

THE BATTALION

Serving the Texas A&M University community

Vol. 74 No. 142
30 Pages in 2 Sections

Friday, April 24, 1981
College Station, Texas

USPS 045 360
Phone 845-2611

The Weather

Tomorrow	Today
High 80	High 75
Low 63	Low 56
Chance of rain 20%	Chance of rain 20%



Staff photo by Chuck Chapman

Help at hand

An unidentified cyclist seems to be in no pain Wednesday afternoon even though he is riding with a broken leg. His crutch is close at hand.

Female cadet testifies in discrimination suit

By BELINDA McCOY
Battalion Staff

A sex discrimination suit filed in 1979 by former Texas A&M cadet Melanie Zentgraf against the University is undergoing preliminary proceedings in federal court in Houston, James Bond, University attorney, said.

Four female cadets voluntarily accompanied Bond to Houston for the preliminary proceedings, but Bond said only one — cadet Janet Larsen from Squadron 14, Zentgraf's former outfit — actually testified in the case.

The others were prepared to give testimony, Bond said, but they did not have to do it.

Zentgraf, a 1980 graduate, filed a class-action lawsuit on behalf of herself and other female cadets at Texas A&M on charges that federal and state statutory and constitutional provisions are violated when women are excluded from several Corps-affiliated organizations.

In a class-action suit, one member of a group (Zentgraf) is viewed in the case as being representative of a whole group (the female members of the Corps of Cadets).

District Judge Ross Stirling did not feel that it was necessary to hear testimony from the other three cadets, Bond said, because the testimonies would be so similar. The purpose of the proceedings is merely to determine if the lawsuit can be considered class-action.

The cadets were prepared to testify that Zentgraf was not representative enough of the women in the Corps to bring a class-action lawsuit.

The four cadets went to the federal court proceedings for two reasons, he said: "To indicate that Melanie would not be a proper person to represent the Corps," and also "They would not want to be part of a class-action suit."

Cadet Mary Stubbard from Company W-1 said the four female cadets decided to go to Houston after one of them volunteered to Bond. That cadet — whose name Stubbard did not reveal — then talked to the other three and they decided to testify on behalf of the University.

"It's a class-action lawsuit, and I don't want to be included," Stubbard said. "I just told them my side."

Cadet Dawn Daniels, who also went to Houston to testify in the proceedings, refused to comment on the case, saying that she feels such action would cause disruption in the women's outfits.

"We're trying to resolve everything. . . Things were going along real well until she filed this lawsuit," Daniels said. "It really is a touchy subject with us."

Stubbard said that she knew of no disruption that the suit has caused in the women's outfits.

"We don't even talk about it," she said.

Larsen and cadet Doriot Mascarich

from Company W-1 refused to comment on their appearance in the federal court.

A trial date for the suit will probably be set within six months, Bond said. Named as defendants in the original suit were: Texas A&M University; Dr. Jarvis E. Miller, former Texas A&M president; Dr. John J. Koldus, vice president for student services; Col. James R. Woodall, commandant of the Corps; and Robert J. Kamensky, 1978-79 Corps commander.

Since the suit was filed, however, Woodall has been dropped as a defendant. The Justice Department would have had to defend Woodall, since he is a federal employee. But the department arranged to have Woodall's name dropped in the suit, so that it would be free to intervene on Zentgraf's behalf.

Those organizations which the suit names as discriminatory are the Ross Volunteers, Parsons' Mounted Cavalry, which has since allowed women to join, the Aggie Band, Rudder's Rangers, the Fish Drill Team and the Brigade Color Guard.

Zentgraf is now stationed at Reese Air Force Base in Lubbock. Even though the suit was filed two years ago and Zentgraf was graduated from Texas A&M almost one year ago, she still feels strongly about her actions, she said.

However, Zentgraf declined to comment further on the case upon the advice of her lawyer.

Coordinating Board refines review process

By PHYLLIS HENDERSON
Battalion Staff

Since she was 3 years old, Sara has been raised on Aggie traditions. At that age, she also discovered her interest in art.

Now, as a high school senior, Sara is torn by a dilemma. She must choose between her love of art and her love of Texas A&M University. She can't have both — the University doesn't offer a degree program in art, though it's not from lack of trying.

