

University Faculty Senate Minutes

April 28, 2025

Online Zoom Meeting

Please note that a complete audio recording of this senate meeting is available at [UNI Scholarworks](#). The timestamps noted throughout these minutes refer to that recording.

Faculty Senate meetings are open, and any faculty member may attend. If you wish to attend, email a member of Senate leadership for the Zoom link.

The summary below was generated using Microsoft Copilot and reviewed for accuracy.

Senators in attendance:

Kenneth Elgersma (Chair), Alexa Clements (Vice-Chair), Melissa Dobosh (Faculty Chair, Past Senate Chair), Randall Harlow (Parliamentarian), Nick Bailey, Megan Balong, Erika Bass, Andy Berns, Cathi Bowler, Karen Breitbart, Rebecca Dickinson, Scott Giese, Mark Hecimovich, Melanie Hill, Charles Holcombe, Wu-Ying Hsieh, Julie Kang, Syed Kirmani, Alexandra (Ana) Kogl, Reza Lahroodi, Matthew Makarios, Dayna Miller, Susan Moore, John Preston, Shelley Price-Williams, Ali Tabei

(Fifty percent quorum met, with 22/31 voting senators present; the Faculty Chair is non-voting, as provided in the Faculty Constitution, and the Senate Chair votes only in case of a tie.)

Call to Order at 3:30 PM [timestamp 0:00:00]

Call for Press Identification: *None Present*

Introduction of Guests:

Regular Guests: José Herrera, Chris Martin, Alli Webster (NISG President), Deirdre Heistad, Amy Nielsen

Other Guests: Kristen Woods (Enrollment Management and Student Success), Kristin Moser (Workforce Alignment Review), Stephanie Huffman (Workforce Alignment Review)

Courtesy Announcements

Comments from Provost Herrera

[00:01:27]

Enrollment Projections: Projections have slightly decreased due to ongoing national enrollment challenges and state-specific higher education funding uncertainties, but enrollment is still anticipated to be higher than last year. This would mark the third consecutive year of institutional growth. The current enrollment estimate is 9,349 students, which reflects a slight decline from previous projections. However, this estimate does not yet account for incoming international students, who would be additional to the projected figures.

Faculty Hiring: A total of 51 new faculty positions have been posted, with 39 being new hires and 12 renewals of term positions. Among the 39 new hires, 23 are tenure-track faculty, representing approximately 59% of the new hires. Hiring efforts have been successful, and 35

faculty members have already accepted offers for Fall 2025. Faculty recruitment is outpacing departures, as only 27 faculty members are retiring or leaving, reinforcing the institution's overall growth and expansion.

Budget Planning: The institution is awaiting a finalized state budget decision. While the Senate and Governor's Office have reached an agreement, the House has yet to finalize its stance. Previously, deans were asked to prepare for potential 1% and 2.5% budget cuts; however, the 2.5% cut has been removed from consideration. If state funding is secured, the 1% cut may also be avoided, further stabilizing financial planning for the upcoming year.

Comments from Faculty Chair Dobosh

[00:06:45]

Faculty Chair Melissa Dobosh ceded her time to Kristen Woods from Enrollment Management and Student Success, who provided an update on the Office of International Engagement's efforts to support international students. Woods discussed recent challenges affecting students' visa statuses, outlined the office's direct outreach initiatives, and highlighted social programming designed to foster connection and community.

Woods reported that two international students had their SEVIS status terminated by the federal government on April 10. However, both students had their status reinstated over the weekend, and were notified of this update. Staff from the Office of International Engagement worked closely with the affected students by providing individualized support, connecting them to immigration attorneys and counseling resources, and coordinating assistance with the Dean of Students Office. She emphasized the office's commitment to maintaining student privacy and safety.

Over the past two months, the Office of International Engagement has prioritized direct outreach to students, including in-person meetings and small-group discussions. Communications sent in March and April encouraged students to seek support and reinforced the message that they are not alone. The office also hosted three in-person meetings for international students, with a fourth scheduled for May 2. Woods noted that these efforts aim to reassure students while creating spaces for them to voice concerns.

