

coeducation may cause transfer discrimination

by michael russell
cavalier daily staff writer

Coeducation at the University as it gradually evolves over the next few years may practice discrimination in transfer admissions policies against the women in Virginia's State institutions.

The charge was leveled in an editorial which appeared in the September 22 issue of "The Bulletin," the student newspaper at Mary Washington College. The editorial was written by Mary Ann Burns, the managing editor of the paper, and charged:

"The Board of Visitors will announce in October its plan for the 1970 state educating the University of Virginia at Charlottesville. According to a reliable source within the University, indications are that the plan for 1970 will give preference to out-of-state women transfer applicants to the undergraduate college of arts and sciences, as opposed to giving preference to in-state women transfers."

"What this means to MWC students, in particular, is that although the college has a legal status which no other state college enjoys - the coordinate college of the University of Virginia - the women of this college will not be given transfer preference. In fact, if the proposal is enacted, it is possible that MWC liberal arts students will not enjoy transfer privileges in 1970 at all."

news analysis

Miss Burns' assertions are substantiated by the policies and statements made by officials at the University concerning the future prospects of coeducation.

In The Cavalier Daily of September 23 there appear a series of articles surrounding the plans for coeducation. Frank L. Hereford, the University Provost, was interviewed in the lead story in that issue and his statements deny that there will be quotas established on the number of women who will be admitted to the College. Instead he talks about projections on "how many women would be

qualified for admissions and would come here with no restrictions." His attempt to refute the quota system, however, falls short in light of other statements.

As an example, one of the major sources of female applicants will be the annual increase of state women attending colleges. In the past these women have been absorbed by Mary Washington, but the future plans of Mary Washington call for continuation of education without an increase in enrollment. Coeducation in part means that the same percentage of women will be educated in state institutions, rather than an increased number of women between Mary Washington and the University.

Mr. Hereford further asserts that the plans for coeducation have been laid such that the University will not decrease the number of men which it enrolls every year. The coeducation will occur therefore among the annual increase in the college enrollment and from transfer students (mostly in their third year).

According to the Mr. Hereford:

"...we don't feel it would be proper for the University to admit women in such numbers as to be damaging to other state institutions. We are part of an overall state system and must act accordingly."

"With coeducation, there are indications we shall have a tremendous number of applications from other state institutions, and we shall probably have to limit female transfers to the University as well as continue accommodating the same number of men here, in order to prevent any damage to other state schools."

These statements lead to a positive affirmation of Miss Burns' charge later in her editorial that, "The rationale for this potential policy, according to the University source, is that when coeducation begins at Charlottesville, enrollment and the quality of students at MWC will decline. The Board of Visitors is very concerned about the status of MWC, and is considering this discriminatory means to maintain the quality of the college."

Miss Burns' last statement is her chief concern in bringing this matter to light. For some time women at Mary Washing-

ton have felt that they were attending a school which because of its lesser budget, was unequal in facilities and instruction to the major base of the University. The concern for an equal education led to the initial drive on the part of students at Mary Washington and at the University for coeducation of the Charlottesville school.

Effectively what Mr. Hereford's and the Board's statements and policies do is to limit the women who attend Mary Washington from the outset of their college education to Mary Washington. If they find the school unsatisfactory or inferior, they cannot transfer to another state institution (and particularly the University) because their transfer is viewed as harming Mary Washington. On the other hand, out-of-state student women who wish to transfer to the University on an equal basis with men (keeping in mind of course that the number of men will in no instances be limited) have a greater probability of being admitted than women in our own state system.

Thus the students who initially began the push for coeducation because of the educational imbalance of the system will not be admitted on an equal basis because the Visitors fear that the imbalance will increase.

Miss Burns sums up in her editorial possibly the best and most equitable way of making the educational system in the state equally satisfactory for both men and women.

"The Board of Visitors is concerned with our status. In order to protect the level of enrollment and the quality of students, the Board has discussed (again, according to the UVA source) the proposal that women from MWC not be accepted as transfer students to the liberal arts college. But the way to maintain the status of MWC, and surely the way to improve the status of MWC, is not to wall us in, to prevent us from attending the University at Charlottesville. Rather, it is to pay the professors more salary, build more facilities to MWC, build more facilities, and ultimately, if an adequate coordinate system cannot be attained, to coeducate MWC and perhaps sever ties with UVA."

Law School here last spring. He also has testified before a Senate subcommittee on prison conditions.

When I mentioned Mr. Hirschkop to the guard, the smile on his face disappeared and he said that he never wanted to see "that ultimate SOB" around the prison ever again.

After a few more words about Mr. Hirschkop were exchanged, the four group came down into the yard with a guard at the front of the line and one in the rear.

After talking to a few of the students in the group I learned that they had seen the metal and Home shops and some single cells.

We then proceeded to a large building where they had double cells. The beds were neatly made and pajamas were neatly folded on the beds. The two-man cells were about eight by ten feet and had bunk beds, two wooden chairs, a table, a toilet and a sink.

After passing through the commissary and heading toward the school rooms, it became apparent that no great insights into prison conditions would be gained by the tour alone.

We waited outside of the "school house" as the inmates, carrying their spelling and reading books, filed out into the yard.

As the tour continued into the building, I saw a prisoner standing in a nearby doorway. I noticed that the rear guard was busily talking to one of the students, so I took the opportunity to walk over and talk to the prisoner about conditions within the State Pen.

Just as I reached the doorway however, the guard spotted me and rushed over to us and said, "Let's move along right NOW, Suk."

As we entered the electric chair room, most of the students were surprised to find a twelve foot gallery from which the executions would be witnessed. The guard simply told us that he had no mind to witness the execution of a