

**Senate Year End Report
2014-2015
Rodger L. Jackson, President (2013-2015)**

This is the end-of-year report for the sixth year of operations of the Faculty Senate. I want to formally acknowledge the excellent work and dedication of the senators who served this past year. I would also like to thank the Senate Executive Committee for their intelligence, insight, creativity and patience. Whatever success I have had as President has been due largely to their efforts.

The Senate met seven times and the Faculty Assembly met three times (as required by the Stockton Constitution passed in 2008), including a meeting in which the President addressed the Senate on the state of the college. There were also two extraordinary combined meetings of the Faculty Assembly with the Stockton Federation of Teachers. As in the previous year, a snow day cancellation of a meeting and the extensive workload of the Senate meant we were unable to set aside a meeting for a guest speaker, which had been done in prior years.

The following document offers a broad overview of the Senate's activities for AY 2014-2015 rather than a comprehensive account of all the actions taken by the Senate. For example, it only includes those items actually passed by the Senate, although a number of issues, after discussion, were referred back to a standing committee. Interested parties can examine the official minutes of the Senate and the reports of the committees and task forces for a more detailed description of activities this past year.¹ It is also important to note that this document does not provide a final account of the status of the measures it has approved. Sometimes these matters were referred to the Senate from the Provost's Council and would then be referred to the Board of Trustees, and in other cases, they were to proceed from the Senate to the administration.

After an initial chronological listing of Senate activities, I have provided a brief summary of the various undertakings and accomplishments broken down according three general areas:

- A) Policies and Procedures
- B) Standing Committees & Task Forces
- C) Other Senate Activities

Admittedly, there is some overlap in these designations as policies and procedures are frequently the product of joint efforts of the various standing committees of the Senate and the administration. However, some policy proposals are presented to the Senate directly, at which point the Senate will review and take action without referring to a standing

¹ For example, in some cases the Senate approved of a policy as it was originally presented, while in other cases the Senate recommended an alteration, clarifying language, additional requirements, and so on.

committee. Moreover, this year, the Senate charged various standing committees with specialized tasks, somewhat akin to what it does with a task force. Hence, it is conceptually useful to differentiate Senate activities on policies and procedures, regardless of whether a proposal for consideration came through a standing committee or from the work done by said committees on projects charged to them by the Senate at large.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF SENATE ACTIVITIES 2014-2015

1. The Senate created a Task Force on Dual Credit.
2. The Senate determined that the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance shall henceforth interpret its standing charge to include the regular consideration of issues regarding campus accessibility.
3. The Senate commended the administration for its actions in implementing several specific recommendations of the Task Force on Accessibility regarding the priority access gaps and encouraged it to continue addressing these issues with all due speed.
4. The Senate passed a resolution calling for full and substantive participation with the administration in developing an Atlantic City Campus, were such a purchase to take place.
5. The Senate passed a resolution calling for a Task Force composed of faculty and administration to advise the Office of the President in the implementation of any Atlantic City campus.
6. The Senate approved a new process for selecting student speakers at commencement exercises.
7. The Senate approved changes to the Academic Life Cycle Program procedures.
8. The Senate approved the creation of an Ed.D. in Organizational Leadership.
9. The Faculty Assembly, led by the Senate, and the Stockton Federation of Teachers met in two extraordinary sessions to discuss a number of issues stemming from the problems that arose with regard to the Showboat Casino purchase
10. The Senate and the Stockton Federation of Teachers conducted an online referendum to vote on faculty participation on the Board of Trustees as well as to assess the President's conduct.
11. The Senate approved attendance policy revisions and consolidations proposed by the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.
12. The Senate approved of changes to the manner in which faculty were elected to the Academic Honesty Board.
13. The Senate moved to have the Task Force on Dual Credit continue its work into the next year.
14. The Senate approved pilot testing a permission slip for field trips.
15. The Senate recommended that the university adopt a policy of graduate tuition waivers for spouses, partners, and dependent children.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Life Cycle of Academic Programs: This policy is an updating and clarification of the university's procedures for obtaining approval of new academic programs (or programs promoted by level from concentration-minor-certificate-major- baccalaureate-masters-doctoral), as well as for managing programs during their life cycle, and for program closure.