In addition to crisis support, the Office of International Engagement continues to foster social engagement among students. Recently, the office organized a weekend trip to Chicago, with 53 students participating, including both international and domestic students. Additionally, ongoing weekly cultural and social events allow students to connect, and local host families have stepped up to provide gatherings that strengthen community bonds.

Woods concluded by encouraging faculty and staff to share feedback on additional ways to support international students. The discussion was then opened for questions.

Comments from United Faculty President Chris Martin

[00:1:43]

United Faculty President Christopher Martin expressed appreciation for the positive update on the reinstatement of two international students' SEVIS status. He then highlighted the success of the April 17th Teach-In event, which was part of a national day of action. The event was well received, with over 100 attendees.

Martin also announced an upcoming event, the United Faculty Annual Sunday Fun Day and Faculty Appreciation Day, scheduled for May 4th from 11:00 AM to 1:00 PM in the WRC. The event is free and will include food and faculty awards, such as recognition for contingent faculty, the UF Member of the Year, and the UF Department Head of the Year.

He concluded by thanking attendees and opening the floor for any questions.

Comments from NISG President Webster

[00:13:04]

Alli Webster introduced herself at her first meeting as the incoming NISG Student Body President. She is a second-year student studying public relations and political science, with an anticipated graduation in May 2026. Webster did not have specific agenda items to discuss but welcomed any questions from the group.

Comments from Senate Chair Elgersma

[00:13:50]

Kenneth Elgersma thanked faculty for their feedback on concerns related to publicly available syllabi. He noted that the proposed bill did not pass through the legislative funnel but instead was redirected to a new Board of Regents policy. This shift is seen as a positive outcome, as the Board of Regents is more familiar with academic processes than legislators and is expected to craft a more effective policy.

A key advantage of the Regents policy is its protection against faculty doxing, as it does not require faculty names or contact information to be displayed in a publicly searchable database. Concerns raised by faculty at other regents institutions aligned with those discussed at previous meetings, and the Board of Regents appears to have considered this feedback in its decision-making process.

Elgersma acknowledged that while students will likely continue informal discussions about courses, the policy transition mitigates potential negative impacts. He cautioned that the legislative session is still ongoing, meaning further developments could arise. However, he remains hopeful and committed to advocating for positive outcomes for both students and faculty.

Minutes for Approval

[00:16:10]

Kenneth Elgersma introduced the approval of minutes from the March meeting, noting that Copilot has been used to assist in their creation. He expressed appreciation for Vice Chair

Clements, who has done an excellent job managing the task. Given the time-consuming nature of taking and refining minutes, Elgersma emphasized that Copilot serves as a tool to streamline the process and reduce the burden on Senate operations.

He also reassured attendees that the use of Copilot does not replace human oversight, as Vice Chair Clements continues to review and refine the minutes to ensure accuracy and clarity. While Clements was still teaching and would join the meeting a little later, Elgersma encouraged anyone with questions about the process to reach out to her.

[00:17:29]

Motion to approve the minutes from March 24, 2025

MOTION: Berns/ Makarios (17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain) *Minutes are approved.*

Docketed Items

1642 Consultation from the Workforce Alignment Review Committee

[00:18:22]

1642 [Consultation: Workforce Alignment Review committee](#)

Deirdre Heistad, Stephanie Huffman and Kristen Moser provided a consultation on the Workforce Alignment Review charge and work to be done over the next few months.

Deirdre Heistad: Provided an overview of the Workforce Alignment Review Initiative, explaining its origins in response to proposed state legislation (House Study Bill 50, House File 420, and Senate Study Bill 1024) aimed at requiring the Board of Regents to evaluate all academic programs based on workforce needs.

She explained that the original legislative proposals directed the Board of Regents to conduct a statewide review of academic programs, focusing on three key aspects:

1. Complete a review of all undergraduate and graduate academic programs by November 1, 2025.
2. Determine whether and to what extent each academic program aligns with current and future workforce needs in the state.
3. For each academic program review, recommend whether the program should remain unchanged, be modified, or be eliminated.

