard
Crawford, Colorado State College,
Greeley, Colorado.
2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI — R. J.
deLaubenfels, Simpson College, Indi-
anola, Iowa.
3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS — Edwin A. Hol-
latz, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illi-
nois.
4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC — Herb
Booth, California Institute of Technol-
ogy, Pasadena, California.
5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX — Arthur
Prosper, Black Hills State College,
Spearfish, South Dakota.
6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI —
Evan Ulrey, Harding College, Searcy,
Arkansas.
7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES — Gilbert Rau,
Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleas-
ant, Michigan
8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI —
William Robertz, Gustavus Adolphus,
St. Peter, Minnesota.
9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST — David
Walker, Middle Tennessee State Uni-
versity, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.
10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST — Roy
D. Mahaffey, Linfield College, Mc-
Minnville, Oregon.
11. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST — Wil-
liam Teufel, Grove City College, Grove
City, Pennsylvania.

COVER PICTURE

YOUR NATIONAL COUNCIL

Fred Goodwin, member S.E. Missouri State; Larry Norton, Sec-Treas. Bradley University; H. Francis Short, Vice.-Pres. Kansas State College; Theodore O. H. Karl, Pres. Pacific Lutheran Univ.; Georgia Bowman, Past-Pres. William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri; James Grissinger, member Otterbein College; L. I. Lawrence, member Montana State Univ.; Gilbert Rau, Editor Central Michigan Univ.

A Perspective on Changes Proposed in Pi Kappa Delta Debating

DR. MELVIN W. DONAHO, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan

Dr. Donaho was formerly a member of DSR-TKA and co-directed one of their national tournaments. As a member of PKD and as a participant in both national tournaments, his comments merit careful consideration.

Most Directors of Debate in Pi Kappa Delta are vitally interested in both championship and cross examination debating. In the March, 1967 issue of *The Forensic*, Jean Jochenning pleaded for more cross examination debate and further proposed the Oregon Style or typical 8-3-4 format.

In the various "Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Biennial Convention of Pi Kappa Delta" several excerpts point up our organization's trend toward championship cross examination debating:

1. In the "Minutes of the Seventh Business Meeting" Stephen Dickman one of our outstanding students reported that our students urge:

- A. "...that there be at least one bracketed championship category in debate."
- B. "...that all divisions include elimination rounds with the awarding of trophies to the champions."
- C. "... (that) a shift to the Oregon style of cross-examination debate (be adopted)."

2. William DeMougeot, Chairman of the Convention Evaluation Committee reported: "There is a strong sentiment for a championship division, and that it be cross-exam and open to all." He further reported that "The customary 8-3-4 format for cross-exam debate seems to be more popular than the one used here (in the 1967 convention)."

3. George Armstrong, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, presented the following resolution: "And be it further resolved, that there be a Championship division in debate."

In view of this trend toward championship cross examination debating and other major changes in the tournament structure of Pi Kappa Delta there are a few basic problems which we as a national organization should consider.

First, why a championship division? It is ironic that we pride ourselves in being members of Pi Kappa Delta which stresses brotherhood and fellowship within the framework of a national (or province) convention. Yet, we propose a championship division as well as elimination rounds in our other divisions which presents us with several considerations. Do we extend the convention one day to permit the necessary elimination rounds and still retain the convention atmosphere for all members? Do we retain the same number of days and increase the number of debates per day while reducing the convention emphasis? Do we increase chapter dues to cover additional expenses such as an increase in the number of judges needed and for trophies? Do we count the championship division toward the sweepstakes award? Do we require each chapter to furnish one judge for *each* debate division entered and for the individual events? Do we use one judge or three judges in the "championship" division and/or in the other elimination rounds? Where do we get these necessary judges for the elimination rounds? Do we *require* all chapters entering debate to be able to furnish the necessary judges for the elimination rounds? How?

In addition to the above considerations there are a few more pertinent factors to consider. How do we get *our* championship teams to enter *our* tournament? Usually, the Pi Kappa Delta convention overlaps with the National Debate Tournament.

Even if it doesn't, these two tournaments are close together. Can we afford, educationally, to have our students miss this many classes in such a short period? Remember, not all of our chapters are on Easter or spring vacation.

