

# HEW report indicts University

By GINNY BENTZ  
Collegian Junior Reporter

A federal report released yesterday indicates the University's actions to eliminate discrimination have not adequately met its obligations to employ women and minorities.

The report resulted from a recent six-month review of University employment practices by a team of compliance specialists from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The review was a result of a complaint filed by the Women's Equity Action League against the University charging sex discrimination in employment practices under Executive Order 11246, which forbids federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

HEW requires a written plan of affirmative action efforts by the University to recruit women and minorities for faculty and staff positions. A plan developed voluntarily by the

University in 1971 was found deficient in several areas, the report said, although it showed a firm policy of non-discrimination has been established.

HEW delivered the report on Oct. 18 and the University administration has been reviewing it for 30 days before responding to HEW and releasing it to the public.

The report said the University lacked an effective centralized mechanism for checking on possible discrimination in employment practices.

In answer to this, University President John W. Oswald said a full-time Affirmative Action Office staffed by an officer, a specialist and a clerical assistant is being established to make sure efforts at equal opportunity employment are carried out.

The office will report to the University provost and be considered staff of the Assistant Vice President for Personnel Administration, Oswald said. The HEW report recommended the affirmative

action officer be responsible only to the President so the officer's position could acquire the status necessary to influence hiring decisions by academic department heads.

The HEW report criticized affirmative action policies on maternal leave for faculty and staff women and the employment of two members of the same family. It recommended a clear statement of policy to insure that women are not penalized if they require time away from work because of childbirth, and explained when simultaneous employment of two family members is discouraged, the woman is usually the one denied employment.

Oswald agreed to include the recommended University policies on maternal leave and simultaneous employment of two family members in the affirmative action plan.

The report said the University lacked realistic goals and means of relating to women and minorities in certain major

academic departments as well as semi-professional, skilled and semi-skilled areas of other departments.

Minorities still are not represented in University job positions in proportion to their national availability, although there has been an annual percentage increase in minority employment since 1968, according to the report.

The report said an overall deficiency in women employed still exists at the University despite the percentage of women with doctorates in these fields.

"It appears that (the University) has made attempts to correct the apparent salary inequities of its male vs. female faculty," the report said. However, it also cited a number of apparent salary inequities among the University's faculty which range from minor to substantial differences in pay.

"As a result of this review," Oswald said, "new procedures to insure equity in salary structure have been instituted."

The HEW report recommended the University make efforts to include women on University committees, especially those vital to the interests of women. It also recommended that a task force including women faculty be assigned to conduct a review of personnel policies and practices of all departments to determine inequities in faculty employment.

The task force's analysis comparing women and men should include but not be limited to an evaluation of salaries, tenure, utilization, appointment to committees, placements and rates of advancement.

Oswald said a Committee of Personnel Representatives including a large number of women has been active in the University's affirmative action program, and a sub-committee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Faculty Senate will advise the provost and the Affirmative Action Office

Oswald said. "The University now has developed a grievance procedure ready to be put into use as the occasion arises."

The report said sound grievance procedures to deal with complaints of discrimination are necessary to show good faith effort on the part of the employer.

Oswald said the University is establishing a procedure of staff vacancy announcement which will provide the University community with knowledge of job positions as they become available.

Employment procedures to provide concrete evidence of efforts to recruit qualified women and minorities for faculty appointment are being established at the University, Oswald said.

"This University is committed to a good faith compliance," Oswald said, "not from duress but from concurrence with the underlying principles of justice and equity which motivate both the University and HEW."

## Keddie files \$70,000 tenure suit

By RICK NELSON  
Collegian Junior Reporter

Wells Keddie, the controversial former Penn State faculty member, filed suit yesterday asking to be granted tenure at the University and damages of \$70,000.

The suit, filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, asks that the procedure used in the denial of tenure to Keddie be declared in violation of Keddie's First and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

The breakdown of the damages includes: \$10,000 for damages and loss of salary, \$10,000 for injury to reputation, embarrassment, humiliation and mental and emotional distress, and \$50,000 for exemplary and punitive damages. He also asks the University to pay the cost of the suit.