She noted that while the legislation ultimately did not make it through the funnel, the Board of Regents agreed to conduct this workforce alignment review voluntarily, rather than having it mandated by law. The Board of Regents accepted responsibility for conducting the Workforce Alignment Review of programs, agreeing to develop a formal report by October 15, 2025, which would then be presented at the November 2025 Board of Regents meeting. Instead of following a rigid legislative-mandated structure, the review will focus on:

1. Workforce alignment for existing academic programs

2. Job projections and student return on investment (ROI)
3. Wage analysis using Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics data
4. Identification of low-enrollment programs

The data sources proposed for the Workforce Alignment Review report are publicly available datasets including:

- **Census Bureau:** Provides workforce participation trends, employment statistics, and earnings data at different intervals.
- **Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS):** Offers job projections, industry trends, wage reports, and labor market insights.

She continued by emphasizing that this work will take place over summer 2025 to prepare the report in time for fall deadlines. At UNI, the WAR Council consists of Deirdre Heistad, Kristen Moser, and Stephanie Huffman. They meet biweekly with the Board of Regents and collaborate across regents institutions to compile workforce alignment data. Their work will include:

- Providing updates to faculty leadership, deans, and department heads.
- Reviewing workforce trends, enrollment data, and program return on investment (ROI).
- Ensuring program classifications accurately reflect UNI's strengths and contributions.

Similar WAR Councils exist at the other regents institutions and function in parallel, supporting their respective universities in gathering workforce-related data and maintaining transparent communication with faculty and leadership throughout the review process.

Discussion:

[00:23:56]

Faculty Chair **Melissa Dobosh:** Asked whether the review would be an annual process, as originally proposed in the legislation. Dr. Heistad clarified that the legislation did not mandate an annual review, only a one-time submission by November 2025.

Dobosh followed up by asking about the role of faculty in the review process, given that the report relies on publicly available workforce data. Heistad responded by explaining that the project is evolving by the week. She explained that the WAR Council is developing one-page reports for each undergraduate and graduate program, summarizing graduation numbers, return on investment, workforce alignment, and job projections. Questions remain regarding how local or anecdotal data might be included in these reports. She stated that as faculty work on developing and refining curriculum, they could think about their own programs' alignment with Iowa workforce needs and graduation rates.

[00:28:02]

Stephanie Huffman: Encouraged faculty to proactively assess and refine programs, ensuring that departments are prepared to highlight their strengths before external recommendations are made.

[00:29:44]

Faculty Chair Dobosh raised concerns about Standard Instructional Program (SIP) codes, questioning whether department heads had received updated classification lists. She continued that if so, had they been shared with faculty.

[00:30:36]

Kristin Moser confirmed that college deans were instructed to distribute SIP code lists to department heads but acknowledged possible delays in communication. She also reminded the senate that this report will be back looking and will use the SIP Codes that have been assigned to programs.

Faculty Chair Dobosh responded that there are some challenges to communication and encouraged the WAR Council to consider including additional checkpoints in communication strategies to account for the rapid evolution of this process.

Deirdre Heistad stated that meetings with SBS and CHAS department heads had already taken place, with sessions for College of Education and Wilson College scheduled in the coming weeks.

[00:33:29]

Senator Ali Tabei: Asked about the possibility of program terminations as part of the Workforce Alignment Review process. Specifically, he inquired about the criteria that might lead to a program being eliminated and how that decision would be made.

Deirdre Heistad: Responded by stating that no formal criteria for program elimination have been defined at this point. The original legislation directed the Board of Regents to classify programs into three categories:

1. No changes required
2. Change with specific recommendations
3. Eliminate the program

However, the current directive from the Board of Regents does not include these three buckets, meaning the review process is focused on data collection rather than direct program elimination discussions.

Kristin Moser: Added that UNI should leverage the review process to highlight positive institutional changes. She emphasized that UNI has actively revised curricula, created new programs, and responded to workforce needs over the past decade. The goal is to present these efforts proactively in the report, ensuring that existing program improvements are recognized, potentially preventing programs from being categorized for elimination.