Those of us who are directors of debate must be concerned with even more immediate problems. During the 1967 convention we could enter a total of six debaters per school. The trend seems to indicate that this number will remain constant if we retain switch-sides debating. However, we are considering three divisions: novice, varsity, and championship. Sadly, it is my observation that a vast majority of colleges and universities do not have novice debaters (whatever a novice is . . .) who are capable of debating both sides well. Perhaps, such a division should permit four entrants. Both of the other divisions should be able to switch sides effectively so there should be less problem here. We'll always be faced with the problem of coaches' entering unqualified teams in an upper division which is unfair to those well trained, highly experienced teams who expect to meet debaters of equal skill. If the upper division counts toward sweepstakes this problem becomes worse.

Our critical concern should be with the addition of elimination rounds, the adding of a "championship" division, and the presenting of trophies. Here I am deeply concerned. The elimination rounds serve absolutely little worthwhile purpose to our organization and add little if anything to either the educational experience of the debaters or to the goals of Pi Kappa Delta. Our conventions usually take place around Easter. By this time we find essentially three types of chapters participating: a) those chapters with extensive budgets and well-grounded programs with highly experienced teams; b) those chapters with a moderate budget and adequate programs for educational purposes; and c) those chapters with inadequate budgets and students with minimal experience. By Easter one more debate or even four more debates mean little from an educational stand-

point to the "a" classification and not too much to even the "b" classification. Those chapters in the "c" classification who wish to retain their membership are forced to compete or at least attend every other year and their teams simply are not in the great majority of cases prepared to meet championship debaters.

Within our present convention format we have a variation of power matching but with an emphasis upon a convention atmosphere — fellowship, brotherhood, and sharing of ideas. If we adopt elimination rounds, what will the Pi Kappa Delta Convention have to offer? To me — very little. It simply becomes another competitively oriented tournament — and an expensive one at that. Any college in our nation can find as good or better *competition* at less expense nearer to its own campus. By the time Pi Kappa Delta takes place who *needs* another competitively oriented tournament? We need educational experiences and those in variety. At least the convention atmosphere has something different of value to offer.¹

There are numerous formats an elimination schedule can take: eight preliminary rounds and four elimination rounds, 6+3, 7+2, etc. However, the feeling at White-water seemed to be in favor of the 8+4 format. This format presents several problems of significance. It is obvious we would either have to decrease the convention aspect; permit debaters to enter only debate and no individual events; or else extend the length of the tournament. Decreasing the convention atmosphere would affect chapter attendance and probably tarnish our motto significantly. Limiting debaters to just debate would be detrimental to chapters attempting to economize, especial-

¹Let it be clearly understood that I believe fully in tournament competition. I do not believe that after the fiftieth debate for a debater in any one year that there is much educational value. Besides, by Easter I'm tired and certainly do not wish to drive to a distant tournament, judge twelve rounds of debate, individual events, and then drive home.

ly those traveling great distances. This would also deprive many debaters from achieving an additional educational experience. Extending the length of the convention is readily impractical since many schools already spend five or six days in all and are on limited budgets.

Also critical is the major problem of judges. If we only utilized one judge per elimination round, we would expect chapters entering to supply judges *after* being eliminated. Anyone who has ever run an elimination tournament is, well aware of the problem of getting schools to keep their commitments as well as other difficulties.

Specifically, we should evaluate our desire for a championship cross examination division. At the 1967 convention the question was raised as to how many chapters had their best teams present. Although no count was recorded, there were at least twenty chapters which did not. Let's be practical, the National Debate Tournament is *the* competitive debate tournament at the approximate time of our convention. Ironically, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha was quite affected this year while our attendance was up and they have held championship divisions for several years although not in every year. Perhaps, we need to investigate the success of our sister organization in attracting its chapters with elimination type debate formats before we follow suit.

Regardless, we will not have a division of champions but rather a division of the best teams we can field under the circumstances. Therefore, perhaps, we should retain our present eight round format with its certificate awards for excellence and superior students. Most definitely, we should oppose the awarding of trophies. They are not only costly but mean little five years hence. Most of us find them glittering, tarnished, gaudy, awkward, dust catchers. I often wonder how large an attic some of our highly successful colleges must have. Awards are meaningful to the students who earn them; so, let's give any award to the students.