Policy For Selecting Student Speakers For Commencement Exercises: This was the approval of a pilot process for selecting student commencement speakers starting spring 2015 and possibly for all future ceremonies. The intention is to develop a process with clearly defined selection criteria whereby eligible students can apply to represent their class during commencement ceremonies. Past experience indicates that, when asked, some eligible speaker candidates have declined the request to address their class; therefore, a speaker application process would both confirm a student's initiative and willingness to make such an address as well as provide an equitable process for selecting speakers from among qualified applicants. The two students awarded the honor to present a "Student Address" would be represented in the ceremony program book with a brief biography highlighting their accomplishments.

Creation of a Permission Slip For Field Trips: The form that was designed by the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee with Senate input contains the name of the student, the sending faculty member, and the date and time of the field trip, filled in by the sending faculty member to avoid inappropriate usage. Students are to sign their own names and present them to the affected faculty members. The pilot permission slip also specifically indicates the faculty member whose class is being missed has the prerogative not to excuse the absence. The Senate approved a year trial period in which professors would not be required to use it but could as a courtesy to their colleagues.

Alteration and Consolidation of the University Attendance/Graduation Policy: There was only one piece of new information in Policy II-17. The Senate approved the removal of time limits for undergraduate degrees. Such limits had been in the previous policy but had never been put into practice.

Alteration to the Policy Concerning Membership on Academic Honesty Board: There had been concern regarding the manner in which faculty were selected for the Academic Honesty Board. The Academic Honesty Board is not a standing committee of the Senate, and therefore had not historically used the same election cycle or process. There had been no standard means of appointing members to this committee from each school, and no defined term of service. The Senate recommended an alteration to the existing procedures so that the election cycle, election process, and length of service would be the same as those of senate committees.

STANDING COMMITTEES & TASK FORCES

Addition to the Charge of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance:

One of the recommendations of the 2013-2014 Task Force on Accessibility was to construct a means for an ongoing consideration of these issues. Moreover, they concluded that it was important that there be a clearly identified entity to which faculty, students, staff and administrators could turn if they had questions or problems which needed investigation or remediation. The Senate voted to extend the charge of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance to include the regular, ongoing consideration of issues regarding accessibility at Stockton University.

Task Force on Dual Credit: This task force is conducting a detailed investigation into the current status of Stockton University offerings in collaboration with local high schools, whether taught here or at the high schools. Their charge was highly detailed and quite extensive and only a preliminary report could be completed by the May retreat. Given the importance of this matter, the Senate voted to continue the work of the task force into the next year with a requirement to issue a report in December 2015.

Task Force On Atlantic City Campus: As a follow up to a resolution passed earlier in the year (see below), the Senate voted to create a joint Senate/administration Task Force to advise and make recommendations to the Office of the President on issues regarding the establishment of a campus in the former Showboat Casino. The Task Force was co-chaired by the Senate President and the Provost.

Creation of an Ed.D. in Organizational Leadership: The Standing Committee on Academic Programs and Planning voted 13 to 1 (abstention) to recommend the creation of a Doctorate in Organizational Leadership at the University. This new program can draw on an already strong cohort of faculty from across different schools, and meets an identified need for professional development identified through market surveys. Although drawn from professional leadership standards, the program will not culminate in a professional certification. Nor will additional accreditation be sought beyond the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools as the regional accreditation body. It was moved and seconded to use a ballot vote for consideration of the matter. The vote was 20 in favor, 11 against, no abstentions.

OTHER ACTIVITIES BY THE SENATE

Normally, this section of the report details those Senate activities that do not fall neatly into the standard categories outlined above. These have included resolutions praising members of the Stockton community, declarations about political events, and recommendations for the administration to take particular actions on some university matters. Although important, such activities typically do not take up much of the Senate's business.

This past year, however, was unique in Stockton's history. Events connected to the purchase of the Showboat Casino and subsequent attempts to turn it into an island campus, dominated much of the university's energies during 2014-15, including that of the Senate. Hence, this section of the report will be devoted to detailing the Senate's role in what occurred.

