

EDITORIAL

Letters to the Editor

Can I state this reader's total incredulity with Mackenzie McDermott's (31st January) article in your current issue, in the writer's over-the-top negativity towards African-American Democrat State Senator Maria Chapelle-Nadal's wholly apposite idea that this state's parental schoolchildren and their families should be obligated to have any guns they possess legally registered? The whole world-wide shocking tragedy at Connecticut was facilitated by the harsh fact that members of the NRA will intentionally, nay, even shamefully, not face is that the killer had access to so much "legal" ammunition inside his slaughtered mom's house in the first place. So much so, that even strong adult teachers themselves killed by a weapon shooting several bullets a second, could not physically overpower him and prevent him from strewing his assault weapon's contents into the bodies of little six year old children and themselves.

The analogy McDermott attempts to raise, civil liberties alleged menacingly, against Chapelle-Nadal's wise and sage measure, that it is "invasively" on a parallel with the Bush junior initiated and, needlessly Obama costly persisted, airport and AMTRAK TSA record-swiping won't pass muster. The TSA is an overblown gesture to this country's television-fanned paranoia about the abstraction labeled "global terrorism." It, however, seriously swallows up money that could be used to properly improve the excellently rigorous US regular Customs service and add to its Republican cuts reduced numbers, so that it could deal with real home-grown extremist right-wing religious terrorism and still, largely unchecked US merchant marine port stationed shipping.

All, by contrast, Chapelle-Nadal seeks to do is give regular police forces, Missouri and teacher staff the entirely sanely added protection, so there be sufficient school and police knowledge enabling them to prevent relatively unknown gun parented kids leaving open their arsenals to disturbed adolescents, like the Connecticut mentally deranged killer of the little children at Sandy Hook Elementary School. No confiscation is arbitrarily sought of parents effectively denying their emotionally distraught children/teenagers or, even in Kansas tots, access to this sickening supply of weapons. And, frankly, it's bizarre that Mackenzie seems to, in 2013, feel that a gun is somehow part of a person's "privacy," akin, almost, one has to feel, to a man or a woman's real private appendages.

Finally, one has to wonder at the lack of editorial and journalistic balance. Sure, McDermott's views should be aired. But where is the old "centrist" Index balance of either a refutatory article in the next column or somewhere in the same issue or thereafter? Or, heavens, at least, one liberal feminist columnist among you who might refute the Republican state legislator who wants "elementary to TSU level instructors" to have "complete" classroom legality to bring arms into any classroom, and students too, for that over-escalation matter additionally?

Larry Iles
Kirksville resident

The Thursday, January 31st edition of Truman's student newspaper, The Index, ran an article about the Joint Committee on Education's work on a higher education funding formula. Although the University's Vice President of Administration, Finance and Planning, Dave Rector, expressed concerns about the formula's possible impact on Truman, the article is not an accurate reflection of Truman's official position on either the proposed formula or the work of the Joint Committee on Education and its Executive Director, Dr. Stacey Preis. As we understand it, the article contained some inaccuracies, and no representative from the committee was contacted for comment.

Truman has the utmost respect for how Senator David Pearce, Representative Mike Lair, Dr. Preis and the entire committee have followed a deliberative and inclusive process with the goal of doing what is in the best interest of Missouri and public higher education. As we understand it, the committee will release simulations of a proposed formula on Monday, February 4th. After we have a chance to look at the simulation of that formula, we will provide more substantive feedback to the committee.

We understand this is a process, and I apologize to both the committee and Dr. Preis if this article gave the impression Truman does not respect that process or the hard work of the committee and its staff. Although we are passionate about our mission and our role in Missouri's higher education landscape, we also possess the deepest respect for our elected officials and their service to the public good.

Troy Paino
Truman State President

Betty L. McLane-Iles
Truman State French professor

Corrections

Last week's "Funding formula presented" story on page one incorrectly stated that Stacey Preis created the proposed funding plan. The plan was submitted to the Joint Committee on Higher Education by Preis, House Research Analysis Rebecca Deneve, Senate Appropriations Analyst Trevor Foley, House Budget Director Mike Price and Senate Research Analyst Michael Ruff.

Last week's "Funding formula presented" story on page one incorrectly stated that Truman State could lose \$4 to 5 million.

Last week's "Funding formula presented" story on page one incorrectly stated that with the proposed plan, 90 percent of funding would be based off factors including credit hours

collectively taken, but it will be based off of completed weighted student credit hours.

Last week's "Funding formula presented" story on page one incorrectly stated that a performance-based funding plan was developed about a year ago by the Missouri Department of Higher Education and not put into effect. The performance-based funding plan was developed by the Higher Education Performance Funding task force and was approved by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education during April. The first year the plan could potentially be applied is fiscal year 2014.

