

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Regular Assembly Meeting, December 17, 1973

ATTENDANCE Present: Allen, Anton, Bishop, Buning, Caldwell, Cassidy, Cohen, Colburn, Cooperrider, Danielson, Ehrenkreutz, Evaldson, Floyd, Gikas, Harrison, Heller, Higgins, Hoffman, Hymans, Ilie, Jameson, Johnson, Kaplan, Kell, Kelsey, Kish, Holbrook, Lagler, Lloyd, Loomis, Magrill, Mohler, Nystuen, Oberman, Ostrand, Paul, Rowe, Sana, Sawyer, Seligson, Springer, Falls, Terwilliger, Williams, Wilson, Zweifler, Kincaid, Goodman

Absent: Berki, Brockway, Brown, Cartwright, Darvas, Dernberger, Farrand, Adams, Berkove, Creeth, Kerr, Krachenberg, Lands, Larkin, Lehmann, Kline, Schmickel, Sibley, Taylor, Vander, Vaughn, Hildebrandt

Guests: Dr. Raymond Kahn and Associate Dean Charles Morris

CALL TO ORDER Chairman Goodman called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheater.

MINUTES APPROVED The minutes of the November 19 meeting were approved as distributed.

Chairman Goodman announced that the faculty research program on university governance, approved in principle by the Assembly as part of the report of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities chaired by Professor Reed, was about to come into existence. Dr. Merrill Flood, who had spent ten years on campus at an earlier date, had agreed to come and serve as director for the next three years. We were very fortunate in securing his services. It was expected that his appointment and the establishment of the program would be formally approved by the Regents at their December meeting. [This has since taken place.]

REPORT FROM CESF: PROFESSOR JOHNSON The next item on the agenda was a report by Professor Harold Johnson, the chairman of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, on proposals for early retirement.

At the start of the meeting, Professor Johnson had distributed copies of a set of retirement policy recommendations prepared by CESF; in his talk, he ran through this document, adding brief commentaries.

Part I of the recommendations dealt with medical and life insurance coverage for retirees, and involved lowering the age of eligibility for these benefits from 60 to 55, with some broadening of benefits.

Part II of the recommendations was quite complicated, and was intended to increase the options available to faculty members by making retirement at ages 62, 63, or 64 an attractive possibility. To this end, provisions for splitting the furlough year, for a paid single life annuity contract to provide income at age 64 ranging between 55 percent and 75 percent of the faculty member's final salary, and University payment of 15 percent of the faculty member's final salary into a regular annuity contract were included. Professor Johnson predicted that adoption of this proposal would result in a significant further decrease of the average retirement age, which had already dropped about one year following the previous liberalization of furlough arrangements.

Part III of the recommendations provided for a comprehensive review of any new arrangements that were adopted after a period of five years, and Part IV proposed a program of pre-retirement counselling specifically designed for faculty members.

Part V of the recommendations, dealing with the mandatory retirement age, expressed CESF's feeling that the present mandatory age of 70 should be retained. Part VI was intended to make part-time employment of faculty members after retirement easier than under the present arrangement, which requires express action by the Board of Regents in each case. CESF felt strongly that retiring faculty members should be encouraged to continue their involvement with the University.

Following his review of the recommendations, Professor Johnson said that the Committee and the administrative officers were going to meet with the Regents at their coming meeting to present their proposals and gauge the Regents' feelings on these questions.

Chairman Goodman opened Professor Johnson's report for discussion, stressing that comments as well as questions were desired.

Professor Emeritus Norman Nelson asked whether there was not a difference in health insurance coverage after retirement. Vice-President Allan Smith replied that premiums were fully paid by the University except for Part B of Medicare. The University would like to pay these costs also, but had not yet found a way of doing so under the present federal provisions. (This constituted an obstacle to acceptance of one of the CESF recommendations.) Professor Nelson added that Major Medical coverage had been reduced to \$10,000 in his case. Professor Johnson and Vice-President Smith said that they could not verify this point from their own recollections, but that the information should be available from the Staff Benefits Office.

Chairman Goodman asked whether the Regents were likely to take action on these questions at their January meeting, pointing out that there would be no Assembly meeting in the interim. He added that CESF was faced with a massive problem of communication, in that it was not operating in a formal bargaining mode, and yet was supposed to be representing faculty interest.