The suit names as defendants The University, University President John W. Oswald, Dean of the College of the Liberal Arts Stanley F. Paulson and five John Does, the members of the ad hoc faculty committee that denied tenure to Keddie in June, 1971 whose names are unknown to Keddie.

Keddie, after six years at the



University as an assistant professor of labor studies, was denied tenure by the ad hoc committee in spite of a recommendation from his department that his tenure be renewed and a high evaluation of his teaching by students.

The suit states that during his em-

ployment at the University, Keddie "performed with a degree of professional competence sufficient to qualify him for a tenured position."

Keddie, who is presently teaching at Livingston College of Rutgers University, called his tenure denial a "political firing...an attempt to silence and immobilize critics of the status quo in this University."

The suit points out that while at Penn State Keddie took part in activities such as demonstrations and strikes and that he was "vocal in his expressions of opinion with respect to such activities, and his expressions were often critical" of University administrators.

Also cited in the suit are Keddie's efforts to persuade faculty members to form a union to initiate collective bargaining with the University.

The suit also mentions Keddie's attempts to learn the reasons for his tenure denial and offers as evidence a request from Keddie to Paulson asking for this information.

Aside from asking damages, the suit charges the defendants with conspiracy and breach of contract. The suit charges that the defendants conspired to

"deprive the plaintiff of the equal protection under the laws" and charges that they used "information and reports in a preconceived determination to punish the plaintiff for his political, educational and union activities."

The charge of breach of contract stems from "policies of the defendant" (the University) that state "the provisional period of service prior to the attainment of academic tenure is seven years" after which "the faculty member shall have permanent tenure."

The suit continues the University "wrongfully terminated (Keddie's) employment after the plaintiff had received promises of academic tenure from previous employment and had also completed more than the requisites of seven years" at the University.

Keddie said of the suit, "I am pleased that it has come up," but added he did not know how long it would be until it came up in court.

Fred Speaker, Keddie's lawyer, said he did not like to comment on cases in progress. He did say that after the suit was served the University would have 20 days to respond and added that it could be a long time before it came up in court.



Photo by Jon Fortuna

Night of light.

## D & D resumes ticketing activity in spite of legality challenges

By BOB YUSKAVAGE  
Collegian Senior Reporter

D and D Parking Lot Security Company, shut down since June by a court injunction and tentatively reopened by company owner Dean Wagner last month, is definitely back in business but with its legality challenged.

Jeffrey Ernico, special deputy attorney general of the state Bureau of Consumer Protection, who last spring handled the case against D and D, said that so long as D and D operates in compliance with the injunction its business is legal.

However, Ralph Kim (7th-architectural engineering) told The Daily Collegian he paid Dean Wagner \$3 for a parking lot violation last night. Kim said Wagner informed him and another person in the office a \$15 fine from the district magistrate's office awaited them if the fine were not paid.

The injunction issued June 19 by Commonwealth Court Judge Genevieve Blatt, however, specifically orders D and D to stop collecting fines. All parking violation fines by law are to be collected through the district magistrate's office.

State College District Magistrate Clifford H. Yorks last night was unavailable for comment. The notice placed on Kim's car stated no amount to

be paid, no place to pay nor that a summons from the district magistrate would be received.

D and D's address, however, is printed on the bottom of the notice. Kim said he went to D and D's office because he did not feel he deserved the fine. While there Wagner told him he could pay the \$3 fine, Kim said.

Stephen Rosenfeld, Organization of Town Independent Students president, said he has testimony from three people who have paid the D and D fine. "It's my inclination that this is very, very close to an injunction violation. Things are not as milk and honey (with D and D) as some people thought," he said.

Rosenfeld said he questions the D and D notice because it does not cite section 1021.1 of the Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Code, which deals with parking on private property and said he also questions Wagner's right to negotiate for fine money.

Last week Ernico said the D and D situation "seemed to be legal" since the firm was not violating the injunction. Rosenfeld said he plans to visit Ernico again Monday to further discuss the matter.

