

3-19-1971

## Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, March 19, 1971

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_trustees\\_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_trustees_minutes)



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

(1971). Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, March 19, 1971. .  
[https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_trustees\\_minutes/21](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_trustees_minutes/21)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Board of Trustees Minutes by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact [library-corescholar@wright.edu](mailto:library-corescholar@wright.edu).

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING  
MARCH 19, 1971

---

**ROLL CALL**

The Board of Trustees met on Friday, March 19, 1971 in the Lower Hearth Lounge, University Center, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Oelman, at 9:30 a.m. The Secretary called to roll:

Present were Edgar E. Hardy, Harry P. Jeffrey, John E. Keto, George W. Lucas, Richard O. Michael, and Robert S. Oelman. Harry K. Crowl, Michael M. Liskany, and David L. Rike were absent.

---

**PROOF OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

The Secretary reported that the meeting had been properly called by written notification and that a quorum was present.

---

**DISPOSITION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Mr. Jeffrey moved to approve the Minutes of the meeting of January 29, 1971. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael and unanimously adopted.

---

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

The Chairman presented no report.

---

**REPORT OF COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Dr. Hardy reported that the Committee had met on March 12 with Dr. Andrew P. Spiegel, Vice President *and* Provost, and Mr. O. Edward Pollock, Vice President *and* Director of Student Services. As

a result of that meeting the Committee was prepared to report on five items of business.

### **Program Leading to the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Arts Degrees in Science and Engineering**

The Committee recommended approval, in principle, of the Program Leading to the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Arts Degrees in Science and Engineering, as distributed at the January 29 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

It suggested that a number of editorial changes be made, some of which had been carried out since the document was first submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee. The Committee especially recommended careful definition of some of the general terms in the broad sense in which they have been and are meant to be used in the document—especially the term “research,” which is not used only in the narrow sense of scientific research.

The Committee also expressed the strong feeling that the value of the computer and information sciences, as a common basis and vital tool for all the programs recommended, should be stressed. The Committee stated that, while it did not want to dictate to the faculty, it was suggesting that the University examine the value of requiring competency in these fields as a pre- or co-requisite for these programs.

The Committee expressed wholehearted approval of the interdisciplinary aspects of the program. It requested, in the light of the experimental nature of the suggested new program, that implementation be reviewed at regular intervals. Results should be reported to the Board of Trustees no later than two years from the initiation of the program.

There had been considerable discussion in the Committee concerning the need for fair evaluation of students over the entire graduate span, based on total work accomplishments rather than on single or specific subject examinations. After discussion it was the Committee’s feeling that this program endeavors to meet this need.

President Golding reminded the Board that this will be Wright State University’s first Doctoral program. However, because of funding problems it may not be possible to implement the program if and when approved by the Board of Regents.

Dr. Hardy moved to accept the Committee recommendation. The motion was seconded by Dr. Keto and unanimously adopted.

### **Program in Environmental Health Leading to the Bachelor of Science Degree**

The Academic Affairs Committee recommended approval in principle of the Bachelor of Science Program in Environmental Health.

Dr. Hardy said that the Committee understands that this program is a highly specific one, aimed at undergraduate training for the field

of public health and for study of the effect of the environment on the individual citizen.

Some concern was expressed, in Committee discussion, that events in the environmental field will move so quickly that an experimental program will require a considerable number of new interdisciplinary courses. These will have to be developed and updated at all times with the everchanging requirements in this field. The Committee endorsed the valuable experimental approach suggested to fill this urgent need for training in Ohio. It recommended that the Board be informed about the implementation and success of the proposed program no later than one year after initiation.

The Committee stated that it understood that federal funding is being sought for this program and that implementation will not be possible in the near future, even though the need is great, unless federal funding can be obtained.

Dr. Hardy moved to accept the Committee recommendations. The motion was seconded by Dr. Keto and unanimously adopted.

### Policy for Faculty Leaves

After careful study of the following Policy for Faculty Leaves, recommended by the Academic Council of the University, the Academic Affairs Committee recommended approval. However, it pointed out that the program is subject to funding limitations and that only a limited amount of funds can and should be made available each year.