At the 2014 fall faculty conference, President Saatkamp announced that he was looking for a property in Atlantic City where the university could establish a branch campus. Although the university already operates some properties in Atlantic City (e.g., the Carnegie Library and the Arts Garage) and leases or manages others (e.g., Dante Hall), the President indicated that he hoped to establish a more substantial presence in the city. These remarks were not unusual; indeed, he had made similar public statements on a number of occasions, although in no prior instances had such initiatives moved forward.

Historically, the President had not sought the input of the Senate or the Faculty Assembly as to any major capital purchases, much less whether establishing a residential campus in Atlantic City would be a good idea. Moreover, there was relatively little information provided in the monthly meetings between President Saatkamp and the President of the Senate as to such potential decisions. Furthermore, what small amounts of information were proffered in said meetings were accompanied by the admonition that it could go no further as any negotiations had to be held in strict confidence. Neither the Senate nor any other members of the faculty governance had any effective, ongoing relationship with any members of the Board of Trustees, so it was unclear to the Senate as to what their views were on any potential such projects. Still, as has been previously noted, the fact that all of previous attempts to secure a large enough building in Atlantic City had failed may have contributed to a general lack of interest on the part of the Senate.

This year, however, as a result of economic downturns, several large properties became available in Atlantic City.² But while the possibility of a purchase increased, the President chose not to substantively consult with either the Senate or the Faculty Assembly, which meant that there were few opportunities for broader communication or discussion about this initiative. Indeed, faculty, staff and students were specifically told they could not be privy to information about this process, as such financial matters required the strictest confidence.

On November 12, 2014 President Saatkamp announced that the university had signed a letter of intent to acquire the Showboat Casino property from Caesars Entertainment Corporation. The announcement noted that Stockton "plans to repurpose the former Showboat site as a branch campus. The transaction is subject to completion of due diligence by the College and the negotiation and execution of a definitive agreement." The

² A number of factors, both economic and political, contributed to the closing of four major Atlantic City casinos, including the Atlantic Club (formerly the Golden Nugget casino and hotel, January 2014); Showboat Casino (August 2014); the Revel (September 2014); and finally Trump Plaza (also September 2014).

President also reiterated that he was unable to provide more details as all parties were bound by a confidentiality agreement.

In response to this news, the Senate Executive Committee decided to raise this issue with the Senate. It crafted a resolution, brought before the Senate on November 18, 2015, which demanded the opportunity for substantive faculty input on the process of implementing this project were it to proceed, as well as on any other future such projects. The Senate deliberated upon the proposed resolution, made some minor modifications, and passed it unanimously. The resulting document was sent to the Offices of the President and the Provost.

In between the November and December Senate meetings, senators worked in small groups, and engaged in a series of email discussions to determine what would be the most effective method of ensuring the full and active faculty participation called for in the November resolution. The consensus was that a task force should be created which would be composed of an equal number of faculty and administrators. This task force would advise and make recommendations to the Office of the President regarding implementation of an Atlantic City campus, if indeed the University went ahead with the purchase of the Showboat property. The details of the Senate's recommendation as well as its rationale for this particular model were carefully laid out in the document "Motion from Stockton Senate Executive Committee Regarding a Joint Task Force on a Potential Atlantic City Campus Dec 9th, 2014," which can be found on the Senate website. The charge for such a task force was amended to include language that explicitly stated that the creation of such a body did not constitute approval of the project.

The Senate Executive Committee further asked the Senate for permission to recruit volunteers for task force membership, if needed. Ordinarily, composing a task force is an activity which would have engaged the full Senate but this would have proved difficult given the likelihood that the task force might have to be mobilized over the winter break. The Senate unanimously approved both the proposed motion and the request to empower the Executive Committee to recruit task force volunteers.

On December 12, 2014, the President announced the purchase of the Showboat casino building. In the subsequent weeks, the Senate Executive Committee put together a slate of faculty who would be willing to serve on the task force if the administration agreed. The President announced in January that he would form three different working groups to advise him in the process of developing what he called the "Island Campus." One of these groups would include a version of what the Senate had envisioned and be called the Academic Affairs Task Force; it was for this group that Senate Executive leadership had recruited faculty members.³ Because Senate Executive leadership had been unaware that two additional task forces were in process until that recruitment had been completed, all faculty members had volunteered for the Academic Affairs Task Force .