"I have an assurance from the state that if D and D is in violation of the cease and desist order it (the state) will stop D and D from operating," Rosenfeld said.

The injunction ordering D and D to stop operating followed a series of complaints last spring against the company by apartment residents in State College whose lots were patrolled by D and D.

Company employees were accused of abusive behavior in their ticketing practices. Several people claimed they were abused by Wagner in his office. D and D patrolled privately owned lots and ticketed illegally parked cars. D and D kept a share of the fines and turned over the rest to the state.

Oct. 12 Wagner mentioned he was going back into business but would not specify the date. At that time Yorks said he would "not accept any cases from D and D until I get a ruling from the attorney general with regard to the injunction."

Last week Yorks told The Collegian he is now honoring D and D's notices since Ernico gave him the okay as long as the particular lot owner has granted Wagner a contract. Wagner now receives a fee from the landlord whose lot his firm patrols.

Neither Wagner nor his attorney Ben Novak, former University student legal adviser, will comment on D and D's status. Robert Wagner, the owner's son, last week confirmed by telephone that D and D is back in business but would not comment further.

## Parkway complexes get the ax

By ELAINE HERSCHER  
Collegian Senior Reporter

The Parkway Plaza Apartments, Westerly Parkway, is the first big State College apartment complex required to lower rents resulting from the present Internal Revenue Service shakedown of local landlords.

Owned by I and A Corporation and controlled by Alex Woskob, owner of several area complexes, most of Parkway's 296 units were subject to rent rebates after the IRS finds of non-compliance with federal price-freeze standards set last August.

Neither the IRS nor the owners would comment either way as to Parkway's compliance, but it was never denied. Apartment owners contacted by The Daily Collegian said they find a distinct parallel between the IRS reports of 380 of

500 units owned by the same landlord ordered to lower rent and their own sudden rent decreases.

The story is the same for all tenants contacted. In late October they were notified by letter, indicating their rent was illegal, several tenants said. "I think it came because of the price freeze he (Woskob) did not adhere to," one renter said, referring to the Phase II program.

After the letter came, an S-38 form, notifying the tenants of a rent change was hand-delivered to each tenant by the I and A secretary. On the form are listed the base rent (the source of the illegality) 2.5 per cent of the base, which is the allowable increase and other incidentals such as maintenance costs and improvements.

Those contacted had decreases of \$10 to \$15 a month originally until all charges were re-computed and the landlord determined he could then raise rents \$6 to \$9, depending on the base.

These increases, as required by law, must be explained by the landlord. If the tenant is not satisfied with the landlord's decision or explanation, he can appeal to the local IRS, 444 E. College Ave. for investigation or clarification.

At the Pittsburgh district IRS, conducting the regional investigation, although complaints are readily ac-

cepted, no one is talking about them. When asked if Parkway Plaza is the complex ordered two weeks ago to mete out \$9,900 in rollbacks to its tenants, IRS officials refused to answer.

"I can't disclose this," an agent said. "That is strictly confidential." He said the disclosure of individual violators or complainants could injure further rollbacks besides inciting retaliatory action from the landlord against the tenant.

One tenant described the affair as "shrouded in secrecy," having been told little by his landlord about the rent cuts. No renter remembered ever seeing a word printed about the IRS.

Woskob's wife, who would not divulge her first name, handled the IRS investigators but refused to comment on their instructions to her. When asked if Parkway Plaza was the cited complex, she said, "It was checked, that's all I can say. That information is not available." When asked why not, she said, "It's not for publishing."

Ms. Woskob said the IRS gave her "nothing but how to arrive at base rents. It was very helpful they did this," she said. She added her rent rates had not changed in four years, that only the base rent was changed. One of the tenants, a University professor, said his rent was raised \$15 last July.

## PSU money vote soon—maybe

By KEN CHESTEK  
Collegian Senior Reporter

Reliable sources in Harrisburg said last night the conference committee discussing Penn State's appropriations bill will report the bill out for a vote today, with Penn State's \$2 million addition intact.

Other sources would not confirm the report, agreeing only the committee probably will report the bill today.

