

Oregon Daily Emerald

Monday, November 16, 1987

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 89, Number 53

Inside:

- Streetwise, Page 5
- Cougar defeat, Page 7
- Aussie invasion, Page 9



Photo by Andy Cripe

University President Paul Olum, (left) and State System Executive Vice-Chancellor Bill Lemman, at Friday's state board meeting.

Board poised to oust Olum

By Mike Drummond
Emerald Associate Editor

With more than 500 administrators, faculty and students looking on, the State Board of Higher Education moved one step closer to terminating Paul Olum's presidency in 1989.

After hearing faculty, students and Olum testify to reasons why he should remain until 1992, the board voted 9-1 in favor of scheduling a telephone conference call at 2:30 Wednesday to make its final decision regarding Olum's retirement.

Interrupted by frequent applause and cheers, faculty and student representatives told the board that Olum should be retained because his role remains necessary in the search for a new provost, completion of the Riverfront Research Park, and garnering support for the University's capital campaign project.

Paul Armstrong, English professor and University Senate representative, said forcing Olum into early retirement "would be a mistake because it

would put at risk qualities of this institution."

Peter von Hippel, chairman of the chemistry department and University Assembly representative, told board members "plucking Paul Olum out of this institution at the height of his powers, and in the midst of the carefully orchestrated development of many important activities, would be very disruptive."

In closing, von Hippel suggested "that there must be a State Board equivalent of the physician's Hippocratic oath which states: 'Thou shalt do thy patient no harm.'"

The board, however, remained unmoved by the testimony and offered no rebuttal to the reasons supporting Olum.

However, on Saturday State Board President James Petersen of La Grande hinted that during Wednesday's conference call board members may address the issues cited in the support testimonies. When asked why the board failed to offer rebuttals, Petersen stated that board members had heard all the reasons to keep Olum before.

"We didn't get any new information that we didn't already

know," Petersen said.

Although the board did not respond to the testimonies, during closing statements board member Janet Nelson of Coos Bay said she has philosophical differences with Olum and charged that under his administration the University has devalued undergraduate programs at the expense of emphasizing graduate programs.

"In good conscience, I cannot agree to a date beyond 1989," Nelson said.

However, in an interview on Saturday Nelson declined to elaborate on her remarks.

"It's just a really sensitive situation, and I don't want to make it worse," Nelson said.

Nelson maintained she hasn't been pressured by anyone on the board not to speak, and added that she has already said more than other board members. Nelson also admitted she feels badly about the frustration Olum's retirement has caused students, faculty, administrators, the community and even the board.

Petersen echoed Nelson's opinion that the quality of

Turn to Olum, Page 4

Despite questions, athlete drug testing continues

By Craig Harris
Emerald Sports Reporter

While many student-athletes initially may not have supported Athletic Department voluntary drug testing, two weeks after enactment it appears the policy is being accepted and will remain.

Already the 15 members of the men's basketball team consented to drug testing, and a number of football players likewise consented to drug testing.

But for women student-athletes, support for drug testing is less than enthusiastic. Some believe the policy is unnecessary and unfair, citing undue embarrassment as a key argument for not signing the new consent form. Others believe drug testing should not

be mandated until sanctioned nationally by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Still others, student-athletes and coaches, question how the policy originated and who spearheaded the movement.

The Athletic Department re-enacted drug testing Oct. 30 after undisclosed student-athletes and coaches approached athletic directors and asked if some form of drug testing could be revived.

To ensure the privacy and sense of confidentiality with the Athletic Department, Associate Athletic Director Chris Voelz again declined to release the names of student-athletes.

The Athletic Department initiated mandatory and random drug testing in the fall of 1986, effective until spring 1987. It then placed that policy on hold and requested an Oregon attorney general ruling on the

constitutionality of the policy. Assistant Attorney General Richard Wasserman said no specific release date is set for the opinion.

Two men's coaches, football head coach Rich Brooks and basketball head coach Don Monson, admitted discussing with Voelz the possibilities of a new drug testing policy after talking with players on their respective teams.

Brooks talked to his seniors and class representatives at a time when the Ducks were 4-2 and in contention for post-season play and asked the players to propose a voluntary drug testing policy to other members on the team.

"Coach Brooks asked us to talk to the team," junior class representative Scott Kozak said. "At that time we had a shot for a bowl game and the NCAA would have tested us anyway."

Monson said that he and All-America candidate Anthony Taylor talked about the drug problem that exists in major college athletics.

"I was concerned, and I think some of my players were concerned. Anthony talked to me about volunteering and I asked him to talk to the ball club and whether they wanted to do volunteer testing. The kids held a team meeting, Anthony came back, and the team voted to do drug testing," Monson said.

By consenting, the signee is tested for more than 80 substances banned by the



'I thought it was a good idea and it's not doing anything wrong. By doing this we don't have people worrying about athletes using drugs. It clears things up.'

— Anthony Taylor

NCAA. The signee also accepts the protocol and sanction system.

Taylor said he adamantly supports the policy, but added he did not talk to Voelz personally.

"I thought it was a good idea, and it's not doing anything wrong. By doing this we don't have people worrying about athletes using drugs. It clears things up," Taylor said. "But not everyone that is against it is guilty of taking drugs."

The protocol states athletes must remove clothing from armpit to ankle level and urinate in the direct presence of an observer to prevent cheating.

Some athletes said the protocol causes incredible embarrassment and that the new policy came as a surprise.

"I'm not going to sign the form because the process is

totally humiliating." All-America volleyball candidate Teri Kramer said. "I was certainly surprised that athletes went to Chris (Voelz) and wanted it. I don't know anyone on the team that went forward," Kramer said.

Two women basketball players, Stefanie Kasperski and Jacquie Semeniuk, expressed the same dissent and questions of the origination of the voluntary policy.

"I don't have to prove to anybody that I'm not taking drugs. If the NCAA wants to test then it's OK, and if they (Athletic Department) are testing for suspicion it's OK, but if there is no reason it's wrong," Kasperski said.

"Personally I am not going to do it. I don't feel I have to prove to anyone that I'm not taking

Turn to Testing, Page 4

'I don't feel I have to prove to anyone that I'm not taking drugs. We should be innocent until proven guilty, not guilty until proven innocent.'

— Jacquie Semeniuk