She reiterated that while no program elimination decisions have been made, the university is working to be as proactive as possible in shaping the review to showcase its strengths and responsiveness to workforce demands.

[00:35:17]

Deirdre Heistad: Discussed the importance of Standard Instructional Program (SIP) codes in the Workforce Alignment Review. She explained that each academic program is assigned a six-digit SIP code, but some programs may also be categorized under broader four-digit SIP classifications. She stressed that six-digit SIP codes provide very specific program definitions, but aggregating at the four-digit level could present programs more favorably by increasing reported graduate numbers. She advocated for using four-digit SIP classifications where applicable to strengthen workforce alignment metrics.

She continued by highlighting the review's reliance on Census Bureau wage data, which tracks employment at one-year, five-year, and ten-year intervals. She explained that using longer-term wage data (five-year and ten-year) provides a more accurate representation of how graduates settle into careers, rather than only examining first-year earnings. She emphasized that the goal of the review is to present regent institutions in the most favorable light. She noted that Board of Regents staff are actively working to ensure programs are evaluated in a way that highlights their strengths and contributions to workforce development.

[00:37:24]

Randall Harlow: Asked how the Workforce Alignment Review Council is addressing degree programs that lead to graduate study in different disciplines. He pointed out that programs in the humanities often prepare students for careers outside their direct field of study, creating cross-disciplinary outcomes. He also inquired about how smaller degree programs contribute to other disciplines through coursework and questioned how that impact is measured in the review process.

Kristin Moser: Explained that UNI tracks graduate employment outcomes using multiple data sources, including the Census Bureau, IRS employment records, and the National Student Clearinghouse. She detailed how UNI provides individualized data for each graduate to the Board of Regents, allowing for tracking across multiple career intervals (one-year, five-year, and ten-year post-graduation). She noted that some disciplines, such as music majors, show career shifts—starting in retail or gig work but transitioning to music education after five years.

She continued by highlighting that the review will also assess graduate school enrollment trends, ensuring programs are credited for students who pursue advanced degrees in other disciplines. She emphasized the need for additional narrative space in the report to provide context on degree pathways beyond raw employment statistics.

Stephanie Huffman: Added that UNI is collaborating with external organizations, such as the Iowa Business Council, to highlight the broader value of liberal arts degrees, emphasizing that essential skills (often called soft skills) make graduates more employable. She advocated for structuring the report so each regent institution can tell its unique story rather than having data aggregated across multiple universities.

[00:42:22]

Randall Harlow: Expressed concerns about correlating academic programs solely with post-

graduation earnings, arguing that economic contribution is not always reflected in salary data. He warned that prioritizing financial ROI could lead to biased evaluations, overlooking programs with critical intellectual and societal value. He also asked what criteria would define a "failed" program.

Deirdre Heistad: Explained that the Board of Regents has not defined criteria for eliminating programs. Instead, the review focuses on workforce alignment in Iowa, specifically evaluating student return on investment (ROI) rather than broader institutional benefits. She acknowledged Harlow's concerns, emphasizing that the review is narrowly focused on workforce alignment within Iowa rather than a broader evaluation of academic or institutional value. She explained that UNI already conducts regular program reviews and noted that the Board of Regents opted to oversee this workforce review instead of allowing direct legislative control.

She clarified that the ROI metric used in this review is focused on the value for students, rather than institutional financial sustainability. She reaffirmed that faculty should consider how their programs align with workforce trends while also ensuring academic integrity and depth are maintained.

[00:45:41]

Alexa Clements: Shared personal anecdotes to illustrate how workforce alignment metrics might overlook important career pathways. She highlighted a person who earned a bachelor's degree in communication studies, which was required for their previous job but became essential when they launched their own business. Clements questioned whether entrepreneurial career paths are recognized in workforce alignment assessments. She stated that she was encouraged by incorporating Iowa business perspectives into the construction of these reports.