³ The other two were the *Task Force on Facilities and Finance* and the *Task Force on Student Affairs*. The final makeup of all three can be found in the University archives.

The faculty had made numerous requests to the Senate to find out the status of the Island Campus. While some faculty expressed interest and even excitement at the prospect of creating an Island Campus, there was also a great deal of uncertainty, insecurity and apprehension. A number of faculty and staff complained that they did not know whether they would be forced to teach at the Showboat against their wishes, whether their entire program would be simply moved out there, whether it would be a branch or a satellite campus, what the timetable would be, what the security arrangements would be, and so on. This uncertainty was exacerbated by the news that the corporation that sold Stockton the building, Caesar's Casino Entertainment, declared bankruptcy in January.

Some of these issues clearly fell within the purview of the University's Stockton Federation of Teachers, and, as such, the Union leadership had been actively seeking answers at every opportunity. Their efforts were stymied by the fact that they too were only minimally consulted as the process moved forward. While the Senate made sure to include an SFT representative on the Academic Affairs Task Force, there were no SFT representatives on the other task forces.

Given the extraordinary circumstances and the paucity of detailed information available to the Stockton community, the Senate Executive Committee asked the President to give his State of the University address earlier in the term than he had done in recent years. The Senate Constitution requires that the President (or the President's representative) speak to the Faculty Assembly at least once a year and provide his or her take on the health and future of the institution. Typically, this occurs midway through the spring semester, but the Senate Executive Committee proposed that President Saatkamp address the Assembly as soon as possible upon the resumption of classes. With this in mind, the Senate, in consultation with the Union, scheduled a presentation by President Saatkamp on the last Tuesday of January, a date normally set aside for Union business. Unfortunately, due to inclement weather the school was closed that day, and his talk was rescheduled to February 17, 2015.

In the interim, people from all areas of the university, including the Academic Affairs Task Force, began work on the many issues involved in transforming the roughly 1.5 million square foot building into a residential campus.⁴ Initially, the Task Force focused on its charge to facilitate communication about the Island Campus to the university community. Various members of the Academic Affairs Task Force attended each of the seven academic school meetings to answer what questions they could, to find out the concerns of the faculty and to solicit suggestions and ideas for what might be tried. Throughout this process, it became clear to members of the Task Force that, just like the faculty, many staff and administrators in all areas and levels of the university felt inadequately informed about the Island Campus project generally and their role, if any, in how the project was to unfold. The Task Force transcribed these school-wide discussions into a master document that

⁴ While the term "residential campus" can have a technical meaning, in the context of this report it only means that the immediate plans included having students live at the Atlantic City site. The exact final designation of the Island Campus, (e.g., "satellite", "branch" "residential") was never fully clear.

identified and highlighted recurring themes in identified opportunities and potential problems, and followed up with a series of online surveys intended to reach those people who had been unable to attend the school meetings or allow those who had commented earlier to register their views in writing. President Saatkamp's state of the university address took place on February 17, where he spoke for roughly 40 minutes, focusing mostly, though not exclusively, on the Island Campus. There were relatively few questions from the audience and the presentation ended earlier than its allotted time.

The next five weeks were marked by an intense amount of activity. All faculty working on the project were, of course, continuing in their normal responsibilities (teaching, scholarship, and service) but also doing their best to come up with answers to the myriad questions entailed by the project. Should the university devise a new meeting module system? What would be the role of advising? How should programs and deans decide who would teach in Atlantic City and who would teach at the main campus? What kind of a shuttle system would be set up between the two campuses? Should there be a minimum age for students living in Atlantic City? What should the classrooms look like? How many computer labs would be needed? How much of the building should be set aside for commercial development and how much should be dedicated to academics? How would accessibility issues be addressed?

The difficulty of resolving these and other related items was exacerbated by a number of factors. While this is by no means an exhaustive list, the following are a few of the inter-related features which made the process more difficult than it might have been and which contributed to the way events played out in March and April.