## POLICY FOR FACULTY LEAVES

### Academic Leave With Pay

#### *Purpose*

The purpose of an academic leave is to advance the professional competence of the member of the faculty and to enhance his contribution to the University as a teacher and scholar. The academic leave is a privilege gained by service to the University.

#### *Programs*

Wright State University offers two plans to its faculty for academic leaves with pay. Plan I supports the faculty member for one quarter at full salary or two quarters at half salary. Plan II supports the faculty member for two quarters at full salary or three quarters at two-thirds salary.

These alternatives are made available because the purposes of the academic leaves differ and thus the length of time necessary should be variable.

#### *Eligibility*

Academic leaves are granted only for programs of study, creative activity, research, travel and other professional undertakings of importance to both individual and University. All leave proposals that demonstrate the potential of improving the faculty member's knowledge or ability will be considered. Academic leaves ordinarily may not be used to work toward a terminal degree.

To be eligible for Plan I an applicant must have four academic years of

(fully-affiliated) service (three quarters, or two trimesters, within each twelve-month period) as a faculty member at Wright State University, and one-half of that time must have been at the rank of assistant professor or above. To be eligible for Plan II an applicant must have six academic years of (fully-affiliated) service as a faculty member at Wright State University, and one-half of that time must have been at the rank of assistant professor or above.

#### *Evaluation*

The faculty member desiring an academic leave with pay must submit a statement of his program to his departmental chairman by October 15 of the year preceding his leave.

Suitability of leave proposals as defined by the criteria of eligibility shall be determined by the divisional faculty. The order in which leaves will take effect will then be established by the Dean of the division, with major consideration based on seniority, rank, and time since the last leave in that order, consistent with the budgetary and staffing requirements of the division and the University. Recommendations on leave requests will be made by the Provost and Academic Deans to the President. Approved leaves will be funded as a separate University budget item.

If the budget is not adequate to fund all recommended leaves some will be postponed. Postponed leave proposals will be funded before new ones. During the period of postponement, the applicant will be expected to submit any significant modification in his proposal.

Upon termination of an academic leave, the recipient is required to serve the University for one academic year. By the end of the first quarter after his return he must submit a report of his activities to the divisional faculty.

#### *Basic and Fringe Benefits*

The total salary received by a faculty member during the period of an academic leave may not exceed the regular basic contracted salary for the same period of time. All basic and fringe benefits which are provided by Wright State University shall remain current and in force throughout an academic leave, except that any fringe benefit provided by another source during this period of leave shall release Wright State University from the obligation of providing the similar benefit.

#### **Leaves Without Pay**

Wright State University recognizes that frequently faculty will desire a leave but cannot be considered for an academic leave with pay. Typical reasons for leaves without pay would be pregnancy, convalescence, a visiting professorship at another university, a limited assignment with a governmental agency, private foundation, corporation or similar agency, time to work toward an advanced degree, etc.

#### *Eligibility*

Any faculty member at the rank of assistant professor or above is eligible for a leave without pay. This in no way precludes the right of the administration to grant a leave without pay to a petitioning instructor.

#### *Evaluation*

The faculty member desiring a leave without pay must submit a leave request for the approval of his Departmental Chairman or Dean at the earliest possible moment. All approved leave requests will be granted contingent upon the department being able to accommodate its program to the vacancy created.

#### *Basic and Fringe Benefits*

Because the faculty member is not fully affiliated with the University during

his leave, the University is not obligated to provide basic or fringe benefits for this period. When he returns all previously-accrued tenure will contribute toward any future basic or fringe benefits.

President Golding expressed his pleasure that this policy for faculty leaves has been proposed for adoption only four years after the opening of the University.

Mr. Michael said that in his view the justification of the proposal lies in the value which will accrue to the University from research and other activities of the faculty while they are on leave.

Dr. Hardy moved to accept the Committee recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeffrey and unanimously adopted.

