

# Faculty to help recruitment

*Fike's response* from page 3

Concern over the quantity and quality of student enrollment is always a concern of a small college, and Guilford is no exception. As a first step in a long range policy aimed at improving enrollment at Guilford, the Faculty Admissions Committee is calling on the faculty and perhaps students to play a larger part in the recruiting effort.

The recommended policy takes into consideration the fact that normally 50% or more of the students accepted by colleges, including Guilford, opt

faculty members personally call or write accepted students will prove to be a successful method of differentiating Guilford from the competitors. Studies of population trends indicate that the pool of college age students in the U.S. will be declining until approximately 1990. This will result in tougher competition among colleges for a decreasing supply of good students. Receiving a phone call or a personal letter from a faculty member will provide the student with a special glimpse into the community atmosphere and

who enrolled in the fall of 79 did not return in the fall of 1980. This mark of 20% has been the normal percentage at Guilford in recent years. It is the hope of the committee that the extra communication between the school and prospective students will improve the quality of enrolled students by reducing the percentage of mismatched students and increasing the number of that would be most inclined to remain here for four years.

In addition to the faculty's increased involvement, students may also be called upon the future to take part in this effort. At present, ideas concerning the role students can play in the recruiting process are being discussed by the Admissions committee. According to Ellen O'Brien, a committee member, the Union and campus organizations contact accepted students who have expressed interest in these activities. This could serve the dual purpose of providing the prospective student with a current, active students' view of Guilford while possibly helping to increase the participation of the freshman class in campus organizations.

At present, student involvement in recruiting is limited to a small group of students, volunteering as tour guides.

## 58 of 298 students who enrolled in the fall of 1979 did not return in the fall of 1980

for another school. In hopes of coaxing some of these students away from Duke, Wake Forest, Davidson, and the University of Virginia (Guilford's perennial competitors) this policy has been accepted. Upon acceptance of a student who has expressed interest in a particular field of study, a professor in that department will be notified and asked to contact this student concerning the requirements and options that he/she would encounter at Guilford.

This type of interaction, which will be used this spring, attacks the enrollment problem from two directions. First of all, it is hoped that having

personal approach that the committee thinks represents Guilford College. This will make a stronger impression on a student than the commonly used "Dear Student" letter from other schools.

It is indeed possible that the additional knowledge of Guilford gained by the student through this interaction could lead him/her away from rather than towards Guilford. However, those students who, after receiving more information, decide not to come to Guilford, might well have ended up as transfers after their first year. According to Registrar Floyd Reynolds, 58 to 298 students

## Guilford confronts federal cuts

David Stewart

Part 1

Certainly one of the busiest places on campus this semester has been in the financial aid office, which is directed by Anthony Gurley and Dianne Harrison. Ordinarily, the routine workload they and work study students share would not be news.

However, business ceased on the morning of November 5, 1980. Financial aid offices in almost every educational institution nationwide would soon begin to feel the aftershocks of a proposed federal cutback in funding. Since a considerable number of Guilford students are on financial aid, federal program changes suddenly assume greater significance for many students and parents, as well as schools.

Many will be relieved to know that students here may not experience the trauma of those who enroll in other schools in North Carolina. In the Past, Guilford has been able to keep annual increases in educational costs near the 10% mark. The

1981-82 jump will be around 11.5%, which is below the approximately 15% increase of several institutions statewide. In addition, Guilford will probably slip from being ranked as the third most expensive private school in the Tarheel state to sixth or seventh.

How will Guilford College confront the tight money situation and still provide assistance to needy students? Given the tenuous federal outlay for education, a plan for immediate financial aid packaging can at best seek to minimize the impact of the almost certain reductions.

One recent proposal sent by the Financial Aid Committee to the Retention Committee is: 1) students must maintain a GPA of 1.30 as a freshman and 1.90 thereafter, 2) failure to keep levels of acceptable academic work would make funds available to others.

It is hoped that removal of students who fail to maintain

adequate academic work would make their funds available to those who have.

Consideration about other changes in awarding aid are not final. One proposal is that, in the future, minimum summer savings requirements computed by the needs analysis formula may not be waived as a matter of policy. Also, following the trend established by other institutions, Guilford may choose to begin assessing automobiles of residential students as an additional asset. This means that a student's demonstrated need would be reduced by an amount equal to 10% of the mean Blue Book value of the car. Both policies would not prevent a student from appealing a special circumstance to the Financial Aid Committee.

Be reminded, these are only tentative changes. A bulletin from Washington tomorrow could portend fluctuations in policy for good or ill. Yet such are the exigencies inherent in providing money to meet educational costs for all who want to attend college.

practice a covert nepotism ... Decision making and the solution of problems tends to be indirect and covert." The reader will note that Professor Malino has left out the qualification I attached to the first sentence: "at least to some extent." This deceitful omission makes it nepotistic. Then Professor Malino "constructs" (and I mean just that) the following syllogism:

1) All decisions making at Guilford is covert decision making.