First, President Saatkamp initially insisted that he wanted the University to begin offering classes in the first summer session, which began in mid-May. This meant an extremely short window for all parties concerned: building crew to create the space, faculty to volunteer to teach there, administration to schedule classes, support staff to make it functional, and so on. Moreover, this tight time frame meant that a more deliberative approach to substantive matters was undercut by the necessity of responding to the exigencies of a summer opening.

Second, the three task forces were largely separate entities with separate memberships and limited lines of communication. Unfortunately, any decision reached by one group was bound to have an enormous impact on issues being considered by the other two groups. Even under normal conditions, there are severe challenges to establishing coherent, ongoing, clear working relationships across divisional lines. The manner in which these three task forces were created (and the subsequent working groups formed from them), and their basic structure, did little to smooth such relationships and often impeded them. A fourth task force composed of the chairpersons of the other three was meant to provide a mechanism for exchanging ideas and questions, but it was largely ineffective.

Third, President Saatkamp exerted near total control, both in terms of the overall design of the new campus and the specific details of its future daily operations. Disagreements about timetables, suggestions to change the name of the Island Campus to a variety of

alternatives, specifications about the design of rooms for particular programs were often dismissed or met with the charge that people were dragging their feet. This resulted in a top-down decision system which limited autonomy and flexibility on the part of the many different working groups.⁵ Moreover, it further exacerbated the concerns on the part of many faculty that the administration had already made most of the major decisions and the attempts by the Academic Affairs Task Force to solicit their input was a smoke screen.

Fourth, the ongoing sense of uncertainty, insecurity, and bewilderment was frequently exacerbated by a lack of consistent, reliable information. Statements about the project made at Stockton differed from what appeared in the local newspapers and television reports. Such mixed messages are not unexpected in a project of this size and complexity, particularly as Stockton cannot control representations of the project in the media. Unfortunately, as the project was marked by extreme secrecy since the initial purchase, such differences contributed to a climate of mistrust.

Yet, despite these obstacles, progress was being made, a testament to the hard work and dedication of the Stockton community. The Academic Affairs Task Force surveyed students to learn their thoughts on the project. Academic programs met to determine the contributions they might be able to make, and whether they needed to revise their degree requirements to take advantage of the new location. A number of faculty volunteered to teach in Atlantic City either during the summer or fall, and still others created original courses specifically designed to integrate Atlantic City and its surrounding environs into the classroom experience. The Deans and Assistant Deans coordinated with each other to provide a diverse schedule of classes, and the architects, builders, and IT service personnel endeavored to create working classrooms, offices, dorms, a cafeteria, performance spaces, computer labs and so on. The Office of Student Affairs made a great deal of progress towards figuring out how to establish housing in the Island Campus buildings for four hundred students for Fall 2015. By mid March, a video advertising dorm life at the Island Campus was rolled out. While the May opening the President had initially ordered was deemed unrealistic, classes were scheduled for the first of July. By March 23, hundreds of students had signed up to move in for Fall 2015.

On March 24, while the Senate met, President Saatkamp issued a press release that said, "With immense sadness, I am announcing today that Stockton University's efforts to create a residential branch campus in Atlantic City have reached a stalemate...Stockton tried to establish a full campus in Atlantic City six times during my tenure as president and got kicked in the teeth each time. This time, we were stabbed in the heart." Trump Entertainment Enterprises was enforcing a 1988 covenant that stated that anyone purchasing the Showboat Casino would have to operate it as a first-class casino and hotel. The President explained that while the University knew about the covenant at the time of

⁵ For example, when the Union publically released a list of questions and concerns from its membership about the project, members of the Academic Affairs Task Force suggested this indicated a lack of adequate communication between the administration and the faculty. The President responded that he would not be bullied by the Union and that anyone could have had the answers to these questions simply by asking him personally.

purchase, it had been assured that this was only a formality that could be resolved by Caesar's Entertainment. Moreover, it had also been assured that it was indemnified from any financial losses that might result from the covenant. The President expressed his confidence that the University would prevail in any legal battle but admitted that if it could not be resolved quickly they would need to sell the property.