Probably, there is little difficulty in uniting the sexes and this does seem to be the vogue. There is also little opposition to a cross examination format in the upper division. Although here again I urge considering other alternatives. We should encourage utilizing different formats for their educational value and for increased student interest. The 8-3-4 format first published in 1934 is the one with which we are most familiar. Since that time there have been some exciting new styles tried with success. One such variation is an 8-4 cross examination format with one five minute summary by each team. However, the debaters have complete freedom during the four minute examination period: they can waive the period, ask one question and sit down, ask one question and give their opponents the remainder of the time to answer it, use the entire four minutes for questioning, use the four minutes for refutation and/or construction, and even question either member of the opposition. This format was introduced in 1967 and was enthusiastically received by both debaters and judges. There are numerous other alternatives which are worth trying. We might even experiment with some new formats of our own. The point is that Pi Kappa Delta should be concerned with a variety of educational experiences within the spirit of fellowship and not become just another highly competitive tournament.

President Bowman is to be lauded when she reflects: "Yet in (our) very differences there is strength, for it would be a dull and moribund organization were there no strong voices calling for change, so that we are occasionally forced to stop and evaluate what we are doing." Yet, any significant change should be evaluated carefully in light of its contribution to the objectives of Pi Kappa Delta and to our students' educational needs. Let us evaluate the proposals made in our 1967 convention most carefully before enacting them — perhaps, to our detriment. □

The Secretary's Page

LARRY NORTON
Bradley University

As of July 31, 1967 Pi Kappa Delta had a total of 241 active chapters and a membership of 41,107. Twelve hundred and three new members were added during the year.

The financial report shows that 22 chapters sent in more than \$125.00 for all purposes, and 17 chapters submitted key orders amounting to more than forty dollars. The top 22 schools are listed below. An (*) indicates memberships carried over from the previous year. An (n) indicates a new chapter.

* 1. Wisconsin State—Eau Claire .	\$331.50	*13. Western Washington State C.	152.00
n 2. University of Houston	317.85	14. Southern Illinois U.—	
3. Illinois Wesleyan University .	313.90	Carbondale	151.20
n 4. North Dakota State U.—Fargo	255.00	15. Wisconsin State—Whitewater	140.78
n 5. State College of Arkansas . .	221.25	*16. Arizona State University . . .	138.55
6. Bradley University	214.10	*17. The Principia College	137.85
n 7. East Stroudsburg State Col. .	209.80	n18. Saint John's University	135.00
* 8. Marietta College	194.75	19. Northwest Missouri State	
n 9. State Univ. College-Geneseo .	177.75	College	132.60
n10. Evangel College	174.00	*20. Lewis and Clark College . . .	130.00
11. William Jewell College	163.79	21. Macalester College	130.00
n12. McMurry College	163.45	*22. Wisconsin State—Oshkosh . .	126.25

In the following list of 19 chapters which added eleven or more active members during the past year.

n 1. University of Houston	(31)	11. Macalester College	(13)
* 2. Wisconsin State-Eau Claire . . .	(29)	*12. Lewis and Clark College	(13)
n 3. North Dakota State U.-Fargo . .	(23)	13. Illinois State University	(12)
* 4. Marietta College	(19)	14. Southern Illinois U.-Carbondale	(12)
5. Illinois Wesleyan University . .	(18)	*15. Wisconsin State-Oshkosh	(12)
6. Bradley University	(18)	16. Colorado State University	(11)
n 7. State College of Arkansas	(16)	17. Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana	(11)
n 8. Evangel College	(16)	n18. Saint John's University	(11)
n 9. East Stroudsburg State College	(16)	n19. State Univ. College-Geneseo . .	(11)
*10. Western Washington State			
College	(15)		

The following 17 chapters purchased more than forty dollars worth of keys in 1966-67.

