

arise as to the method of implementing the termination in a manner which is both practical and fair to the various individuals concerned. Those presently enrolled in ROTC have expectations, which, unless special arrangements are made, will be seriously affected by the discontinuance of ROTC at Stanford. They hold deferments, and many receive scholarships or subsistence support.

The Committee notes that the proposed modification* in status of the Army ROTC for a trial period of one year recommended by the President and approved by the Senate January 22, 1970, was never formally implemented. Nor can it be now implemented in view of the Senate resolution of May 7 1970. The result is to leave the underlying contracts unmodified by University action except in so far as effected by the Senate resolutions of 1969. Those resolutions, as previously described, envisioned the termination of present ROTC programs by means of a progressive phasing out beginning in the Autumn of 1970 (when no new students would be enrolled in ROTC programs) and extending to 1973

*The modification proposed a shift from an academic department to a center for military studies; a change in academic status of the professor of Military Science; and removal of academic credit except as approved by CUS.

when all students currently enrolled in ROTC at Stanford would have necessarily completed their academic requirements). In view of the University's contractual obligations and in the interest of fairness and equity to the individual cadets and midshipmen currently enrolled in ROTC (many of whom are on ROTC scholarships), the Committee believes that the phasing out of ROTC programs at Stanford over a period of time is appropriate. The findings of the Committee's poll confirm that the need for some kind of transitional arrangement is recognized by the dominant majority of the Stanford community.

The Committee therefore recommends that, in light of the termination of existing contracts, the President take appropriate steps to:

1. Ensure that the date beyond which no new enrollments be accepted or become initially effective in any ROTC program be August 31, 1970. Specifically, members of the Class of 1974 or subsequent classes shall not be admitted to any Stanford ROTC program as currently constituted.

2. Ensure that freshmen who have been accepted for admission to Stanford in the Fall of 1970 and who have been awarded ROTC scholarships should, within the limits of

Stanford's financial aid policies, be awarded scholarships by the University and at the same time that the Army and Navy be encouraged to offer alternative ROTC placement at comparable universities for those who wish it.

3. That the ROTC units be allowed to remain at Stanford pursuant to the 1969 Resolutions only so long as is absolutely necessary to permit students currently enrolled to complete their programs.

4. Urge that the ROTC units expedite the phase-out process with a view to enabling students currently enrolled to complete their ROTC programs by June 1972.

5. Seek to secure from the Services an assurance that in light of the changes and uncertainties caused by the phase-out process, the punitive clauses will not be invoked against any student who wishes to disenroll at any time before completing his ROTC course.

6. Have the Provost designate an academic officer to advise and assist in settling cases of individual hardship.

IV. LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Alternative Programs for Officer Training

The Committee recommends that the President of the University initiate discussions with the Department of Defense to determine whether an alternative officer training

program can be organized for Stanford students.

In light of experience with ROTC programs through the years and with various other forms of officer training, the universities and the Department of Defense ought to be able to devise a form of officer training that a university student might obtain concurrently with his education, that would impose upon the student no compromises upon the pursuit of his own intellectual and academic ambitions and that would not produce the incompatibilities between university education and military training inherent in the present ROTC concept.

This new plan would have the best chance of attracting suitable candidates in substantial numbers if it had the following characteristics:

1. Provision of Deferments: As long as the draft continues, the most appropriate way by which a student could choose to serve as an officer, rather than as a drafted enlisted man, would be to obtain a deferment during his enrollment in the training program.
2. Scholarships: As the Navy found and the Army and Air Force emulated, and as universities have known for some time, scholarships are one way of attracting high calibre students to enroll in a program. To avoid the punitive clause problem, the Services could protect their investment by converting the scholarship aid to a loan with a

long-term payment provision if the student drops the program before his commission. The repayment term should be sufficiently long so that the threat of debt does not simply replace the threat of active duty. (See Appendix 3 for a full discussion). If the terms were too onerous, the student could opt for aid under the usual terms from the university.

