This Committee was established as the result of an action taken by the UWM Faculty at a special meeting on May 24, 1966. The duties of the Committee outlined at that time were to review selective service policies and procedures as they affect the University, to poll male students concerning their desires on the role of the University in determining their deferment, and to report its recommendations to the Faculty.

Accordingly, the results of the male student poll and the recommendations to the Faculty on University procedures under the existing selective service system are presented in this report.

A similar committee on the Madison campus was completing its report when the UWM Committee was appointed last fall. The introductory portions (sections I, II and III) of Madison Document 95 are included in the appendix to this report in order to provide, we think, an excellent statement of background information.

The recommendations presented here were deliberately developed with reference to similar recommendations by the Madison faculty committee. One important reason for this was to minimize discrepancies within the university system while retaining our distinctive convictions where necessary.
The report concerns University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee students' attitudes about the role of universities and colleges in the selective service procedure. The data was obtained in a survey of students' attitudes about United States involvement in Vietnam. A total of 599 students were selected by chance from the complete list of UWM students. It was determined that this would be a large enough sample to meet the objectives of the study. The questionnaires were sent to the 599 students in late June, 1966. A total of 207 students completed and returned the questionnaire by 6 September 1966. A comparison of this sample with the larger universe indicates that we may have confidence in its representatives.

Students were asked about the role of universities and colleges in the selective service procedures. The responses are reported on Table 1.

**TABLE 1. STUDENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES INVOLVEMENT IN THE SELECTIVE SERVICE PROCEDURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much should universities and colleges be involved in the selective service procedures?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that universities and colleges should:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. automatically report a student's status and his rank in class to the selective service?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. provide only such information as the student may request including his present status in school and his rank in class?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. provide only such information as is required by law?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results reported in the right hand margin show that 21 per cent of the respondents feel that universities and colleges should automatically report a student's status and his rank in class to the selective service. Such a policy would increase the role of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee's role in the selective service procedure.

The second alternative, which describes the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee's present policy, was designated by 39 per cent of the respondents. Finally, 39 per cent answer that universities and colleges should provide only such information as is required by law. As the law is now written, the University is not required to provide any information to the selective service agencies. This questionnaire however, does not measure students' knowledge of the law as it now stands.

It is clear that more than three-fourths (79%) of the students at UWM do not want universities and colleges to become more deeply involved in the selective service procedure.

One question remains unanswered, so far as the charge to this committee is concerned. How do eligible males in this University feel about the role of colleges and universities in the selective service procedure? Table 2 reports the students' answers to this question by their status.
TABLE 2. ELIGIBLE AND NON-ELIGIBLE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES INVOLVEMENT IN THE SELECTIVE SERVICE PROCEDURES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University's Role</th>
<th>&quot;Automatic&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Request&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;By Law&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you in the National Guard, the Armed Forces, Reserves, presently eligible for draft, or what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am in the National Guard</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am in the Armed Forces Reserves</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am eligible for draft, but have a student deferment</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am eligible for draft, but am deferred for reasons other than being a student</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am eligible for draft and am classified</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am not serving and am not eligible for draft</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have already served in the armed forces</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&amp;9. I don't know whether I am eligible for draft or not</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Inapplicable including female</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in student opinion about the role of universities and colleges were examined by the students' draft status. The results show that of the 49 students who are eligible and have a student deferment, nearly half (47%) want the University to provide such information as is requested by the student. A smaller proportion (16%) want universities and colleges to automatically report the student's class and rank and 37 per cent want universities and colleges to provide only such information as required by law.

Two general conclusions may be drawn from this survey. First, most UWM students do not want colleges and universities to become more involved in the selective procedure. Second, the students who are most directly affected by the draft are most likely to ask that universities and colleges provide only such information as the student may request and these students are less likely than students as a whole, to ask that the University automatically provide information to the selective service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations with comments are as follows:

A. CONTINUING THE POLICY OF DEALING DIRECTLY WITH STUDENTS, RATHER THAN WITH DRAFT BOARDS, IN ALL MATTERS RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL CASES

Comment:

Since spring 1966 it has been University policy to deal directly with
students in providing information which they request for use in seeking to establish their claim to an educational deferment. The University is presently operating under a procedure which each semester provides each male student with a certificate that he is enrolled on a full-time basis. In the past the University has automatically notified an individual's draft board when a registrant receiving such a certificate either withdraws from school or ceases to pursue a full-time course. Under present University practice it is left to the student, not the University, to notify his board of any such change of status. Local Selective Service officials express concern that some students may enroll only long enough to obtain a certificate, then withdraw without notifying their boards. This could result in having others called up for induction ahead of those who misuse the system in this way. The Committee, however, treats the principle of University non-involvement with individual draft boards as so important that it supports this recommendation unconditionally and would leave it to the Selective Service System itself to prevent such practices through use of penalty provisions in the Act (e.g., fines or imprisonment). This would limit the University's role to (a) supplying the student with the requested information and (b) confirming or denying the authenticity of the data he has submitted to his board, upon query by the board.

B. SUPPLYING TO THE STUDENT ANY MATERIAL OR INFORMATION BEARING ON HIS STATUS AS A STUDENT OR HIS ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE - INCLUDING HIS RANK IN CLASS - PROVIDED THE BASIC INFORMATION IS AT HAND OR IS READILY DERIVABLE FROM AVAILABLE DATA

Comment:

The Committee thinks the reasons for support of the general principle of the recommendation are evident: historically, the University as an institution and its faculty individually have gone to considerable lengths to provide information and support for students in countless ways. When requested, information and support have been available to a student seeking employment, to one applying for admission to school, to one seeking research grants. To deny our students information available to students at other institutions might
selectively disadvantage them by our unilateral action. Information and support
for those seeking to establish a claim for deferment under existing national
law invoke the same principle.

C. THAT CLASS STANDING BE PROVIDED TO ALL FULL TIME STUDENTS WITH THAT RANK
    COMPUTED BOTH ON THE BASIS OF THEIR SCHOOL OR COLLEGE AND ON A CAMPUS-
    WIDE BASIS, BOTH CUMULATIVELY AND ANNUALLY

Comment:

If rank in class information is to be made available on request of draft
registrants, it should be available on broader terms than can now be had.
Since grade-point medians vary substantially among the several schools and
colleges - and between freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years within a
particular school or college - the choice in systems for compiling class rank
involves real differences. It is not a proper business of the University to
take a stance favoring one group of students against another merely to shift
the incidence of the draft within the institution. We would provide the student
with his class rank compiled both by school and on a campus-wide basis -
annually and cumulatively, also, if desired - and let him do with it whatever
he chooses. Details of the administrative procedures to be followed in applying
the principles generally stated here can best be developed cooperatively between
the Registrar and the continuing Faculty-Student Committee on Selective Service
(the establishment of which we recommend in E, below).

One committee member dissents and believes that the possibility of rankings
based on male students only be permitted. The argument is that inclusion of
this recommendation tacitly admits the possible usefulness of this ranking to
students in deliberating with their draft boards. The provision of this ranking
data then, must properly be justified on the grounds that it is a service to our
students rather than on the pretext that since it is provided for all students
it has no relation to the selective service system. Since the ranking can be
justified on the basis of a student service there is no reason to prohibit such a
ranking being based on male students. Since many schools now rank male students
only it may be that UWM students would be placed at a relative disadvantage in obtaining deferments in order to pursue their studies. Such a disadvantage would be unfortunate and unnecessary within the general position advocated for the University in these recommendations.

D. THAT UNIVERSITY FACILITIES BE PROVIDED TO ACCOMMODATE THOSE DESIRING TO TAKE THE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST, REAFFIRMING THE PRINCIPLE THAT SUCH USE OF UNIVERSITY FACILITIES IMPLIES NEITHER INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL NOR DISAPPROVAL OF THE TEST OR ENDORSEMENT OF THE AGENCY ADMINISTERING IT

Comment:
The Committee feels that the provision of space by the University for this purpose has certain similarities to the provision of space to other agencies and organizations as a service to our students.

E. THAT A CONTINUING COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF TWO FACULTY MEMBERS AND TWO STUDENTS BE CREATED TO MAINTAIN SURVEILLANCE OVER POLICIES AND PRACTICES RESPECTING EFFECTS OF THE DRAFT ON THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY, AND CHARGED WITH THE DUTY OF REPORTING ITS RECOMMENDATIONS AT LEAST ANNUALLY TO THE FACULTY AND AT SUCH OTHER TIMES AS THE REASONABLE NEEDS OF THE OCCASION MAY REQUIRE
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