"Sara" doesn't exist, but this dilemma is one many students face — trying to find the right program at the right university. Many times, the source of their frustrations can be traced directly to the decisions made by an 18-member board and its staff — the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System.

The Coordinating Board was set up by the Texas Legislature to coordinate the affairs of the 37 Texas state colleges and universities. Its members are appointed by the governor.

One of the board's major responsibilities is reviewing and approving all new degree programs, and it's in this area that conflict most often arises between the board and the universities.

In 1974, the board became concerned with the proliferation and duplication of programs, particularly doctoral programs, within the state, and it refused to accept any new graduate degree programs for review. This moratorium didn't end until the fall of 1980.

The moratorium was "more than just a halt, it was a review and revision" process, said Norma Foreman, the board's assistant commissioner for senior colleges and universities. It gave the board a chance to review its standards and set a clear definition of what its members wanted to accomplish, she said.

"The goal (of the board) is to provide excellence in (academic) offerings, so there is not du-

plication," she said.

Texas A&M administrators agree that the Coordinating Board needed to review its approval process and that the moratorium was beneficial in that respect.

Texas A&M Chancellor Frank W.R. Hubert said that during the moratorium, "the Coordinating Board perfected and refined their review process."

He said: "The moratorium, I'm sure, from the Coordinating Board's vantage point, was essential. They were receiving dozens and dozens of new program requests."

J.M. Prescott, vice president for academic affairs, agreed, but added: "I think they may have let it (the moratorium) run too long."

In recent years, the Coordinating Board has toughened its review of all programs, and the universities have felt the crunch.

"We got most of our programs through prior to 1974," George W. Kunze, dean of the Graduate College, said. "After 1974, it got tougher, and lately it's gotten a lot tougher."

The Coordinating Board has two major criteria a new program must meet before it can be approved:

— Is it within the role and scope of the university as the board perceives it?

— Are there quality programs in this area already in existence in the state?

Foreman said: "We are encouraging each university to review its own role and mission. We are asking them to try to look at what they're doing to see if it is central to their primary mission."

In the case of Texas A&M, the Coordinating Board has defined the role and scope of the University as that of a land-grant college, with an emphasis on the sciences, engineering and agriculture.

"It's a major research institution," Foreman

said. "Historically, it has been centered in the sciences, engineering and agriculture. It has a broad base of extension services. These are all central to its mission."

Some University administrators, however, claim this is a narrow view of the University's role and scope, and that programs which have been submitted to the board in the past, especially in the fine arts, have a legitimate place at this University.

At this time, a degree in theater arts is the only program the University offers in the area of fine arts.

"We've got our foot in the door in the fine arts area," Hubert said, "although it's a little foot in a big door."

"The fact that Texas A&M's role and scope defines it principally as a land-grant type of university should not be restrictive to the point that fine arts will be ruled out completely."

"They (the programs in fine arts) have not been appropriate for the roles A&M has had in the past, Foreman said. "She said if the University wants to expand its role and scope, the change will have to be initiated within the University itself."

"A lot of that will be in response to internal institutional planning," she said. "We react to institutional requests. They need to do long-range planning if they wish to develop in these areas."

The University did submit a baccalaureate degree program in fine arts to the Coordinating Board's staff, but withdrew it when the staff said they would give it a negative recommendation. In almost all cases, the recommendation of the staff will stand.

"Unless you're willing to fight the staff's recommendation, the Coordinating Board normally will accept the recommendation of its staff,"

Kunze said. "The decision of the staff . . . stands 85 to 90 percent of the time."

"It behooves you, as an individual, to go to the staff, presenting your case to the staff to make certain they fully understand what you're trying to do. You need to furnish them with information. They are dealing with a great variety of information. This is a matter of being able to communicate with them."

There is an occasion when the staff has reached a foregone conclusion (about a program) — and then you're fighting a losing battle."

In the case of the fine arts program, the staff said the program did not fall within the role and scope of the University. Prescott, however, disagrees.

"We asked for a bachelor of fine arts in graphic art," he said. "We consider that to be a support for our architecture program. In that light, I think they put a very narrow constrict on us. If we had asked for a fine arts program in musicology, they would have been perfectly justified in saying it wasn't within our role and scope."