3. Professional Training Off Campus: In order to avoid mixing academic and professional officer training, professional officer training should be conducted off campus. In areas like the south Peninsula where several major universities are close neighbors, the Services could achieve substantial economies of scale with limited amounts of travel inconvenience to the students. Since the use of summer camps and summer cruises could continue, it is likely that some of this professional training could be shifted to the summer months. The frequency of meetings for professional training during the academic year might thereby be reduced.
4. Academic Instruction at Stanford: The Program might include a set of designated courses taught by regular Stanford faculty as normal departmental offerings. Any such plan should be worked out by local military representatives in conjunction with a Committee of the Senate. Military or civilian lecturers, specially supported by the Services, would not be accepted for such a plan.
5. Commissions: The student would normally receive his commission either upon graduation or in the summer following graduation upon completion of summer training.

For graduate students, the commission would come at the second year of off-campus training.

6. Campus Organization: There would seem to be no need for a formal or informal campus organization for this program, but nothing would prevent the students from voluntarily establishing (or disestablishing) an organization for inviting lecturers and delving into problems of mutual interest.
7. Recruiting and Counselling: The Services may wish to have an officer on campus on a part-time basis to assist in recruiting students to the program and advising them of problems which arise during the course of the program. He may be provided facilities with the Dean of Students or the Placement Office.
8. Contracts: If the plan is properly worked out, a formal contract of the present type between the University and the Services should prove unnecessary. In any event, every care must be exercised to see to it that the University not delegate to an outside agency any aspect of control over its decision-making processes.

Since a program of this type would benefit some future Stanford students and not in any way commit academic or other resources to military training, the President should begin discussions immediately with the Department of Defense. It may require the cohesive and congruent action of a number of university presidents.

The aim should be to establish the new plan by the Fall

of 1972, so that freshmen entering in 1970 may benefit from a two-year version of it.

With respect to this Recommendation, it is the Committee's view that if a plan of the kind envisaged is worked out, it need not fit any conventional category. Nothing is gained by trying to characterize it as an "organized, official activity of the University," as a "voluntary student organization," or under any other particular phrase or rubric. Formal labeling or categorization is not important; it is the substance with which we are concerned.

Finally, this Committee has been sharply reminded in many of its deliberations and hearings that compulsory military service, as presently implemented in the Selective Service System, is one of the major factors influencing participation in the ROTC program. We are convinced that many students enter ROTC principally to alleviate the uncertainty of the draft. Therefore, we believe it entirely appropriate, and within our charge, that we include a call for a thorough review of the Selective Service System by the Government.

B. A National Student Services Program

There appears good reason to try to move what has been at Stanford "the ROTC issue" above the level of symbolism -- a measure of whether somebody agrees or disagrees with the Southeast Asia policy.

The question of whether training men to be officers in war is an appropriate university function is exacerbated because ROTC is the only visible in-university training which the Federal Government subsidizes. There is a case to be made for providing some kind of officer training opportunity to those who desire it, even though a majority of students and faculty members would themselves make a different choice. But there is no better inherent case for providing this kind of training on this subsidized basis than there is for providing training on a similar basis for other high purposes.

The Committee recommends that the President initiate, within the Stanford community and with representatives of other universities and of the Federal Government, a full consideration of the possibilities of developing a continuing program which will offer to university men and women special training opportunities for roles in various

types of service deemed essential to the welfare of the nation. This "National Student Services Plan" would include programs for special training, on terms comparable to the officer training program, for other kinds of service. We see this as expanding the concept of service to include a wider range of activities. Among these activities are training programs to develop more effective approaches to ameliorating the problems of cities and changing rural areas, the treatment of minority groups, alteration of the environment and programs designed to permit more effective public administration.

Already some programs exist in these areas and should be considered for incorporation into a National Student Services Plan. VISTA and the Peace Corps come quickly to mind. But we urge that consideration be given to the development of new programs in which the competence of the universities and the needs of the society converge. Examples include the development of a program for training students to act as science specialists to legislative or administrative components of government. Such specialists might play the difficult "broker" role between the quickly developing findings of scholarship

and the concurrently developing concept of appropriate science policy or application of science to public problems. Such a program might consider both on and off campus elements -- including summer tours or internships.