Vice-President Smith said that he could respond with regard to the timetable. After the coming discussion with the Regents, he hoped that the administrative officers and CESF could draft a definitive recommendation that they could feel sure would be accepted by the Regents. While he had originally hoped that this might be done by the January Regents' meeting, he now felt that so much work would be required that the recommendation would not be ready before the February or perhaps the March meeting.

Professor Cohen asked whether there was any provision for taking pro rata retirement furloughs if a sabbatical had occurred in the last few years of a retiree's service. When Professor Johnson and Vice-President Smith said that there was no such provision, Professor Cohen expressed his strong opinion that there should be one. Next, remarking that with luck he would retire with 50 years of service, Professor Cohen asked why the early retirement benefit schedule on the last page of the CESF recommendations stopped at 30 years. Professor Johnson replied that CESF thought that 75 percent was a reasonable upper limit for the benefit.

Professor Cohen then remarked that when Professor Johnson had presented the same material to the Literary College, several faculty members had viewed with horror any reduction of the mandatory retirement age. Some had said that the high retirement age was a factor in their coming to and remaining at Michigan rather than going elsewhere. He felt that this intensity of feeling should be recognized. Vice-President Smith replied that there are those who believe with equal intensity that the retirement age must be reduced if Michigan is to retain its current high academic standing. He added that no proposal had been advanced in the direction of lowering the mandatory retirement age that did not provide for a significant period (at least 10 to 12 years) of adjustment to a new arrangement. He didn't think that the age of compulsory retirement was a major factor in the thinking of faculty members under 50. However, he saw merit in both sides of the argument.

Vice-President Smith went on to say that some of CESF's basic objectives were universally applauded. Split furloughs, already used occasionally, should be amplified and extended. They would permit a form of phased retirement that was far more beneficial for both the faculty member and the University than the abrupt cutoff that is now apt to occur. Encouraging retirement at age 62 of those who were so inclined was also a worthy objective. However, he thought that the proposal for an extra retirement year at 55 to 75 percent pay went too far, and that putting it forward might jeopardize the concept of the retirement furlough itself. He was also somewhat bothered by the proposal for continued insurance benefits for faculty members retiring at 55 after five or more years of service. This might tempt other universities to make high salary offers to some faculty members in this age class, on the theory that Michigan would be paying for their fringe benefits.

Professor Nelson remarked that nothing had been said so far about inflation. He gave a few examples of its impact, and remarked that insurance companies, labor unions, and others were gearing benefits to the cost of living. Professor Johnson replied that the newest Social Security amendments peg their future benefits to the cost of living. Also, CREF was supposed to have advantages in this direction.

Professor Ehrenkreutz objected to the way in which the lives of retirees were being described, saying that he was looking forward to retirement as an opportunity to do some work that he hadn't been able to get to.

Professor Colburn said that he would like an explanation of how the failure to lower the retirement age would hurt the University. He remarked that as an undergraduate at Illinois Wesleyan, some of his best professors had been retirees from the University of Illinois. He also asked that someone who held the position that the mandatory retirement age must be lowered in order to keep Michigan's current academic standing (the position alluded to by Vice-President Smith as one which received strong support by many) defend that point of view. Chairman Goodman asked if anyone wished to speak to that point. There was no response except one general reference to the notion that it would be a move designed to get rid of "dead wood."

Professor Anton asked whether implementing the recommendations on early retirement would cost a lot of money or only a little. Professor Johnson said that it would depend on how many faculty members participated. CESF thought the plan would become self-supporting, but the administration disagreed. Mr. Forsyth said that there were many variables and it was hard to predict net effects; the maximum cost was about \$100,000 a year. There was hope of breaking even. Professor Anton asked Professor Johnson for his reactions to Vice-President Smith's criticisms. Professor Johnson said that there was a need for greater turnover between ages 62 and 70, and that CESF wanted to achieve this by providing incentives rather than by lowering the mandatory retirement age. The split furlough and paid single annuity contract are the kinds of options that would serve to induce faculty to retire early. Further, such a program, would pay for itself if enough persons took advantage of it. Professor Loomis said that a 62-year old faculty member would have the privilege of continuing interesting work, and also of receiving good retirement benefits.