Over the next seven days, rumors abounded, but hard information about what would or should happen next was difficult to find. The task forces and working groups continued to meet although it was unclear what exactly they should be doing until the lawsuit was resolved. The overall sense of uncertainty and insecurity was intensified by the fact that the University's chief academic officer, Provost Kesselman, had accepted the position of President of the University of Southern Maine and was due to start on July 1. Many faculty were angry with what they perceived was the the administration's lack of due diligence, while others felt the blame rested primarily with Trump Entertainment and their insistence on preventing Stockton from moving forward.

On April 3, President Saatkamp announced that Stockton would enter into an agreement with KK Ventures, a subsidiary of Glenn Straub's Polo North, Inc. The arrangement was part of what Straub appeared to have named the "Phoenix Project." The \$500 million, 8-part project was to turn Revel Casino and large sections of Atlantic City into sports and non-gaming entertainment attractions, with investment from Straub. The Florida-based developer deposited \$26 million in escrow for 90 days. During that time Stockton tried to work out an arrangement with Trump Entertainment to disentangle the issues surrounding the covenant. The deal was for sale and right of first refusal for 18 months and/or the right of first leasing-The press release detailing Stockton's new role in the Phoenix Project was posted up on the Stockton website.

Several faculty began to raise concerns about the deal. They pointed out that, like the original Showboat purchase, this arrangement had been conducted in relative secrecy, that that there had been no faculty input on this new venture, that Straub had a questionable history with regard to his other properties, and that the exact nature of the relationship between Stockton and Straub was ambiguous.

As the deal became public, earlier remarks Straub had made in 2014 during a Reuter's interview resurfaced. In describing his plans for the Revel Casino, Straub stated that he intended to convert part of the building into "a university where the best and brightest young minds from across the world could work on the big issues of the day." His ideal student would be someone who had no financial obligations or, as he described them, "free, white, and over 21." Then on April 7, Straub was reported in the Atlantic City Press as looking forward to Stockton professors training "my next-level backup night desk clerk." This language enraged many faculty who publically demanded clarification from the administration as to why Stockton was entering into a business arrangement with Straub.

It is worth noting that other faculty held different opinions, and stated that the deal with Straub was a reasonable attempt to fix a difficult problem. While such faculty might deplore Straub's manner of expressing himself, they argued that this was a business

arrangement, and that consequently, his personal views, however abhorrent they may be, were irrelevant.

On April 4, the day after the President's press release about the Phoenix Project, the Senate Executive committee called for the following:

- 1) An immediate and public denunciation of Straub's remarks by the university administration
- 2) A university-wide forum to allow the administration to clarify the exact relationship Stockton had contracted to be in with Mr. Straub, both legally and financially, as well as the role Stockton was to play in the development of this initiative, or whether Stockton should be involved in this partnership at all.

With this in mind, the Senate Executive Committee and the Union organized a joint meeting of the Union membership and Faculty Assembly.⁶ This may have been the first time in Stockton's history that a joint meeting of these two institutions had been called.⁷

A meeting was scheduled for Thursday, April 9 for both Faculty Assembly and Union members to discuss and debate their views on any and all aspects connected with the Showboat situation. President Saatkamp was invited to speak and answer questions from 4:30 to 5:00 pm.

On April 9, it was determined that a quorum of both the Assembly and Union was present in Alton auditorium. Both bodies conducted separate votes to authorize this unique meeting and to establish that it would be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order. By mutual agreement, the Union leadership and the Senate Executive Committee had previously agreed that the President of the Senate should chair the session. A number of administration and staff who were not members of either the Union or the Assembly had asked for permission to attend, as they felt equally uninformed about recent events; they were permitted to attend for the first half hour, and then, proceedings moved into closed session.

⁶ The Faculty Assembly is the faculty's ultimate authority on all matters with regard to the life and health of the University. The Senate is empowered to call for a Faculty Assembly meeting whenever it deems it a matter of such import that the entire faculty should be involved. The Senate Executive Committee interpreted the constitution to permit it, as part of the discretionary powers embodied in its Senate leadership role, to call for an Assembly meeting.

⁷ Traditionally, the two groups have been extremely careful not to involve themselves in each other's business. For example, the Senate's constitution explicitly prohibits it from taking any action that might affect the terms and conditions of employment. However, both the Senate Executive Committee and the Union leadership agreed that this extraordinary action was necessary as there were issues that fell under the respective purview of both collectives.