### **Due Process Mechanism for Faculty**

The Academic Affairs Committee reported that it had kept in close contact with faculty members for some time concerning their interest in the so-called Due Process Mechanism. The Committee recommended that the Board take cognizance of the following document of January 19, 1971, approved by the Academic Council. The Committee feels that this document is satisfactory, subject to approval by the President of the University. However since it is an internal procedure in line with previously-approved policy, no final Board action is required.

## **DUE PROCESS MECHANISM FOR FACULTY**

### **Preamble**

The Faculty and Administration of Wright State University agree that this Due Process Mechanism provides an orderly method to secure prompt and equitable disposition of complaints. We agree to use the procedures in good faith whereby an atmosphere of mutual respect will exist for each other.

### **Introduction**

The procedures presented in this statement are not to be considered a replacement for the generally-accepted mechanism of administrative review. Faculty members are encouraged to discuss issues with appropriate administrative representatives at all levels.

These procedures are not applicable in cases involving the removal or suspension of tenured faculty or in cases concerning the nonreappointment of nontenured faculty when violations of academic freedom or proper notification are alleged. Procedures applicable to these circumstances are presently described, in sections seven and eight respectively, of the document "Policy and Procedures for the Granting of Promotion and Tenure at Wright State University."

These procedures are not applicable in cases involving only salary disagreements.

The procedures are presented as a mechanism which would allow for the resolution of areas of disagreement with the least disruption to the University.

### **A. DEFINITIONS**

1. The term "complaint" shall be interpreted to mean an allegation by one or more faculty members that there has been a violation, misinterpretation or misapplication of policies or procedures affecting the conditions of his or their

employment or that such policies or procedures are opposed to the stated aims and goals of the University.

2. The term "complainant" will stand for the faculty member or members initiating a complaint.

3. The term "administration" stands for the Dean or Provost at division or University level, respectively.

4. The term "hearing board" stands for, at the University level, a five-member committee appointed by the Faculty Affairs Committee from the tenured faculty. At the division level, a three-member hearing board will be appointed by either: a) an appropriate elected divisional committee, or b) the University Faculty Affairs Committee, the method of selection to be determined by the divisional faculty. At both the University and division levels, a standing hearing board shall be appointed each year and shall serve until the new board is appointed. The complainant and the administration may peremptorily challenge the presence of one member of a hearing board. Replacements, if necessary, will be selected in a manner agreed upon by the complainant, the administration, and the remaining members of the hearing board. Hearing boards shall elect their own chairman. The hearing board shall have the authority to dismiss nuisance cases following deliberation.

## **B. STATEMENT OF BASIC PRINCIPLES**

1. Every faculty member or group of faculty shall have the right to present complaints in accordance with the procedures described herein. These procedures in no way preclude the faculty member or group from seeking resolution through administrative review.

2. Publicity should be avoided during the processing of a complaint and the parties shall avoid infringement upon the rights of third parties.

3. No one who participates in these procedures shall be subject to discipline or reprisal because of such participation.

4. Administrators have the responsibility to consider and take action promptly, within authority delegated to them, on recommendations presented to them.

5. The failure of an administrator at any level to act and communicate his decision within the prescribed time limits permits the faculty member to proceed to the next stage.

6. There are two levels at which a complaint may be pursued, (1) divisional, and (2) University. The normal procedure is to attempt to resolve the problem first at level 1, and then at level 2. However, when the complaint originates at an administrative level higher than the division, the faculty member shall start the procedure at that level.

7. At each level every effort shall be made to resolve the problem by discussion.

8. To insure that the rights of the complainant and of the University are protected, neither party will ever be denied the right to have counsel present. The complainant may have a faculty advisor present in lieu of counsel.

9. During the exercise of this procedure, full pay shall be continued up to the termination of the complainant's contract.

## **C. THE DUE PROCESS MECHANISM**

The procedure will consist of two phases, in the following order: 1) Discussion, and 2) a hearing.

### *1. Discussion*

The complainant forwards to the administration a written description of the complaint, stipulating: 1) The grounds constituting the complaint as defined

in paragraph A; 2) the remedy requested; and 3) that this complaint is submitted pursuant to the Due Process Mechanism. The complainant and the administration will meet to discuss the problem and to attempt to reach an acceptable solution. This discussion is informal and may not later be used as evidence. The administration shall communicate its decision in writing to the complainant within five business days of the completion of discussion.