Professor Cooperrider asked whether they were proposing an extension of the terminal furlough to two and a half years. Professor Johnson replied that this was not so. The 65th year would simply be the first year of the regular annuity. Also, only a person retiring at age 62 or age 63 would get extra furlough time. But part of the principle was that the annuity after 65 should not be reduced.

Professor Cohen asked for further clarification, and Vice-President Smith replied that he had overstated his case a little, but that under the proposal the University would buy an annuity for 55 to 75 percent of the faculty member's salary for a full year period, and would also contribute 15 percent of the pre-retirement salary for three years in order to maintain the regular annuity payments starting at age 65. He repeated his opinion that advancing such a proposal could jeopardize the existing retirement furlough. He emphasized that he was in favor of getting the eligibility for a retirement furlough down to age 62; his objections were to some of the further sweetening provisions.

Professor Seligson observed that as a person who had lived through one really disastrous inflation, she felt that people were very uncertain of what the future might hold in that direction, and would consequently be very cautious about retiring earlier than necessary.

HENRY  
RUSSEL  
AWARD;  
PROPOSALS  
ON  
ELIGIBILITY

Chairman Goodman brought the discussion to a close, saying that it was necessary to move on to the next agenda item if the Assembly was to get through its business. He reminded the Assembly that the Henry Russel Award Committee had made some recommendations for broadening the class of faculty members eligible for the Award. Professor Kish had expressed reservations about the proposed changes, and consequently the whole matter had been postponed until this meeting, when it could be taken up as a regular agenda item. He invited Professor Theodore Buttrey, ~~the~~ <sup>former</sup> chairman of the Committee, to speak, but Professor Buttrey said he would rather respond to questions. Professor Kish, the president of the Research Club, had already indicated a desire to speak, and Chairman Goodman invited him to come forward.

PROFESSOR  
KISH

Professor Kish said that the council of the Research Club had discussed this matter, and had asked him to express their views. He began by saying that the Russel Award had had a long history, having been presented for a period of 48 years, with 49 awards having been given. He presented a table showing that of these awards, 12 had been to persons in the Social Sciences, 11 to Humanities, 11 to Natural Sciences, 13 to the Health Sciences, and 2 to Engineering. He claimed that this was a good balance, and that the award should not be split in two and given by fields as the proposal called for. There was no objection to modifying the six years in rank limitation by adding the words "at the University of Michigan". However, there were strong objections to the recommendation to raise the upper age limit to 50. Professor Kish said that the original bequest that set up the award carried no qualification, and was simply meant to increase the income of deserving faculty members. However, strong traditions had become established since, and the letter to the committee selecting the recipient now includes the phrase "best promise of a distinguished career". Professor Kish maintained that raising the age limit to 50 would change the whole spirit of the award, and would indeed change the nature of it to a consolation prize to one not chosen for the Henry Russel Lectureship.

PROFESSOR  
BUTTREY

Professor Buttrey responded, saying that the Committee did not regard their recommendations as life or death matters. However, they had been worried by the small numbers of nominees. Their third recommendation had merely been intended to remove an ambiguity in the definition of eligibility. As for their fourth recommendation, involving division of the award by categories, he felt that Professor Kish's figures could be interpreted in more than one way and moreover that the imbalance had been noted during the past dozen years or so and was not fully reflected in figures for the entire period. However, the real point was the Committee's feeling that they were being forced to give the award to faculty members in hard sciences because differences in academic life style made it hard for faculty members in other disciplines to enter the competition effectively. The recommendation for raising the age limit came from the nature of the current and future staff situation. The figures showed that only a third of the nominally eligible population was actually eligible, and that the situation would get worse in future. As for Professor Kish's last point, perhaps it was time for the award to start serving a different purpose.

In response to a question from Professor Caldwell, Professor Buttrey said that the nominees for this year were well spread across fields, and their quality was high. In response to a question from Professor Cooper-ridger about the adequacy of the publicity, Professor Buttrey said that the notices were sent to all department chairmen and heads of units.

Professor Oberman said that if the purpose of the award was to encourage young faculty members, raising the age limit would destroy it. If it was to reward superior performance, it was competing with the Distinguished Service Awards.

MOTION  
PASSED

Dr. Falls, with a second from Professor Kish, moved that the first Committee recommendation (that the age limit should be lifted to 50) should not be approved. The motion was passed by a voice vote.