She continued by raising concerns about multidisciplinary academic tracks being undervalued. She pointed to her undergraduate degrees in religion and geology, explaining that while she pursued a career in geology, skills from her religion coursework—such as argumentation and analysis—play a significant role in her professional work. She asked whether degrees in non-primary career fields are counted as "failures" under the current review structure. She proposed an example involving an environmental science major who also studies theater, wondering whether their decision to pursue graduate school in environmental science would count negatively against the theater program, despite the critical thinking and presentation skills gained from theater coursework benefiting their future career.

Kristin Moser: Explained that the Workforce Alignment Review primarily tracks employment outcomes based on Census Bureau and IRS data, meaning graduates are counted toward all completed majors rather than only their field of employment. She assured Clements that graduates who hold multiple degrees are credited in each respective department.

Deirdre Heistad: Reinforced that graduate career paths are captured in workforce alignment data and noted that many graduates enter education-related roles, even if they do not pursue a formal teaching licensure. She observed that graduates often shift into education fields after five years, whether through K-12 teaching, human resources training, or professional workshops.

She emphasized that the review might work in UNI's favor because it tracks graduates remaining in Iowa, strengthening UNI's position in demonstrating regional workforce contributions. She suggested that anecdotal stories like Clements' illustrate the broader impact of liberal arts education, arguing that UNI's commitment to education is reflected in workforce data in a favorable way.

[00:51:35]

Randall Harlow: Asked for clarification on how the review would identify programs recommended for modification versus those potentially flagged for elimination. He questioned what specific criteria would suggest a program needs to change rather than be removed entirely.

Deirdre Heistad: Shared a personal experience from 2011, when several language programs—including French, German, Portuguese, and Russian—were eliminated at UNI. She reflected on how programs could have been structured differently to potentially avoid elimination by consolidating smaller majors into a single interdisciplinary program. She stressed that small, independent programs may need to rethink their structure to ensure sustainability. She suggested that creating a unified "world languages" major with a common core curriculum could have protected those programs. She continued by encouraging faculty to assess how their programs fit into workforce trends and explore innovative restructuring options rather than waiting for external recommendations that might lead to elimination.

[00:54:19]

Randall Harlow: Expressed concerns regarding the purpose of the Workforce Alignment Review. He observed that academic programs are constantly evolving, and revision is a standard part of institutional processes. He questioned whether the review's main objective was merely to demonstrate why programs should remain unchanged, rather than truly identifying needed modifications. He asked how that decision would be made and who would be responsible for making that decision.

Deirdre Heistad: Acknowledged that she wasn't entirely sure who would make final recommendations regarding program modifications or eliminations. She confirmed that the WAR Council's role is to compile and present data, rather than directly recommending changes. However, she noted that once the report reaches the Board of Regents, they may make recommendations, and after that, the Legislature could act on the findings. She continued by stating that UNI has already been proactive in managing academic programs, eliminating or modifying programs over the past decade in response to workforce trends. She suggested that a key goal of the review is to highlight UNI's ongoing efforts, ensuring the institution is recognized for its ability to align with workforce needs without external intervention.

[00:58:19]

Randall Harlow: Reiterated that quantitative metrics should not dictate program decisions. He warned that relying strictly on numerical assessments could lead to arbitrary cutoffs, where programs fall into elimination or modification categories based solely on numbers, rather than

qualitative assessments of their broader value. He stressed the importance of contextualizing data to accurately represent program contributions.

[00:59:23]

Faculty Chair Melissa Dobosh: Reflected on discussions at the Council of Provosts meeting, which included provosts from UNI, Iowa, and Iowa State, faculty leadership, and staff from the Board of Regents. She emphasized the uncertainty surrounding the Workforce Alignment Review, noting that while the review report is being developed, institutions have no control over how the final findings will be used.

She expressed concern that the review could potentially be used against institutions, posing a risk to academic programs and funding decisions. She described this lack of control over the report's ultimate application as deeply unsettling for faculty. She proposed that improving communication within UNI should be a priority. She suggested that faculty should be given earlier access to relevant data metrics, allowing them to better understand how programs are being assessed and respond proactively. She urged UNI to develop a stronger strategy for sharing information throughout the review process to ensure faculty are well-informed.