1. Illinois Wesleyan University . .	\$132.90	11. Central College	42.90
2. William Jewell College	83.79	12. State Univ. College-Geneseo . .	42.75
3. Southern State College	81.45	13. Pasadena College	42.35
4. Pacific Lutheran University . .	57.51	14. Mississippi State College For	
5. Adams State College	55.25	Women	42.00
6. Delta State College	55.20	15. Northeast Missouri State	
7. Texas A & I College	54.15	College	42.00
8. Morningside College	53.45	16. Wisconsin State-Eau Claire . .	41.50
9. Illinois College	45.95	17. Southern Conn. State College .	40.35
10. McMurry College	45.35		

CONSTITUTION of PI KAPPA DELTA

as revised at the 25th National Convention
Whitewater, Wisconsin - March 27-31, 1967

ARTICLE I — NAME

The name of this Honorary Forensic Fraternity shall be "Pi Kappa Delta", the initial letters of the Greek phrase Peitho Kale Dikaia, signifying "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just." The name shall be written thus: Π κ Δ on all insignia of the organization.

ARTICLE II — PURPOSE

It shall be the purpose of this organization to stimulate progress in and to further the interests of intercollegiate speech activities and communication in an effort to provide functional leadership training for life, and at the same time encourage a spirit of fellowship, brotherly cooperation and incentive for achievement.

ARTICLE III — ADMISSION OF MEMBERS

1. *Eligibility.* Eligibility to membership in this fraternity shall be determined as follows. The candidate shall be a regular collegiate student in good standing, or a graduate of an institution of college rank, and shall have represented his college in speech activities as provided in Article IV, Division C, Section 1, or shall be a faculty member in charge of instruction in one or more of the activities recognized by the Order of Competitive Individual Speaking or the Order of Debate, or a coach of one of the recognized forensic activities, in a recognized college.

2. *Recognition.* All institutions maintaining Local Chapters of Pi Kappa Delta and all other institutions of collegiate rank granting a four year degree shall be recognized institutions, provided the institu-

tion is accredited by its appropriate regional accrediting association.

3. *Application.* Each candidate for membership in this fraternity shall make application in writing on the official blank. The Local Chapter shall then make an investigation of the eligibility of the candidate and, after an affirmative two-thirds vote of the active members of the Local Chapter, shall recommend the applicant for membership. The application shall then be forwarded to the National Secretary-Treasurer with a statement of its acceptance by the Local Chapter together with the initiation fee as provided in Article V, Division A, Section 6. The National Secretary-Treasurer shall issue the membership card. After completing the initiation ritual, the applicant shall be given the standing to which he is eligible as a regular member. A membership certificate will be issued upon request at cost.

ARTICLE IV — DIVISION OF MEMBERSHIP

Membership in this fraternity shall be of four classes, three orders, and five degrees:

DIVISION A — THE CLASSES

The classes shall be (1) Active, (2) Inactive, (3) Alumni, and (4) Honorary.

1. *Active.* Only college students, and faculty members actively engaged in the instruction of one or more of the activities recognized by the Order of Competitive Individual Speaking or the Order of Debate, or a coach of one of the recognized forensic activities, shall be eligible to admission as Active members.

2. *Inactive.* Only former Active members shall constitute the Inactive class of this organization. There shall be two divisions of Inactive members: (1) those Inactive because of non-attendance at the Institution of learning in which their chapter is established, and (2) those Inactive by order of the Local Chapter or National Council. An Inactive member of the first division may become active upon payment of all dues and assessments that are due and unpaid by him at the time of his transference to the Inactive list, together with the designated reinstatement fee, and agreement of reinstatement by a three-fourths affirmative vote of the Active members of the Local Chapter.

3. *Alumni.* Only former Active members, or those who were elected to membership after graduation, who have graduated from a recognized educational institution of collegiate rank, shall constitute the Alumni Class of this organization. Graduates of successful petitioning colleges who were active in forensics during the period of petitioning may be admitted as Alumni members.

4. *Honorary.* Only those persons who have shown prowess or interest in forensic activities and who have been nominated by a Local Chapter, approved by the National Council or its delegated authority, and elected by the Local Chapter shall be eligible to admission as Honorary members. They may receive full credit for their college forensic activities toward their degrees in Pi Kappa Delta.