MOTION  
PASSED

Professor Kish moved (with a second from Professor Kaplan) that the words "at the University of Michigan" should be added to the phrase "provided that if the person is a professor, he shall not have been in the professorial ranks more than six years" appearing in the present definition of eligibility. This motion was also passed by a voice vote.

Professor Kish then moved, with a second from Professor Lagler, that a single award should be made annually as in the past.

Professor Buttrey pointed out that the money available for the award had grown in recent years, so that two awards could be made without reducing the amount of the award unduly. Professor Cohen opposed the motion, saying that past history was not a sufficient guide, that Engineering and Health Sciences really belonged with Natural Sciences, that comparison of accomplishments in sharply different areas was of doubtful validity, and that the earlier-flowering characteristic of persons in some fields gave them an undue advantage.

MOTION  
PASSED

The motion was put to a vote and passed with 25 votes in favor to 13 against.

Chairman Goodman now introduced Professor Raymond Kahn, Chairman of a subcommittee of University Council, and Professor Charles Morris, Chairman of the University Council, to talk about the IACP Survey of Police and Security needs.

IACP REPORT:  
PROFESSOR  
KAHN

Professor Kahn gave a quick summary of the report, presenting a number of slides taken from pages of the report. These included tables showing sharp increases in crime, both on the campus and in the surrounding city and county. He reviewed the findings in the report about the lack of clear lines of authority in security matters, lack of University personnel and poor coordination between them and the Ann Arbor police, diversion of Ann Arbor police assigned to the University unit to non-University calls (not compensated for by diversions in the opposite direction), and general dissatisfaction felt on campus with respect to security. The University Council felt these findings were valuable as a basis for decision-making.

Professor Kahn said that the IACP had recommended that the University Department of Safety should be put in charge of all security on campus, and should have a campus police force reporting to it. The report also made two alternative recommendations: one of these was to continue the present arrangements but improve them in a number of ways; the other was to phase out the Burns Agency, and replace its people with University personnel. The University Council had met and given tentative approval to the last of these alternatives. Although they recognized the force of the report's arguments for a separate campus police force, they were faced with the fiscal reality that it would take \$700,000 in additional money that was not readily available. Also, it would take considerable time to set up. However, the Council recommended the implementation of many of the subsidiary recommendations included in the report.

Professor Kahn closed with a personal word about the need for improved security.

PROFESSOR  
MORRIS

Professor Morris reiterated a number of Professor Kahn's points. He said that the recommendation for a separate police force tended to divert attention from 32 other recommendations included in the report that should be implemented. These included better recruiting and training of security personnel and much clearer definition of lines of authority. The Council was inclined to move cautiously, and some were skeptical of our ability to influence the operation of the Ann Arbor Police Force.

Chairman Goodman pointed out that the hour was too late for extensive discussion, and invited Assembly members to communicate their questions and comments directly to the University Council.

Professor Anton said he was struck by the intensity of the presentation, which conveyed the severity of the problem. He asked for evidence for or against the assumption that the campus security problem was the same as the city's problem. Professor Colburn, who is a member of the City Council, said that the mayor had a copy of the report, although he had been unable to reach him for his comments preceding the Assembly meeting. He was sure that something reasonable could be worked out between the city and the University to improve the situation.

NOMINATIONS  
FROM SACUA

Chairman Goodman presented six SACUA nominations to fill committee vacancies, as follows:

Proper Role Committee - 2-year term, Joseph Ullman,  
Professor of Mathematics (to succeed Dr. Greenbaum)

Student Relations Committee - remainder of current year,  
David Mow, Ass't. Professor of Physiology (replacing  
Dr. Saul Harrison)

Office of Student Services Policy Board - 4-month term,  
John Powers, Ass't. Professor of Dentistry (replacing  
John Kolars); 16-month term, Phyllis Ocker, Ass't. Prof.  
of Physical Education (replacing Frances Weber)

Board of Directors, University Cellar - 3-year term,  
David Kopplin, Ass't. Professor of Psychology  
(replacing Vern Terpstra)

Program Evaluation Committee - present to June 1974,  
Robert Taylor, Professor of Chemistry (replacing  
John Crecine)

All the nominations were accepted by the Assembly in a single unanimous vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Wilfred M. Kincaid  
Secretary