[01:00:24]

Ali Tabei: Asked about how the Workforce Alignment Review would assess programs that address high-need areas in Iowa but struggle with enrollment due to external factors such as legislative policies or economic conditions. He questioned how such programs would be treated in the review process.

Kristin Moser: Acknowledged the uncertainty surrounding how these cases will be evaluated, but suggested that linking the program to high-need workforce areas could provide justification for maintaining it. She emphasized that UNI is actively working to fill workforce gaps, even in programs with lower enrollments.

Deirdre Heistad: Suggested that faculty could strengthen the case for these programs by contributing local data on recent curriculum changes designed to increase student interest and enrollment. She stressed that programs should highlight proactive efforts, such as renaming majors for clarity or reorganizing curriculum to better align with workforce needs, rather than simply waiting for enrollment trends to shift on their own.

[01:02:19]

Senate Chair Elgersma: Emphasized the importance of ongoing faculty engagement over the summer. He encouraged senators to identify colleagues willing to stay involved and submit their names to him, ensuring that faculty continue to provide feedback throughout the review process.

[01:03:42]

Melissa Dobosh: Proposed calling a spring faculty meeting to ensure all faculty are aware of the Workforce Alignment Review and its implications. She noted that while some department heads have received information, many faculty members may still be unaware of the review's scope. She invited faculty to provide feedback within the next 24 hours to gauge interest in

holding an informational session.

Docketed Item 1643: Statement Supporting International Students

[01:04:50]

1643 [Statement supporting international students](#)

Motion

Motion to Approve the Statement Supporting International Students

MOTION: Clements/ Moore (18 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention)- *motion passes*

Kenneth Elgersma: Explained that faculty leadership drafted the statement in response to visa revocations by the Federal Government, which created uncertainty and distress for affected students nationwide, including two students at UNI. He emphasized that the International Students Office has worked tirelessly to build a sense of belonging and community, but faculty also wanted to add their voices in support, affirming that international students belong at UNI. He noted that while the immediate visa concerns have subsided, the faculty believes it is important to recognize that harm was done and to reaffirm their commitment to international students.

Discussion

[01:07:14]

Melissa Dobosh: Proposed an amendment to the statement supporting international students, recommending that the term "foreign students" be replaced with "international students" throughout the document. She noted that this wording appeared three times in the statement and suggested the change for clarity and inclusivity.

Chair **Elgersma:** Acknowledged the amendment and opened the floor for discussion.

[01:07:56]

Senator Dickinson: Indicated that she had additional points she wanted to raise but asked whether the group should address Dobosh's amendment first or proceed with other discussions before finalizing the language change.

Susan Moore: Clarified the process for handling the amendment, explaining that the person who originally moved the motion and the person who seconded it should be consulted. If both approve the amendment, it can be folded into the original motion without requiring a separate vote.

[01:09:08]

Senator Dickinson: Expressed appreciation for the statement supporting international students but suggested stronger wording to reflect that visa revocations almost always occur without cause or explanation. She advocated for explicit acknowledgment of improper procedures, stating that these actions have created a climate of fear for affected students.

Chair Elgersma: Responded by recognizing two key suggestions—changing "sometimes" to "often" in the last paragraph and explicitly acknowledging the fear and anxiety faced by international students.

Senator Moore: Supported changing "sometimes" to "often" and adding a statement to recognize student fear, sharing an example of an international student experiencing uncertainty.

Vice Chair Clements: Proposed changing "sometimes" to "often" and adding a sentence in the second paragraph to acknowledge the anxiety these actions create and their impact on intellectual diversity.

Chair Elgersma: Suggested modifying the second paragraph by adding "creating an atmosphere of fear", while cautioning against over-wordsmithing in real-time.

Senator Lahroodi: Recommended using "frequently" instead of "often", arguing that "frequently" is easier to support with evidence and less susceptible to challenge.

