

Letter to the Editor**There's something rotten in alternate housing****Dear Editor:**

As present and former members of the German House, we believe that the decision-making process regarding alternate housing for 1980-81 was improper and grossly mishandled by the Housing Office.

The manner in which alternate housing was selected is inconsistent with Guilford's administration policy. Sybille Colby, Dean of The Continuing Center for Off-Campus Education, has told us that it is the custom to take all matters before standing committees and not to create committees for a specific purpose. The committee which made the decisions on alternate housing was created by Bob White, Director of Housing, for the specific purpose of making the alternate housing decisions. It was not in existence previous to this decision and, now that the decision has been made, it is no longer in existence.

We are convinced that the lack of uniform policies of the Housing Office created an inequitable decision. First, White told us after the decision was made that there were flyers printed up which contained the outline for groups to follow when writing their proposal. This was to be picked up by the groups from Audrey Horning in the Housing Office.

We were never informed of the existence of this flyer and, thus, could not have known to pick it up. Because the Housing Office did not inform us of this, we did not have access to this outline when writing our proposal. White has told us that he "would accept total blame" for this occurrence. This is not only an unbusiness-like way to run

things, but also shows a lack of courtesy to the groups interested in alternate housing.

Regarding the decision-making process itself, White stated that while his vote was based on the merits of each proposal, the other members of the twelve-man committee may have "relied on personal bias." Thus, there was no uniform criteria for the selection process.

White has told us that the selection was made on the basis of what was contained in the proposals and not on the past history of the house (if it had previously been in existence). In addition, he stated that past history was not considered part of the proposal. However, we have seen two proposals that were accepted which contained past histories of their houses (George White and the French House). It logically follows that at least these two proposals were judged on the basis of their past history. This evidence completely contradicts what White has told us.

As a member of the committee, who wishes to remain unidentified, said that the committee was not informed of uniform criteria in the selection process. Instead, the source stated, White instructed the members of the committee to pick three women groups and three men's groups. The member stated that she believed that White had already made up his mind about the selections before the proposals reached the committee. She also said that White told her and other members of the committee that he didn't expect the members of a certain group to be able to follow through on their pro-

posal, thus influencing their decision. On the basis of this information, the purpose of having such a committee is diminished.

In addition, Dick Dyer, a member of the decision-making committee, aided a group in preparing their proposal. This group was later awarded a house. This creates a clear conflict of interest, since he voted on a proposal that he helped to write.

The Housing Office has said that because of the large number of proposals submitted this year (the number ranged from 10 to 13), a special process had to be created in order to deal with the overload. White has stated that many problems of the decision-making process stemmed from the large demand for alternate housing. We

On one occasion, White told a member of the German House, "you guys have nothing to worry about." On two separate occasions, he told different members of the German House that he would like to see the Oktoberfest become "an annual tradition at Guilford College."

After being told these things by the man who we were led to believe had the final say in the matter, we felt assured of getting our house back. There was no reason to be aggressive about finding out information which we should have been told.

The reasons why we feel the German House should exist are many. Our general purpose is to promote Germanic culture. We have promoted and participated in many activities this year.

***The Housing Office should have been prepared for the situation they helped create'***

feel the Housing Office had ample time to prepare for the increased interest in alternate housing, which should have been expected.

In February, the Housing Office prominently displayed signs soliciting interest in alternate housing all over campus as never before. Also, they attached a flyer to every student's housing contract asking if he or she was interested in alternate housing. This was not done before this year.

The fact that they were stimulating interest in alternate housing should have alerted them that interest would be greater than ever before. The Housing Office should have been prepared for the situation they helped create.

We have been criticized for not being aggressive enough in finding out how the decision was made before submitting our proposal. We defend our behavior on the basis of the following information. When we saw all of the advertising for alternate housing last February, we went to White and asked him if we should make our proposal the same as last year's. He said that would be fine, but did not inform us of any specific criteria, nor did he tell us how the decision was to be made.