President Saatkamp spoke and responded to questions. Many issues were raised, and while there were those who expressed support for the President's actions, the general atmosphere was one of anger, mistrust, and confusion about the immediate future and the decisions of Stockton's leadership. For example, while the President agreed that Straub's comments were unacceptable and that the university was not in a partnership with him, he was asked why the university website still featured a press release about Stockton's partnership in the Phoenix Project. At 5:00 pm, President Saatkamp departed, and the meeting moved into closed session.

Again, while there were dissenters, three themes emerged from the comments of the majority of those present in the ensuing discussion.

First, the administration was not, nor had it been for some time, engaging in a robust sense of shared governance. Furthermore, it was believed the administration had effectively isolated the faculty from the Board of Trustees.

Second, faculty and Union members expressed frustration and anger that the University had entered into a business arrangement with Glenn Straub. His offensive comments indicated, at the very least, a profound lack of understanding of Stockton's mission and history. This was compounded by the questionable history of his development projects in other cities, his public feud with the Atlantic City energy suppliers, and his vague and unclear remarks about the Phoenix project, and his inflammatory classist and racist remarks about his vision of education.

Third, assembly and union membership expressed a desire to vote on the president's leadership. Many stated that there should be a vote of no confidence, others felt that the president should be asked to resign, and still others felt that the president had made mistakes but not to the extent that he should be sanctioned by the faculty.

Given that it was rapidly approaching 6:00 pm, as well as the complexity of the issues that remained under discussion, the assembled parties voted to continue the meeting the following Tuesday. In the interim, the joint leadership of the Union and the Senate worked on an agenda specifically addressing concerns about shared governance, Stockton's partnership with Glenn Straub, and questions about a vote of no confidence.

On the following Tuesday, the meeting, having never formally been adjourned, continued in closed session. Assembled faculty and Union members voted to hold a referendum on President Saatkamp's leadership and to demand representation on the Board of Trustees. Because of the historic significance of these measures, the decision was made to make the vote as inclusive as possible by having an on-line referendum. While the 4:30-6:00 pm time slot is reserved for meetings, many Union and Faculty Assembly members were unable to be there in person. Moreover, an anonymous on-line referendum would provide a level of confidentiality for those who were concerned about the possible retaliation over the vote. Because there had been many suggestions about what exactly such a referendum should say and how it would be constructed, the exact structure and wording was left to a joint committee of the Senate and Union, which was comprised of the Executive

Committees of both bodies.

Over the next five days, the Union membership voted to authorize the use of their funds to pay for an outside polling company, the American Arbitration Association, to conduct the referendum. A copy of the referendum distributed to eligible members can be found in the Senate archives. The breakdown was: 337 Faculty Assembly, 118 Professional Staff, and 304 adjuncts.

The vote was conducted over a forty-eight-hour period. About midway through the process, President Saatkamp announced his intention to resign from his position. The vote continued nonetheless. The results were sent from AAA to the Senate and Union leadership, which then disseminated them to the Stockton community along with their interpretation of the results of the referenda. The statements from the Senate and Union leadership along with the materials from AAA detailing the numbers of those who participated as well as the distribution of their votes are also available on the Senate website. The President of the Union and the Senate subsequently read a statement at the May 2015 Board of Trustees meeting outlining their joint views on the results of the referendum.

Harvey Kessleman was offered the position of acting President by the Board of Trustees and accepted. He accepted the position and stated he would continue in this role until July when he would then take up the presidency of University of Southern Maine. One of his first actions was to form three task forces: one on Atlantic City, one on shared governance, and a presidential search committee. However, in the ensuing months, Kesselman agreed to lengthen his tenure at Stockton, and withdrew from his University of Southern Maine contract. As of September 1, 2015, he became the interim president and the presidential search committee was discontinued. In July, Straub filed court papers asking that he be let out of the sale of Showboat or that the closing date be delayed, asserting that Stockton had acted in bad faith. Then Acting President Kesselman sought redress in the courts to be able to show the property to other prospective buyers which was granted in August. As of the submission of this report to the Senate archives in September 2015, Stockton continues to own the Showboat property.