More significantly, there is good reason to start thinking in terms of a broadly conceived "National Student Services Plan". There are manifest signs among today's students of a desire to take a larger part in solving the nation's problems than they feel they have had an opportunity to do. There are manifest signs on college and university campuses of a growing conviction that education should, in one way or another, be complemented, enriched and made more meaningful. The exercise of some ingenuity about developing a broader service model than a military service training program might produce some fruitful ideas, in keeping with campus ideas and ideals about human needs.

It is at least conceivable that better answers than the present Selective Service system or any commonly suggested alternatives to it would emerge from a consideration of a national student services plan as a part of a voluntary, and specially subsidized, university program.

The Committee accordingly urges that the President of Stanford initiate, within the Stanford community and with representatives of other universities and of the Federal Government, a full consideration of the possibilities of developing a continuing program which will make available to university men and women, on a basis comparable to the officer training program, special training opportunities for roles in various types of service deemed essential to the welfare of the Nation.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Victor Baldrige
Victor Baldrige, Member

William N. Blanchard
William N. Blanchard, Member

Arnold E. Brown
Arnold E. Brown, Member

A. Dale Kaiser
A. Dale Kaiser, Member

Philip H. Rhinelandor
Philip H. Rhinelandor, Member

Carol Roesch
Carol Roesch, Member

Eugene J. Webb
Eugene J. Webb, Member

J. Keith Mann
J. Keith Mann, Chairman

Thomas E. Headrick,
Consultant to
the Committee

Poll Verification Procedure

Each individual who participated in the poll signed his name to the outer envelope which carried the inner sealed envelope. It was not possible to verify each signature, and a sampling procedure was employed for both student and faculty signatures. This procedure required two separate steps: first establishing that the three judges of signatures were "reliable" judges and second that an adequate level of verified signatures was reached--adequate in the sense that the probable level of fraudulent signatures was trivial.

"Reliability" of judges means that the evaluation of signatures is not individually biased. That is, given a signature on a ballot and a signature on a comparison card (e.g., registration card), the judges will agree independently that the ballot signature is bona fide or not bona fide. To determine the level of reliability, a random sample of 132 verifiable ballots was drawn by use of a random number table. Each of three judges independently evaluated each of these signatures. In slightly over 98 per cent of the cases (130 out of 132) all three judges agreed on the legitimacy of the signature. For the remaining two ballots, two of three judges came to the same judgment and the remaining judge was uncertain. This level of agreement was judged high enough to permit individual judges to work separately.

The next step was then to draw another random sample of ballots and verify signatures. A total of 473 student ballots were checked against signatures on registration cards. Of these 470 were judged as legitimate signatures and 3 were rejected. From the faculty ballots a random sample of 140 ballots was selected and the signatures were compared against

signatures from previous sealed-ballot elections. All of the 140 signatures were verified. Thus, combining both student and faculty samples, a randomly selected total of 613 signatures were checked. 610 were accepted; 3 were rejected, yielding an acceptance rate of 99.5 per cent. In the judgment of the committee this rate was sufficiently high to reject the idea of significant fraudulent balloting.

Cross Tabulations of Poll ResponsesRelation between military service responsibilities and ROTC opinions.

To what extent were Stanford students and faculty affected in their opinion on the role of ROTC by their personal relation to military service? Responses to question VIII on the Advisory Committee's Poll (the role of ROTC at Stanford) were compared with sex, draft status, and military experience.

Table 1 shows the difference between men and women in their choice of answer on question VIII.

Table 1

Cross-Tabulation: Sex versus Role of ROTC

		A	B	C	D	E	NA ¹	Totals ²
Males.	Student	22% (1047)	17% (841)	30% (1446)	15% (745)	14% (701)	1% (65)	99% (4845)
	Faculty	19% (114)	23% (139)	33% (197)	17% (99)	6% (34)	2% (10)	100% (593)
Females.	Student	10% (129)	14% (187)	38% (508)	16% (220)	22% (296)	1% (12)	101% (1352)
	Faculty	12% (6)	18% (9)	42% (21)	14% (7)	12% (6)	2% (1)	100% (50)

1 NA category equals non-responses and "No opinion" responses.

2 Totals may not add to 100% because of rounding.

Men, more so than women, chose favoring some retention of ROTC.