## *2. A Hearing*

If the aggrieved is dissatisfied with the administrative decisions at the divisional or University level and he is convinced that further discussion will be fruitless, a request for a complaint hearing may be filed with the administration within five business days. A hearing may be requested at either the divisional or University level but in no case can the complainant request more than one hearing on a specific complaint.

In case a hearing is requested, all parties have the right to present and to examine witnesses and to cross-examine witnesses. The complainant has the right to either an open or closed hearing upon his request; but a majority of the hearing board may close any part of the hearing in which it appears that the evidence to be presented will adversely affect the personal reputation of third parties, or if it becomes difficult to protect the integrity of the proceedings.

The principle of confrontation of witnesses and examination of evidence shall apply throughout the hearing. In this regard all parties should submit the names of first witnesses to be called; a summary of their expected testimony and a description of any other evidence to be presented. This information shall be made available to all parties at least ten days before the scheduled hearing. The minutes of the hearing shall be kept by the board. The board will deliberate promptly and send its recommendations and the minutes of the hearing to both the administration and the complainant simultaneously within sixty calendar days from the date the request for a hearing was filed. The administration shall communicate its decision to the complainant within ten business days of receipt of the board's recommendations.

## *3. Continuation of Procedure*

If the complainant is dissatisfied with the divisional administration decision following a hearing, he may request continuation at the University level by initiating phase 1 (discussion) with the Provost. An appeal of the administration decision to the University hearing board may follow in accordance with paragraph 2 above but if a divisional hearing has already been held, the University hearing board shall not be required to conduct another.

The administration decision rendered after receipt of the recommendations of the University hearing board terminates this procedure.

## *4. Qualifications*

If the complainant and the administration at any level agree that it is in the best interests of the University to insure that a complaint should not proceed beyond that level, and if it is determined that the authority to deal with the matter lies at that level, then they may agree to have the hearing board serve as a board of binding arbitration.

If the administration and the complainant agree, then the above procedures may be altered to fit certain unusual circumstances.

Mr. Michael commented that the document has been improved and permits a fair hearing of grievances, with final decision-making authority vested in the President of the University.

### Article VI of the Code of Regulations and Charter of the Appeals Board

The Academic Affairs Committee reported that it had received a revised draft of Article VI of the Wright State University Code of Regulations and a Charter of the Appeals Board for this suggested judicial procedure. The Committee stated that it had not had sufficient time to study this document and that it believed that the document should be studied by other members of the Board. It therefore recommended distribution of the document to the Board members, which was carried out, and it requested that the document be referred back to the Academic Affairs Committee for further study.

Dr. Hardy thanked the members of the University staff who had assisted the Committee in preparing the preceding reports to the Board.

## REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

### Promotions and Tenure

President Golding presented, with his endorsement, the following list of the recommendations of the University Promotions and Tenure Committee, which, he reported, had previously been approved by the Board by a mail ballot. All promotions and grants of tenure will be effective with the beginning of the Fall Quarter, 1971 unless otherwise indicated.

#### *From Instructor to Assistant Professor*

Harold D. Alleman	(Psychology) 9-1-70
Harold A. Allen	(Mathematics) 1-5-71
Henry B. Andrews, Jr.	(Education) 1-5-71
Carl V. Benner	(Education) 12-1-70
Anthony P. Blozinski	(Mathematics) 9-1-70
Varon Campbell	(Education) 9-1-70
John W. Ellison	(Library Administration)
Diane E. Frey	(Education) 9-1-70
Aloysius S. Gasior	(English) 1-5-71
Gilbert R. Hutchcraft	(Education) 9-1-70
Kimmerly H. Kiser	(Art)
Kanti C. Kotecha	(Political Science) 1-5-71
Andrew J. Kuntzman	(Biology) 9-1-70
Patricia H. Olds	(Music)
Donald E. Richards	(Education)
Alphonso L. Smith	(Mathematics)
Barbara A. Sperling	(Education) 9-1-70
Richard J. Van Steenkiste	(Geography) 9-1-70
Byron S. Weng	(Political Science)
John A. Zamonski	(English) 9-1-70

