

## Editorials

We stand firmly behind the April 15 article on Maintenance by John Hiratsuka. We believe that a careful reading will show that no attempt was made to malign the Maintenance Department or its employees.

The intent of the Maintenance article was to explore an area of student dissatisfaction. Concern about maintenance service had been conveyed to the Guilfordian by several students. Response to expressed concerns is the primary function of the Guilfordian.

Mr. Hiratsuka has done an objective job of reporting. The matter is being investigated by an administrative committee. We have received and published numerous articles in support of the Maintenance Department. We would like to see the matter pursued to the Business Office from which Maintenance takes its orders. If indeed constructive communication has been stimulated by Mr. Hiratsuka's article, we congratulate him for his work in bringing these matters to light.

The Senate Plan for the use of over \$60,000 in student activities fees was formulated in a most unsatisfactory way. The Senate, or rather the minimum necessary for a quorum, was bullied by BASIB and misguided by administrative enrollment projections. The revised budget is a pathetic attempt to placate those who scream loudest, without any effort to explore the reasons behind the screaming or the needs of other organizations.

Worse yet is the creation of a fund for the furnishing of Founders with the money which rightfully belongs to the organizations whose budgets have been slashed. Organizations will now have fine furniture to sit upon while deciding how to cut back services to students.

Guilford students must demand more responsible representation in Senate. You will surely be taxed \$66 for Student Activities next year, make sure you are represented in the allocation of this money.

Guilford College and all institutions of higher learning face two choices. They can continue to require each individual to absorb a particular body of scholarship. They can continue to operate on the same unexamined and unproven premises of liberal arts education: that formal education facilitates one's mental development and that required courses broaden one's interests. While proclaiming these benefits, they can continue, in effect, to prepare people primarily for graduate school, teaching, or other careers in the academy.

Colleges have another option, however. They possess an accumulation of capital, information, intelligent people, and ideas. They can allow the student to draw upon these tremendous resources in the manner -- scholarly or otherwise -- which best meets his needs. Each individual should be able to pursue his interests through any combination of formal courses, independent studies, and nonacademic activity off campus. We point out that one develops and uses his mind just as much in nonacademic pursuits: business, social work, journalism, etc. Furthermore, the proof of broadened interests lies not in taking required courses, but in what one does after taking them. The student who completes a fine arts requirement but never again goes to a play or museum has not broadened his interests.

Guilford's internship program, scheduled to begin next year, may provide one way for the student to shape his education to his needs. We hope the program is a precedent, not a token; we also hope it is not ruined by bureaucracy or insufficient funding.

Beyond that, we hope Guilford will give the individual student more control over the whole of the education which is nominally his, and for which he spends four years of his time and 12,000 dollars of his parents' money.

## Letters to the Editor

### Tenure System

Dear Editor:

One of the aspects of academic life at Guilford which deserves more attention is the tenure system. There are several inconsistencies in this system which need re-evaluation. Whatever the official position of the College is on this issue, there is a professor who was seemingly asked to leave an administrative post because of incompetence in this position, but was retained as a professor because of the tenure system. This shuffling and rearranging may suit the needs of the tenure committee, but it does not necessarily represent the best interests of the students.

Guilford College has the reputation of being a good school, providing quality education, and employing competent and qualified professors. This reputation could easily become tarnished because of instances like the one previously mentioned.

I am asking the promotion and tenure committee to reassess its procedures and values. Continuation of the present procedures could result in a lowering of the currently excellent teaching standards, thereby reducing the overall quality and effectiveness of a Guilford college education. I would like to offer some possible solution to this problem: 1) greater student input through the "parallel" tenure committee and open solicitation of student opinion on those professors in question. 2) Demand that each professor provide a syllabus at the beginning of each course. 3) Place more emphasis on the teacher evaluation surveys, especially the portion dealing

with the question of whether or not the course has followed the proposed syllabus. 4) Incorporate a more flexible tenure plan allowing the cancellation of contracts in cases of incompetence or unsatisfactory performance.

Margaret Murphy

### Maintenance

To the Editor:

In the April 15th edition of the *Guilfordian* an article was published concerned with College maintenance services. In that article, reporter Hiratsuka suggested that at least some community residents question the integrity of College maintenance personnel. This allegation, not substantiated in the article, prompted the maintenance staff to request an investigation by the Administration of the College. While the investigation is not complete, the College wishes to indicate that it has found no evidence to date to suggest dishonesty on the part of maintenance employees. In fact, many of these individuals have worked for the College for years and have exemplary personnel records. The Administration wishes to endorse the integrity of these employees and to express regret for any embarrassment which the *Guilfordian* article may have caused them or their families. The College will continue to review the adequacy and efficiency of its maintenance and repairs program, and I would be pleased to interview any person with concerns about this area of the college service.

Bruce B. Stewart  
Assistant to the President

### THE GUILFORDIAN

Editor.....	David Green
News Editor.....	Jon Hiratsuka
Managing Editor.....	Bob Johnson
Sports Editor.....	Pat Townsend
Photography.....	Steve Causey, Tommy Le
Staff.....	Leslie Zeldin, Lucy Swan, Susie Rice, Angela Lantz, Steve Mathis, David Scott, Tabv Gearhart, Sara Dalcher, Charles Thibaut, Annette Green

The *Guilfordian* is published weekly except for examination periods and vacations. The *Guilfordian* is not an official publication of Guilford College, and the opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors and editors.

This is the last *Guilfordian* of the school year. We have worked hard and are very proud of the *Guilfordian*. We have viewed the *Guilfordian* as a forum for community concerns limited only by the community's willingness to participate. There has been so much to do and so few to do it.

We would like to thank those who, by their encouragement, criticism, and concern, have made the *Guilfordian* less impossible.

### Biology Majors Protest

Dear Editor,

A few weeks ago, several other biology majors and I learned that, true to rumor, Dr. Jams Parker was not having his contract renewed.

It seems that there were a few people on the evaluating committee who had had Dr. Parker for Cell Biology 113 and had received mediocre or bad grades in that course, and decided that they could "get back" at Dr. Parker by working within the committee to recommend that his contract not be renewed. They justified their recommendation by saying that Dr. Parker's lectures were not up to par and that his tests were overly difficult.

First of all, these persons on the committee, (all nonbiology majors), were ill-advised to take Cell Biology. Contrary to the fact that it is the lowest numbered biology course offered, it is by no means an introductory course, and is usually taken by biology majors after they have had other biology courses in addition to chemistry. It soon became apparent that these non-biology majors were not in a crib-course, and were not going to be hand fed by Dr. Parker in lecture, so at the end of the course they severely downgraded him on the evaluation and worked within the committee to have him dismissed. They succeeded for a variety of reasons -- none of which should be condoned by a Quaker institution like Guilford.

One of the things which the committee was to do was to conduct interviews with students who had taken Dr. Parker's courses. Dr. Parker provided the committee with a list of students which he thought were either "for" or "against" his method of teaching. It was later discovered that some of the interviews were conducted by phone, which is not a recommended procedure. Also during an open interview, the members on the committee panel accepted, it seems with pleasure, the comments from students who disliked Dr. Parker's method of teaching, while totally ignoring the comments of those students who supported Dr. Parker. So it appears that the committee had already decided on the "verdict" before the interview was even begun. Furthermore, no effort was made to talk with biology

Cont. on Page 7