The committee met yesterday after several Senate amendments to the House appropriations bills for Penn State, the University of Pittsburgh, and Temple University were not agreed to by the House.

Among the disagreements were additional funds added by the Senate to the Pitt and Temple bills. Penn State's extra

funds, added in both chambers, also came under fire.

Once reported, the bill will require only passage by both houses before going to Gov. Shapp for his signature.

Passage is expected before the legislature dissolves for good at the end of the month.

The only change in the Penn State bill will be in the so-called Snyder amendment. The original amendment, added in the Senate by Sen. Richard A. Snyder, R-13th, required all three state-related universities to provide the General Assembly with a list of all faculty members that do not teach at least 12 hours a week, and explain why not.

The amendment now will read each university "shall submit an analysis of the weekly workload of faculty members," the sources said.

The main debate centered on the money allocated to Pitt and Temple, the sources said. The Senate amended \$2 million to their totals, but the House did not.

Penn State's extra \$2 million, added in both the House and Senate, remained intact through the debate, the sources said.

Passage of the bills by the legislature will mark the end of a five-month delay in state funds to the University. Since the last appropriations ran out June 30, the University has been running on loans, tuition and other income.

University officials repeatedly have said the debt incurred by the delay changes from day to day and could not guess how large the debt is or how much money will be lost to payment of interest on the loans.

## Hearings called harmful

By RICH GRANT  
Collegian Senior Editor

The effect of the Ritenour hearings has been "to tear down confidence in the student's only source of health care," according to John A. Hargleroad, director of University health services.

"I feel they were detrimental to the health service," Hargleroad told The Daily Collegian. He said the morale of Ritenour's staff and their credibility with students had been threatened.

The Undergraduate Student Government Senate conducted two hearings, public on Nov. 9 and closed on Nov. 16, to gather student suggestions and complaints on campus health services.

The hearings created a stir when articles in The Collegian revealed "stories of mistreatment and abuse," charges by several students of faulty diagnoses and bad treatment.

According to Hargleroad, Ritenour personnel were asked not to attend the hearings because their presence might "intimidate students not to give testimony."

"A handful of people got up and aired complaints which for the most part were differences in interpretation," Hargleroad said. "Most of the complaints were the result of somebody having been told another way of treat-

ment and preferring to go along."

According to the director, a coed, taking medicine for a sore throat, went off the medicine after she read the articles and became worse.

"One student came in and asked Dr. (Genevra) Fleagle if she was a doctor," Hargleroad declared. "The staff feels these were unjustified charges."

Hargleroad claimed students do have methods of registering grievances against the University health service.

"They should talk to the physician they have the grievance with," he said. "There is a suggestion box in the lobby. My door is open for any students who have complaints. There is ample opportunity for them to speak to (Raymond O. Murphy) the vice president of student affairs or (Daniel R. Leasure) the assistant vice president for student services."

He added that complaints could be evaluated by the grievance committee of the Centre County Medical Society.

"The USG doesn't know how to evaluate medical treatment," Hargleroad said. "They've assured me this is not what they wanted."

Hargleroad admitted he has not spoken to USG representatives since before the second hearing. At that time, he said, they promised to send him tapes

of the hearings.

"My disagreement with the hearings is that they have been negative," the director said.

To USG senators involved, the hearings are an example of good intentions leading to an unplanned effect. They say it will work out.

John P. Martonick, hearing committee counsel, said, "Its original goal was to look into possibilities for improvement. It was never intended to attack any doctor. It was never meant to be a witchhunt."

Martonick, sponsor of the USG Senate hearing bill, said future hearings will be closed and Ritenour personnel will be invited to testify at them.

Discounting the idea of the hearing being negative, Martonick said, "You'll have a person come in and say, 'This happened to me and I didn't like it.' Then, about the center as a whole: 'good, needs more doctors, more money.'"

"Our idea was mainly to get student input," USG Senator Richard Hoffman said. "We just wanted suggestions."

He described the hearing testimony at the hearings as a mixture of bad and good views.

"Most of us are just students," Hoffman said. "We are not there to judge on technical things."