2) Covert nepotism is covert decision making.

3) Therefore, covert nepotism is a kind of decision making at Guilford.

First, under the guise of "eliminating the frills," Professor Malino has further mutilated by alleged remarks by dropping the qualification of "tends" from the second sentence. This, of course, results in an even further oversimplification of my position. Then he proceeds to set up his syllogism by trying to logically relate two statements which were not intended to be logically related. Even here his intention is suspect. Rather than develop the various syllogistic possibilities existing between the two statements, he arbitrarily confines himself to one--one that would have the desired effect of panning me. For the record, I will not deny that I made both statements in substantially the form in which they were quoted by Mr. Gurley; but I made them in two separate contexts.

Professor Malino pulls basically the same stunt in this second syllogistic fabrication. Once more, logically unrelated statements are wrenched out of context and interpreted selectively to prepetrate a fraud. This time my words are manipulated to suggest that I fail to distinguish between nepotism and the hiring of qualified relatives of persons already employed. Is it plausible to assume that because I did not mention the hiring of qualified relatives, I do not distinguish between that practice and nepotism? Isn't it possible to speak of cows without mentioning pigs? It is not unfair at this point to suggest that Professor Malino is rebelling against common sense.

I am also criticized by Professor Malino for failing to support my allegation with evidence. Mr. Gurley and I discussed this matter during the interview, and he left me under the impression that he did not want to mention names and hirings. This is as it should be--not only to prevent needless embarrassment, but more importantly because nothing would come of the nepotism allegations anyway. Credibility at Guilford has little if anything to do with evidence or anything else which smacks of objective rationality. At Guilford, credibility is associated with what Professor Malino has called "collegiality is associated service, and smiling," and most assuredly not in that order. That is to say, credibility is withheld from whomever or whatever denies the fundamental soundness of

the status quo, no matter what the supporting evidence.

Toward the end of his "Open Letter," Professor Malino takes a parting shot:

"But how about the question whether the college should subsidize twin beds for faculty spouses in order to diminish collusion, power politics, and the reproduction of the tendency to spouse hiring, while guaranteeing the right of spouses (only when best qualified, of course) to a job? (I take it this must have been the alchemy of which Professor Fike spoke.)"

I won't hazard a complete interpretation of this passage. Suffice it to say that Professor Malino makes one last sorry attempt to discredit me, this time by trivializing my comment about Guilford subsidizing employee families and by capriciously associating me with the "pillow talk" comments. I note once more the liberties, if not license, Professor Malino allows himself with other persons' words.

I must confess I find it curious that this self-styled champion of impeccable logic and discourse restricts his abuse largely to Professors Fike and McDowell, with secondary jabs at Mr. Shields and the unidentified sources in Mr. Gurley's article. The remarks of President Rogers, Mr. Place, and Professors Burris, Keiser, O'Brien, and Williams are allowed to pass without comment, despite the anomalous character of many of their claims. I will limit myself to two. According to Mr. Place, "there is no policy of hiring spouses currently in effect." (One can only wonder why any of them, let alone so many of them, are employed at Guilford.) President Rogers tells us: "I think that each member of the Guilford faculty is dedicated to operating professionally in such a way that their decisions would not accrue to the well-being of their spouse." Is it a professional obligation to act to the detriment of one another at the work place? These are, of course, cheap shots, and I want to emphasize that I am not making them in earnest; but they are very much in keeping with Professor Malino's ill-treatment of Professor McDowell and myself.

My question, again, is, why doesn't Professor Malino extend his abuse to these men, not to mention the others? I offer this explanation: he is afraid to attack them, for they are in a position to inflict severe deprivations. For reasons I won't go into, an attack on the other persons would be equally troublesome. On the other hand, Professor McDowell and myself, as pariahs, can be assailed without fear of community reprisals; indeed, most of the Guilford community would applaud such an undertaking, as undoubtedly they did. Whatever his motives for limiting the attack, the decision to limit it to two persons certainly casts doubt on the disinterestedness of Professor Malino's intention.

To what can we attribute Professor Malino's bizarre and malevolent actions? Ms. Irving continued on page 7

## Film Series continues

The Guilford PIRG/Energy Awareness Film Series continues with three short Department of Energy films. "Energy Proffing Your Home," a 10 minute short explores the principles and techniques of saving energy and money around the house. It will be shown on Friday, April 17 following the

main feature "Girl Friends."

On Friday, April 24 following "Agatha," a 12 minute DOE film, "Wind: An Alternative Energy," will be shown. The film deals with the historical use of wind for power as well as its modern day applications.

The final film in the series, "Up the Power Curve," will be

shown on Thursday, April 30. This 10 minute film discusses the practicality of energy conservation.

All of the films will be shown at no charge and members of the College Community are invited to attend.