To submit corrections or to contact the editor, please email index.editor@gmail.com, call us at 660-785-4449 or send a letter to Index, 1200 Barnett Hall, Truman State University, Kirksville, Mo., 63501.

Employers have right to access employees' social media



Adam Rollins


Bosses have the right to creep on Facebook.

Unfortunately, Missouri could soon join a growing number of states with laws prohibiting employers from requiring their employees to give them access to social networking accounts like Twitter and Facebook. Currently floating around the Missouri House of Representatives, the bill designated HB 286 would initiate Missouri into a group with six other states — California, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan and New Jersey — that enacted similar legislation during 2012, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

If this sort of topic is going to be the major social issue of the year, I don't want to live on this planet anymore.

I say this because information posted on social networking sites does not deserve any sort of special protection.

People seem to think when they use social media they can say or show whatever they want as if they are having a private conversation with friends. They post information and pictures of how drunk they were last weekend, whine about how much they hate their boss, confess to cheating, volunteer sensitive medical information, reveal secrets and tell lies. They assume having "privacy settings" classifies any information they upload to these websites and consider it private property.



Cartoon by Megan Archer

But this information is not private. It is viewed by friends, friends of friends, social network employees and advertisers that buy user information. Information stops being private as soon as someone offers it up to be viewed by hundreds of other people.

And yet, when an employer asks to review the Facebook page of a current or potential employee, some employees treat it as an invasion of privacy as though the employer has asked to search that person's car or home.

Nothing on the Internet is private. I might be in the back room of a restaurant or a crowded front room,

but if someone else in the building catches me on film shouting, "The Zune was a terrible product!" you can bet I won't be getting a job at Microsoft.

Social networking sites are not private places. They are not someone's home, office or club. They are public forums and every action creates a permanent digital footprint. In fact, the entire point of social networking is to spread information indiscriminately among potentially millions of other people. This information is public, no matter the intent.

As public information, a boss has a right to view an employee's or employment candidate's social network

account. Employers have as much invested in choosing who to hire as candidates have in getting a job. They are inviting the new employee to join what is essentially a self-contained community, a family with its own values and standards. Employers have a right to know the personality of a candidate before adopting them into the family and risking the wellbeing of their community.

Most companies hold their employees to a certain moral standard. They have codes of ethics and conduct that apply whether the employee is on the job or not. If a company discovered by any legal means other than social networks


that an employee was violating such a code, the employee could be fired, no questions asked. I see no reason why social networks should be any different.

If employees and prospective job candidates don't want their boss to find out what they do in their free time, I suggest they act like responsible adults and not post sensitive information on a website designed to be accessed by millions of people.

Adam Rollins is a sophomore communication major from St. Charles, Mo.

Web Poll

Do you think the outcomes of sporting events are influenced by supernatural powers?



Out of 19 votes.

Editorial Policy

The Index is published Thursdays during the school year by students at Truman State University, Kirksville, MO 63501. The first copy is free, and additional copies cost 50 cents each. The production offices are located in Barnett Hall. We can be reached by phone at 660-785-4449. The Index is a designated public forum, and content of the Index is the responsibility of the Index staff. The editor in chief consults with the staff and adviser but ultimately is responsible for all decisions. Opinions of Index columnists are not necessarily representative of the opinions of the staff or the newspaper. Our View editorials represent the view of the Editorial Board through a majority vote. The Editorial Board consists of the Editor-in-Chief, managing editor, news editor and opinions editor. The Index reserves the right to edit submitted material because of space limitations, repetitive subject matter, libelous content or any other reason the editor in chief deems appropriate. Submitted material includes advertisements and letters to the editor.

Letters Policy

The Index welcomes letters to the editor from the University community. Letters to the editor are due by noon the Monday before publication and become property of the Index. Submissions are subject to editing, must contain a well-developed theme and cannot exceed 500 words except at the discretion of the Editorial Board. Letters containing personal attacks will not be published. All letters to the editor must be typed, double-spaced, signed by at least one individual and include a phone number for verification. They must be submitted by email to index.opinionseditor@gmail.com or on our website at <http://tmn.truman.edu/theindex>. Include the words "letter to the editor" in the subject line of the e-mail. The Index does not publish anonymous letters to the editor. No individual may submit more than one letter a week.

Advertising Policy

For up-to-date information on current rates or to inquire about the availability of classified ads in the Index, contact our advertising department at 785-4319. Our fax number is 785-7601, or you can e-mail us at tsu.indexads@gmail.com.