#### *From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor*

Robert D. Earl	(Education)
----------------	-------------

Rand B. Evans	(Psychology)
Barabara R. Foster	(Music)
James J. Gleason	(English)
James E. Larkins	(Modern Languages)
Marc E. Low	(Mathematics)
Gerald E. Meike	(Mathematics)
Paul D. Pushkar	(Geology)
Ronald G. Smith	(Psychology)
Allan B. Spetter	(History)
Thomas R. Whissen	(English)

*From Associate Professor to Professor*

Prem P. Batra	(Biological Sciences)
Robert Dolphin, Jr.	(Finance)
Krishan K. Gorowara	(Mathematics)
Shigeru I. Honda	(Biological Sciences)
David Sachs	(Mathematics)

*Appointment with Tenure*

Robert L. Clark	(Education)
Francis J. Jankowski	(Engineering)
Robert J. Kegerreis	(Marketing)
John S. Martin	(Physics)
Paul McStallworth	(History)
Reed M. Smith	(Political Science)
Robert J. Wade, Jr.	(Business)
Thomas H. Wetmore	(English)

Dr. Keto moved to confirm the results of the mail ballot approving grants of promotion and tenure. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael and unanimously adopted.

### **Governor's Budget of March 15, 1971 and Its Implications**

President Golding reported that he and Mr. Oelman attended, with other university presidents and trustees, a meeting with the Governor on March 13 in Columbus, Ohio. They were informed that the Governor's recommendations to the legislature will include three items of particular importance to Wright State University.

First, the Governor will recommend a freeze on university enrollments at the present level of full time equivalent enrollment. This action may have the effect of forcing more students into two-year community or technical colleges. President Golding said that he would favor a temporary freeze on enrollment but that the action should be made effective Fall, 1972 because many schools, including Wright State, have already admitted many students for Fall, 1971.

Second, the Governor recommends no major change in subsidy figures from the State, except at lower levels where he recommends an increase in subsidy from \$471 to \$540 for General Studies full-time-equivalent students. President Golding remarked that this may have the effect of permitting reduction in size of larger lower-division undergraduate courses.

Third, the Ohio Plan provides for a repayment of all or part of the State subsidy after a student graduates. President Golding stated that this could have a disastrous effect on graduate education in Ohio unless other states adopt similar legislation. Mr. Oelman commented that this could represent a change in the Ohio concept of making low-cost higher education available to all qualified youth.

President Golding reported that the 1970-71 budget for instruction is \$11,000,000 and that budget requests for 1971-72 are at the \$17,000,000 level. Because he will not know the level of State support for several months, it will be difficult to forecast salary increments or to prepare final budgets for next year in the immediate future.

### **Fees, 1971-72**

President Golding reported that it is inevitable that Wright State University will have to increase substantially both the Instructional and General fees, beginning in the Fall Quarter, 1971.

He said that the 1970-71 budget for Student Services includes expenditures of \$507,268 in excess of income from General fees and other income. This constitutes a serious invasion of operating funds, and two steps will be taken to bring Student Service expenses in line with income. First, an attempt will be made to reallocate those portions of Student Service expenses which are legitimately attributable to the Instructional program—for example, the Registrar's Office should be allocated to both Student Service and Instructional programs. Second, we should increase our General fees to a more realistic level. At \$20.00 per quarter, we currently have one of the lowest General fees in the State system. Even if we raised this fee to \$50.00 it would not cover our Student Service expenses as they are presently allocated.

The President reported that the level of Instructional fees presents a different problem because of the uncertainty of the amount of State subsidy to be appropriated by the legislature. We do not have sufficient income to implement the new programs planned at Wright State. He said he had announced to the faculty that salary increases will be postponed until such time as he could better measure the level of State support.

He said that at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees he will propose a new fee schedule, to take effect in the Fall Quarter of 1971.