We organized and ran the Oktoberfest during Homecoming weekend, and in February we held a Fasching celebration. In between these two large events, the house, which has included three foreign students raised in Germanic culture, coordinated a foreign language booksale; tutored students taking German; held weekly meals; promoted Guilford's Summer School and Semester Abroad program; have had two open houses and a dinner for members of the language department. We also entertained and aided a visiting student from Germany, and are coordinating the beer for Serendipity.

The language department was told to emphasize to their students the existence and the opportunities available at the German House. Thus, the department and the inhabitants of the house were led to believe that the house would be a lasting entity. This opinion was reinforced when it was discovered that the German House was publicized to prospective students in Admissions Office material.

We feel all existing houses should not enter any competition, but instead should be subject to a yearly evaluation which would take into consider-

ation the performance of the house for the past year. On the basis of this evaluation the house would then either be continued or be opened to competition from any interested group. Since there will be two new alternate houses opened by the lake next fall, the competition between new groups should have been for them only.

Due to the already mentioned discrepancies, we feel the selection process for this year should be redone. A definite policy for selection should be given to all applicants. The selection committee should include faculty members as well as members of the Housing staff in order to reconcile academic interests with housing interests.

There are many members of the community already concerned with the discontinuance of the German House. Petitions declaring support for the German House have been signed by students, members of the Senate, faculty, members of the cafeteria staff, and are still circulating. Those who support our views represent a cross section of the community.

The language department is also supporting us and sent a letter of concern to the Director of Housing this past week. We also expect the matter to be brought up before the Administrative Council and the Curriculum Committee. A committee from the student Senate is now investigating the matter and will report to the full Senate at its next meeting.

Our views expressed in this letter are only a criticism of the selection process, not of any personalities within the Housing Office. The relationship between the Housing Office and the German House this year was amicable and could not have been better.

However, the alternate housing selection process should not provide the Housing Office an opportunity to disregard long standing administrative policy and the Quaker concepts of equity and fairness. Rather, we only want to be sure that those responsible for the decision adhered to proper procedures and clarified these procedures to all concerned.

Sincerely,  
Dennis Granzen  
David Hotchkiss  
Bryan Smith  
Peter Rissi  
Peter Kothe

**Senate investigates housing**

By Roger Lifson  
Staff Writer

On Friday, March 28 Housing Director Bob White, announced the proposals granted for next year's alternate housing. German House was denied their petition. At last Wednesday's Senate meeting, a proposal was submitted to review the denial of the German House proposal. The Senate delayed any immediate action because they felt that only one side of this delicate issue was known.

In answer to the German Houses grievances about the selection process, the Senate formed a committee which was set up to review this matter. Specifically, they were to look into the criteria for the selection of alternate houses, and whether or not the existing policy was used indiscriminately.

Two of the committee's members, Paul Swain and Paul Palumbo, tried to set up a meeting with Bob White. White said he couldn't meet at a future date, so an impromptu meeting was held in his office with half of the committee absent. White explained the procedure of the selection process is handled.

What the committee expects to do is report back to the Senate on their investigation. The committee will probably make recommendations on a new policy recommendation to be drafted by the Senate. They hope to see a policy set up whereby once a proposal had been accepted, it is only reviewed every two years, and is put into competition only if the view is unfavorable.

**Variety marks Dipity concerts**

Continued from page one

Whatever label you choose, you'll find that their music is good, it is distinct and progressive, and it is a genuine pleasure to listen to. The concert, sponsored by the Center for Continuing Education, begins on Sunday afternoon at 1 p.m. outside the CCE building.

Don't miss the Truehearts, a Greensboro hard rock-new wave band that is guaranteed to rock your socks off! The concert will be outside Bryan Hall (Dana if rain) on Friday night at 8:00 p.m. The concert is sponsored by the **Guilfordian**.



We feel all existing houses should not enter any competition, but instead should be subject to a yearly evaluation, which would take into consideration the performance of the house for the past year.