

ALARM



Upperclassmen hurt by law

Andrew Shapiro is a draft lawyer and co-author of "Mastering the Draft: A Comprehensive Guide for Solving Draft Problems" [626 pp. Avon paperback]. "PointBlank" is distributed by Access - The Communications Corporation.



Since the new draft law passed, upperclassmen have been too busy counting their blessings to notice what they have lost: a precious ace-in-the-hole known as the I-S (C) deferment.

The I-S (C) was a second lease on life for the student who failed to maintain the "satisfactory academic progress" essential to a continued II-S student deferment. A I-S (C) protected the student until he once again qualified to get his II-S back.

Suppose a student failed to make satisfactory progress at the end of one academic year. Before his draft board found out and ordered him for induction, he would enter his next term of study. Having made a fresh start at satisfactory progress in a brand new term, the student's prior slate had to be wiped clean - at least, temporarily.

He was entitled to have his induction order cancelled and be deferred in Class I-S (C) until the end of the academic year. This breather gave the student time to make up lost credits. By the time his I-S (C) expired, he would once again be maintaining overall satisfactory progress and qualify for a renewed II-S.

With little fanfare, the new draft law abolished the I-S (C). From now on, if you fall behind, or attend school part-time, you cannot wipe the slate clean by simply resuming anew satisfactory progress in a full-time course of study. Should you try this old approach and then receive an induction order, the order will not be cancelled. Your induction date will merely be postponed - normally until the end of the term and, in the case of seniors, until the end of the academic year.

There is a crucial difference between a postponement and a I-S (C) cancellation. For all practical purposes, a cancelled induction order never existed. Its cancellation left you free to effect any change in your status, so that you would merit deferment by the time the I-S (C) expired.

Not so when an induction order remains outstanding, and your induction date is merely postponed. Before you can get any deferment or exemption, you must prove to your board that "there has been a change in [your] status resulting from circumstances over which [you] had no control."

Such a change is hard to prove. Last spring, for instance, the Supreme Court decided that becoming a C.O. after receiving an

induction order did not constitute an uncontrollable change in status. Similarly, any concerted improvement in academic progress is unlikely to result from circumstances over which a student has no control.

The safest course in this season of the precarious II-S is to maintain satisfactory academic progress at all cost. Selective Service Regulations measure satisfactory progress according to a rigid formula: you must earn proportionate credits for each year in your academic program.

For example, if you are in a four-year program, you must earn 25% of your degree credits after one academic year, 50% after your second year, and so forth.

While draft boards apply this test rigidly, pouncing on students a few credits short, the courts have been much more solicitous. They have indicated that satisfactory progress is a question of fact that may vary with individual circumstances. Therefore, a student might still qualify for continued II-S - even if he failed the proportionate progress test - so long as his college certifies that he is expected to graduate on time, and it seems reasonably probable that he can succeed.

The question of satisfactory progress, which will hound students for years, is about to shock some students this fall. Continued eligibility for the II-S is predicated upon the maintenance of satisfactory progress during the past academic year (1970-71).

If you did not make satisfactory progress last year, and you are wondering why you have not yet received your II-S this year, there is a very good reason. On September 22 - one week before the new law was signed - Draft Director Curtis Tarr sent Local Board Memorandum 122 to his draft boards. It instructed them to: "Delay the ...reclassification into Class II-S of any registrant, eligible for such classification as an undergraduate, who ...entered college before the 1971 summer session but who during the 1970-71 regular academic year failed satisfactorily to pursue a full-time course of instruction..."

The message is clear: your draft board is already starting to scrutinize student progress. The abolition of the I-S (C) just may be the incentive to touch off a rash of I-A reclassifications. Since draft boards follow their own rigid test of satisfactory progress - regardless of what the courts say - students may find themselves harrassed the way they once were when protesters were reclassified I-A as delinquents.

pages of opinion

UNCC October 25, 1971

Opinions of the Journal are expressed on its editorial pages. All unsigned editorials are the majority opinion of the Editorial Board. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual writers. Opposing editorial viewpoints may be printed by contacting the Editor.

fred dillahunt

Save our black colleges



Minister of Information
Black Student Union
UNCC

N.C.C.U., E.C.S.U., F.S.U., W.S.S.U., and A.&T. S.U. Those of you who have just finished reading all those abbreviations are of course wondering what they stand for. They stand for: North Carolina Central University, Elizabeth City State University, Fayetteville State University, Winston Salem State University, A.&T. State University. These are the five predominately black colleges in this state that are state supported. We, the members of the Black Student Union of UNCC, feel that their continued existence as black institutions is being threatened by Governor Robert Scott's proposed restructuring of higher education in the state.

To defend this accusation, let us first look at the reorganization plan and deal with the question, "Why keep black schools anyway?"

Last November, the Board of Higher Education held a meeting with Gov. Scott. At the meeting, Scott discussed the need for re-organization of higher education in the state. Since that meeting, Scott has moved to try and implement the restructuring of higher education. These are five options currently being discussed by a committee appointed by Scott. The five plans are: 1) a super board (a board of regents); 2) a large 100-man board of trustees for the higher education system based on geographic representation and composed initially of representatives from all of the local boards of trustees; 3) two boards of trustees; 4) regional boards of trustees; and 5) continuation of the present system of local boards with the Board of Higher Education as the coordinating agency.

The last plan or proposal listed above (a stronger Board of Higher Education) appears to be the only plan of the five that offers black institutions the greatest possibility of expansion and development. The other four plans do not do this and, as a matter of fact, either of the other four plans could facilitate the gradual disappearance of black colleges.

After viewing Scott's plan, the next logical question might be, "Why keep black colleges anyway?" Now if you are one who feels that the existence and survival of black people here in this state and in this country does not really matter, then your reply to the question of

"Why keep black colleges anyway?" probably would speak to the need for abolishing them. On the other hand, if you are one who feels that the existence and survival of black people here in this state and in this country is a legitimate and valid endeavor, then you might be in favor of the continued existence of black schools because you can see the black college as being an educational tool in helping black people to better understand themselves and their role in society vis-a-vis their blackness.

One of the main challenges of the black colleges of today is the responsibility of redefining an educational philosophy in line with the needs and aspirations of black people. If the black college can be allowed to redefine a new educational philosophy relevant to black people, then its validity will have been established. But how can the black college be allowed to do this if it is not even allowed to exist?

Because of our concern for the future of black institutions and education in general, we are in favor of the following recommendations being incorporated into any bill for the restructuring of higher education in the state of North Carolina: 1) That any restructuring of higher education should guarantee 80% or more black representation on all local trustee boards of tax supported predominately black universities and colleges; 2) That these local boards be financed and authorized to utilize the services of scholars and community personnel in restructuring higher education for the black universities; 3) That a minimum of 30% of any state-wide central governing board be black; 4) That a minimum of 30% of any administrative staff for the governing board be black; 5) The new bill of governance should be flexible enough to permit new programs, as local boards recognize local and special needs; 6) The restructuring bill should guarantee the right of each state-supported university to make a direct appeal to the legislative appropriations committee; and 7) An open admissions policy should not be ruled out of a bill on restructuring. A selective and rigid admissions policy would be tragic for blacks due to past educational inequities and impoverished socio-economic conditions.