### **New Dean: Division of Liberal Arts**

President Golding reported that Dr. Eugene B. Cantelupe has been selected as the new Dean of the Division of Liberal Arts and is expected to assume his new position on or before August 1.

Dr. Cantelupe received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Buffalo, a Master of Fine Arts degree from the State

University of Iowa, and a Doctor of Philosophy degree from Washington University. In addition he has performed postdoctoral studies at the University of London.

He has had teaching experience in both English and Humanities at numerous colleges and universities as well as administrative experience as a Department Chairman, Director of Graduate Admissions, and Associate Dean of the College. Since 1969 he has been the Dean of Humanities at C. W. Post College.

President Golding said he anticipates significant further development of the Division of Liberal Arts under the direction of Dr. Cantelupe and he looks forward to his arrival this summer.

### Confirmation of Faculty and Staff Appointments and Administrative Changes

President Golding reported that since the last meeting of the Board of Trustees he had made the following nine faculty and staff appointments and administrative changes, which he recommended for confirmation by the Board.

BLACK, JUDITH E., has been relieved of her duties as Assistant to the Registrar, Registrar's Office, effective January 1, 1971 (Ref. Exec. Memo 69-8, 9-2-69).

BUKALSKI, PETER J., has been appointed Acting Assistant Director of the University Library, for Instructional Services with the rank of Assistant Professor of Library Administration, vice Mrs. Gladys C. Wessels, effective February 1, 1971 (Ref. Exec. Memo 70-4, 4-1-70).

DUKE, GARY L., has been appointed Programmer/Analyst for Student Services in Computer Projects Developments, Administrative Computer Services, effective February 15, 1971.

EMANUEL, MARCIA, is appointed Director of Advisers, University Division, effective March 1, 1971.

LOWE, DAVID C., is appointed Psychometrist, University Testing Service, effective March 1, 1971.

O'BRIEN, MARY PATRICIA, has been appointed Administrative Assistant to the President, effective January 2, 1971.

SPIRK, JAMES C., has been relieved of his duties as Assistant Director of Personnel Administration for Classified Employees, Department of Personnel Administration, and has been appointed Staff Assistant to the Director of Personnel Administration, effective February 23, 1971 (Ref. Exec. Memo 70-4, 4-1-70).

WADDELL, MILDRED H., has been appointed Administrative Assistant to the Vice President *and* Business Manager and Treasurer, effective January 2, 1971.

WIGGINS, RODNEY L., has been appointed Special Supervisor for Development, Executive Offices, effective January 5, 1971.

Mr. Jeffrey moved to confirm the nine appointments and administrative changes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Hardy and unanimously approved.

### Sewer Easement for R. J. Peebles Builders, Inc.

Mr. White reported that the R. J. Peebles Builders Inc., has requested a sewer easement across the northwest corner of the

campus and along a portion of the northern boundary to the campus for the purpose of constructing a sewer line to service an area immediately adjacent to the southwestern edge of the campus.

Because the installation of this proposed sewer line will facilitate the development of property adjacent to the campus and the construction of multiple housing on that property, he suggested that granting the easement would be in the best interest of the University.

Since the granting of the easement will be a relatively complicated matter due to multiple ownership by the State of Ohio, the University, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Dayton Power and Light Company, he recommended that the Board authorize him to take such steps as may be necessary to have the requested easement granted to R. J. Peebles Builders, Inc., as requested, and that final action be subject to ratification by the Board at a later date.

Mr. Michael asked whether it would be possible for the University to tap into the sewer line. Mr. White said it would be.

Mr. Oelman asked whether any of the wooded area of the campus would be damaged by the sewer line. Mr. White said the better areas of woods would not be damaged.

Mr. Jeffrey moved to authorize the Vice President *and* Business Manager and Treasurer to take such steps as may be necessary to grant the requested sewer easement to the R. J. Peebles Builders, Inc., subject to final ratification by the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded by Dr. Keto. The Chairman requested a roll call vote. The motion was adopted by the following vote: Dr. Hardy, aye; Mr. Jeffrey, aye; Dr. Keto, aye; Mr. Lucas, aye; Mr. Michael, aye; Mr. Oelman, aye.