If the University is committed to a program that has been rejected, its only alternative is to keep trying.

"About all you can do," Prescott said, "is wait awhile and go back to it (the board) with another approach."

The Texas Legislature has put more and more power in the hands of the Coordinating Board in recent years in order to control the expenses generated by the universities and colleges.

Kunze said: "The Coordinating Board hasn't necessarily asked for this control — the Legislature has given it to them."

The board's second criterion when reviewing programs — duplication — can find its roots in these economic considerations.

"Educationally unnecessary programs which duplicate each other are costly to the state,"

Hubert said. The principle reason the board has become more active in the review of new degree programs is the fiscal consideration, he said.

In order to curb this duplication, the board has also been given the power to approve all courses in each curriculum. Each university and college must send a course inventory to the board each year. If a course is not approved by the board, the school will not receive state funds for teaching it.

"Their concern is you can start with one course, and eventually build an entire program without approval of the board," said Charles McCandless, associate vice president for academic affairs.

The board has also been given the authority to review existing doctoral programs. These reviews are done by outside consultants hired by the board. These consultants review existing doctoral programs in a specific academic area in state institutions when a university requests approval of doctoral program in that area.

"We welcome the doctoral reviews," McCandless said. These reviews can help the University to improve its programs by pointing out their weaknesses, he said.

Along with these academic responsibilities, the board has been given the responsibility of approving all new campus buildings, except those funded through the Available University Fund. Out of deference to the board, however, Texas A&M submits all building requests to the board for approval.

With each new power given to the board, the University is forced to do more work, especially paperwork. Reports for each program, course and building must be sent in to the board for approval.

"It's taken a lot more time," McCandless said, "and sometimes, that's frustrating."

Campus landmark will be open for Parents' Day

By JANE G. BRUST
Battalion Staff

A new building opened in 1932 on the campus of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, a building which changed the look and orientation of the land grant school known today as Texas A&M University.

With the construction of the Systems Building, Texas A&M turned to face the east and a brand new highway. No longer would the Academic Building face the main campus entrance, formerly the railroad station to the west.

In observance of Parents' Day, the main lobby of the Systems Building will be open to the public from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sunday.

"We'd like the students to bring their parents to see it," said Robert C. Cherry, assistant chancellor of the Texas A&M University System and secretary to the Board of Regents.

"It's a beautiful building, a landmark on campus," he said. "It's the most magnificent state building in Texas."

A long esplanade literally leads up the slope to the monumental building which houses the chancellor's office as well as the headquarters of the College of Agriculture, the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station and the Texas Agricultural Extension Service.

Numerous steps climb up toward fourteen two-story columns that line the front of the building and support the deep horizontal structure forming the third and fourth stories. Detailed designs adorn the exterior cornices and the edges around heavy doors and

stained glass windows.

From the outside, the stained glass does not seem to resemble the brilliant glass commonly found in churches. Looking at the windows from inside the building, however, one can see pastel colors glowing even on a cloudy day.

In contrast to the windows' pastel shades, the interior walls, stairway and ceiling boast colors of gold and blue. More impressive than the colors, however, is the detailed design of the interior architecture.

An enormous lighting fixture island on the main lobby's high ceiling features ornate carvings of animal and human heads as do tall archways and columns.

On the floor is a brass and terrazzo map of Texas — measuring 12 feet in diameter — showing the locations of several Spanish missions and principal Texas battles, including the Battle of San Jacinto. Principal rivers and other geographical features of Texas also appear on the map made of brass inlays and polished marble chips.

In 1970 Texas A&M University President James Earl Rudder's body lay in a flag-draped coffin over the map on the lobby floor. Former U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson was among those who visited the Systems Building to pay last respects to the Texas A&M president.

Construction of the Systems Building cost only \$362,000. "And that was in the depths of the Depression," Cherry said. "Now it's worth several million dollars in architecture."



Staff photo by Brian Tate

The Systems Building, which was built in 1932, is said to be one of the most magnificent state buildings. The main lobby will be open to the public Sunday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. for Parents' Day.