5. *Transfer.* All students, instructors, and directors who transfer from recognized institutions may receive full credit for their previous forensic work toward eligibility for Pi Kappa Delta.

6. *Other Forensic Organizations.* Members of other forensic organizations may be admitted to Pi Kappa Delta or members of Pi Kappa Delta may be permitted to join other forensic organizations.

DIVISION B — ORDERS

The Orders shall be (1) Competitive Individual Speaking, (2) Debate, (3) In-

struction. The members of this fraternity are admitted because of achievement in public speaking. A member may hold one, two, or three orders depending upon his qualifications.

1. *Order of Competitive Individual Speaking.* Achievement for membership in this Order shall be in intercollegiate oratory, extemporaneous speaking, or other types of individual speaking recognized and approved by the National Convention.

2. *Order of Debate.* Achievement for membership in this Order shall be in intercollegiate Debate, or Round-Tables, Panel Discussions, or Legislative Assemblies. A decision debate may be counted as a non-decision debate in fulfilling the requirements of any degree. Each session of round-table, panel discussion, or legislative assembly shall count as one debate.

3. *Order of Instruction.* Achievement for membership in this Order shall be for instruction of one or more of the activities recognized by the Order of Competitive Individual Speaking or the Order of Debate, or as a coach of one or more of the recognized forensic activities.

DIVISION C — DEGREES

The Degrees shall be (1) Degree of Fraternity, (2) Degree of Proficiency, (3) Degree of Honor, (4) Degree of Special Distinction, (5) Degree of Highest Distinction.

1. *Degree of Fraternity.* All members of this fraternity shall be members of the Degree of Fraternity, and the requirements for eligibility to this degree shall be as follows: (a) Order of Competitive Individual Speaking. The candidate shall have represented his college in a recognized intercollegiate contest in oratory or extemporaneous speaking, or in individual speaking on five occasions or rounds. (b) Order of Debate. The candidate shall have participated in eight decision debates, or in twelve non-decision debates. (c) Order of Instruction. The candidate shall be an instructor or coach of one or more of the activities recognized by the Order of Competitive Individual Speaking or the Order of Debate.

2. *Degree of Proficiency.* Eligibility to the Degree of Proficiency shall be determined as follows: (a) Order of Competitive Individual Speaking. The candidate shall have won first place in a recognized intercollegiate contest in which six or more recognized institutions participate, or second in a recognized contest in which ten or more recognized institutions participate, or shall have represented his college in three recognized intercollegiate contests in oratory or extemporaneous speaking, using two different orations or speeches on two different subjects; or shall have participated for two years in individual speaking, using four different subjects. (b) Order of Debate. The candidate shall have participated in debate for two years on two different subjects. He shall have engaged in fifteen decision debates with recognized institutions, or in a total of twenty debates. (c) Order of Instruction. The candidate shall have instructed or directed at least five members of the Degree of Proficiency.

3. *Degree of Honor.* Eligibility to the Degree of Honor shall be determined as follows: (a) Order of Competitive Individual Speaking. The candidate shall have participated for two college years and have won first place in a recognized intercollegiate contest with six or more recognized institutions participating, or second place in a recognized contest with ten or more institutions participating; or shall have represented his college in four recognized intercollegiate contests in oratory or extemporaneous speaking, using three different orations or speeches on three different subjects; or shall have participated for three years in individual speaking, using six different subjects; or shall have received a rating of excellent in the contests sponsored by the National Convention. (b) Order of Debate. The candidate shall have participated in debate for two years, on at least three subjects. He shall have engaged in twenty-five decision debates with recognized institutions, or in a total of thirty debates; or shall have received a rating of excellent in the contest sponsored by the National Convention. (c) Order of Instruc-

tion. The candidate shall have instructed or directed at least five members of the Degree of Honor; or his teams shall have won at least sixty percent of all debates participated in for three consecutive years.