### Ratification of Research Contracts and Grants

Mr. White reported that since the last meeting of the Board of Trustees the University entered into two expansion research contracts through the Office of Research Development. He recommended ratification of the following contracts:

#### *Project #105 – Expansion of a Restricted Government Research Contract*

Title: "Research on Mechanisms of Thermal and Oxidative Degradation of High Temperature Aromatic-Heterocyclic Polymers"  
 Duration: July 7, 1970 through August 31, 1971  
 Sponsor: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base – Aeronautical Systems Division  
 Supervisor: Dr. Robert T. Conley  
 Amount: Total \$27,715  
           Sponsor 27,715  
           W.S.U. – –

#### *Project #156 – Expansion and Extension of a Restricted Government Research Contract*

Title: "Research on Human Performance During Exposure to Combined Environments" "Physiological Measurements"

Duration: May 11, 1970 through May 10, 1973  
Sponsor: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base — Aeronautical Systems Division  
Supervisor: Dr. Malcolm L. Ritchie  
Amount: Total \$28,500  
Sponsor 28,500  
W.S.U. — —

Dr. Hardy moved to ratify the two contracts. The motion was seconded by Dr. Keto. The Chairman requested a roll call vote. The motion was adopted by the following vote: Dr. Hardy, aye; Mr. Jeffrey, aye; Dr. Keto, aye; Mr. Lucas, aye; Mr. Michael, aye; Mr. Oelman, aye.

### Acceptance of Gifts and Donations

Mr. White reported that since the last meeting of the Board of Trustees the University received the following six gifts and donations, which he recommended that the Board formally accept:

1. From the Frigidaire Company, twelve refrigerator shells, valued at approximately \$600, to the Psychology Department;
2. from Miss Lindalee W. Brownstein, Staff Assistant in Communications, books on education, to the Bolinga Black Cultural Resources Center;
3. from Mr. Paul G. Merriam, Instructor in History, history books, to the Bolinga Center;
4. from Dr. A. K. M. Islam, Associate Professor of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, books on anthropology, to the Bolinga Center;
5. from the Newman Club, \$20.00 for the purchase of books, to the Bolinga Center;
6. from the Womens' Auxiliary of the Miami Valley Chapter Society of Optometrists, \$200.00 to be used for the purchase of a tape recorder and other equipment to help blind students at Wright State.

Mr. Jeffrey moved to accept the listed gifts and donations. The motion was seconded by Dr. Keto. The Chairman requested a roll call vote. The motion was adopted by the following vote: Dr. Hardy, aye; Mr. Jeffrey, aye; Dr. Keto, aye; Mr. Lucas, aye; Mr. Michael, aye; Mr. Oelman, aye.

### Acceptance of Deeds of Land for the Western Ohio Branch Campus

Mr. White reported that at the January 29, 1971 meeting of the Board he was authorized to accept deeds and easements from the Western Ohio Educational Foundation to the University Board of Trustees, for the purpose of starting construction of the Western Ohio Branch Campus, subject to future ratification by the Board.

He said that the warranty deed for four parcels, including a utility easement, was transferred to the Wright State University Board of Trustees on February 18, 1971. He recommended the ratification or the acceptance of this deed by the Board.

President Golding reported that a tentative date, April 7, 1971, has been set for groundbreaking ceremonies at Celina, Ohio.

Mr. Jeffrey moved to ratify the acceptance by the Vice President

*and* Business Manager and Treasurer of the deed as transferred to the Wright State University Board of Trustees on February 18, 1971. The motion was seconded by Dr. Keto. The Chairman requested a roll call vote. The motion was adopted by the following vote: Dr. Hardy, aye; Mr. Jeffrey, aye; Dr. Keto, aye; Mr. Lucas, aye; Mr. Michael, aye; Mr. Oelman, aye.

---

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business brought before the Board.

---

#### NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Oelman reported that the date of the next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Thursday, May 27, 1971. He also announced an alternate date, May 20, 1971.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

---

Robert S. Oelman, Chairman  
(signed)

ATTEST:

---

Charles W. Ingler, Secretary  
(signed)