4. *Degree of Special Distinction.* Eligibility to the Degree of Special Distinction shall be determined as follows: (a) Order of Competitive Individual Speaking. The candidate shall have participated for at least three college years and in at least four intercollegiate speech contests, entered by not less than six recognized institutions, and shall have won first or second place in at least three such contests using three different orations or speeches on three different subjects. This degree may also be granted to candidates who participate for four years in individual speaking, using eight different subjects, or to candidates who shall have received a rating of superior in a contest sponsored by the National Convention. (b) Order of Debate. The candidate shall have participated in debate for at least three years, on at least three different subjects. He shall have engaged in forty decision debates with recognized institutions, winning at least half of them; or shall have engaged in a total of fifty debates, of which at least thirty shall have been decision debates, with the debater winning half of them. This degree may also be granted to debaters who participate in contests sponsored by the National Convention and receive a rating of superior in such debate contests. (c) Order of Instruction. The candidate shall have instructed or directed at least five members of the Degree of Special Distinction, or his teams shall have won at least sixty per cent of all decision debates participated in for five consecutive years.

5. *Degree of Highest Distinction.* Eligibility to the Degree of Highest Distinction shall be determined as follows: (a) Orders of Competitive Individual Speaking and Debate. The candidate shall have participated for at least three college years, shall be eligible for the Degree of Special Distinction, and shall have an academic standing in the upper thirty-five percent of his

class. (b) Order of Instruction. The candidate shall have instructed or directed at least five members of the Degree of Highest Distinction.

6. *Change in Standing.* Any member of this organization who after admission to membership may become eligible to a different class, additional order, or to a higher degree, shall have his standing in the organization changed upon application to the National Secretary-Treasurer on the official form. No member may combine degrees in different orders to obtain a higher degree.

ARTICLE V — ORGANIZATION

Pi Kappa Delta shall be composed of three divisions: the Local Chapter, the Province Organization, and the National Organization.

DIVISION A — THE LOCAL CHAPTER

1. *Local Chapter.* A Local Chapter shall be composed of five or more persons eligible to membership in this fraternity as provided in Article III, Section 1. A Local Chapter may be established in any recognized college or university. Local Chapters may be two kinds: Active and Alumni. Alumni Chapters shall differ from Active Local Chapters in that they may be established outside of educational institutions, and shall not be allowed to take in members who have not previously been members in good standing of Active Chapters.

2. *Charter.* A charter bearing the seal of the organization and signed by the National President and National Secretary-Treasurer shall be granted to each Chapter of this fraternity. The charters shall be duplicates of the standard form filed with the National Secretary-Treasurer. New Active Chapters are to be installed only when the dues of members and charter fees are in the hands of the National Secretary Treasurer. New charters shall be presented in formal ceremony at the National Convention; however, charters may be presented at Province Conventions provided that the National Council has approved such action. A member of the National Council, if in that Province, shall make the presenta-

tion. If no member is available, it shall be the obligation of the Province Governor.

3. *Size of Chapter.* No Local Chapter shall be allowed to retain its charter if it shall have fewer than five members for two years consecutively. Any Local Chapter having fewer than five Active members during the college year shall be notified of a probationary status which may be removed by bringing the membership up to constitutional requirements. Graduates may not be counted with undergraduates to make the required number of five for an Active Chapter. The membership on May 15th shall be considered as the membership for the current year. Each chapter shall report on its membership to the National Secretary-Treasurer when called upon for such report, and upon failure to do so may be suspended.

4. *Activities of Local Chapter.* The Local Chapter shall have full charge of all of its activities within the limits of this constitution and the rules and regulations of the National Organization.

5. *Voting Power.* Each Local Chapter shall have one vote in the affairs of the Province Organizations or of the National Organization. This vote may be delegated to a representative in case of conventions and conclaves and shall be a majority vote of Active Chapter members in case of referendum.

6. *Fees.* The initiation fee of all members of all classes shall be ten dollars payable upon application for membership. Each chapter shall be permitted one free Honorary membership each year.

7. *Officers.* Each Local Chapter shall elect officers at least once each year. The following officers must be included in the list of Local Officers: President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, and Reporter or Corresponding Secretary.

Each chapter shall have a faculty sponsor who shall be recognized as the sponsor by the college or university where the Local Chapter is chartered. Refusal to appoint a faculty sponsor shall be grounds for possible revocation or probation of the chapter.