Vice Chair Clements & Senator Moore: Accepted the change to "frequently" in the revised statement.

Docketed Items 1644, 1645, 1646: Emeritus Requests

[1:20:58]

1644 [Emeritus request: Elana Joram](#)

1645 [Emeritus request: Jonathan Schwabe](#)

1646 [Emeritus request: Denise Tallakson](#)

Motion

Motion to grant emeritus status to the three faculty
MOTION (18 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions) *motion passes*

Chair Kenneth Elgersma: Proposed combining three emeritus requests into a single consent agenda, allowing discussion of each but streamlining the voting process.

Discussion

[01:21:21]

Senator Price-Williams: Endorsed Dr. Joram's emeritus request, emphasizing their significant contributions to faculty mentorship and tenure guidance. She noted that Dr. Joram served as PAC chair, providing essential support in helping new faculty understand academic expectations and tenure criteria. Price-Williams reflected on her own experience receiving guidance and mentorship from Joram, similar to that of previous faculty members, underscoring Joram's consistency as an academic leader over time. She concluded by expressing appreciation for Joram's service over 30 years, humorously encouraging them to enjoy retirement and play more pickleball.

[01:23:05]

Senator Harlow: Spoke in favor of Dr. Schwabe's emeritus request, highlighting his dedication to the music theory and composition division. He praised Schwabe's flexibility and willingness to adapt his teaching methods, particularly in response to new pedagogical approaches introduced by younger faculty. Harlow acknowledged Schwabe's openness to rethinking traditional techniques, which helped modernize and strengthen UNI's music programs. Additionally, he lauded Schwabe's commitment to artistic creation, sharing that Schwabe composed a work specifically for him and frequently engaged with touring musicians and artists. Harlow emphasized that Schwabe remains a highly active composer and will continue contributing to the arts beyond retirement.

[01:24:32]

Senator Balong: Endorsed Professor Tallakson's emeritus request, recalling their shared teaching experience at the UNI lab school. She praised Tallakson's exceptional dedication to student-centered learning, noting that students who worked with her were empowered to pursue their academic and professional goals. Balong emphasized Tallakson's commitment to mentorship and advocacy, stating that she consistently worked to create opportunities for students. She described Tallakson's contributions to teaching, service, and scholarship as invaluable, adding that she has positively impacted students since the 1980s. Balong concluded by expressing her deep admiration for Tallakson's contributions and her personal sadness at her retirement.

Motion to Extend Time

[01:26:01]

MOTION

Motion to Extend the Meeting by 20 Minutes

MOTION: (17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstention)- *motion passes*

Docketed Item 1647: Regents Award Nominations

[01:27:24]

1647 [Regents' Award Nominations](#)

The Senate entered an executive session to discuss Regents Award Nominations

New Business

Elect a new Vice Chair

During the executive session, Timothy Dooley was elected to serve as Faculty Senate Vice Chair for the 2025-2026 academic year.

Discussion of Agreements with Other Institutions

[01:28:35]

Senator Dickenson brought to the attention of the senate that faculty senates at other institutions have created agreements to support each other if they are challenged by the administration. A brief discussion followed and it was suggested that more details could be provided at a full faculty meeting.

Faculty Chair Dobosh then discussed using a full faculty meeting to allow the WAR Council to present directly to the faculty. A discussion of the logistics of planning this meeting followed.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn

MOTION Moore/ Clements

Minutes were prepared and submitted by Vice-Chair Alexa Clements.

Summaries of comments were generated using Microsoft Copilot and reviewed for errors.

Appended Zoom Chat

00:15:56	Deirdre Heistad:	Deirdre Heistad, guest
00:29:07	Melissa Dobosh:	Welcome, Alli! :)
00:29:18	Alli Webster:	Reacted to "Welcome, Alli! :)" with ❤️
00:31:56	Christopher Martin:	Reacted to "Welcome, Alli! :)" with ❤️
00:51:13	Kristin Moser:	https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55
00:52:11	Ali Tabei:	Reacted to "https://nces.ed.gov/..." with 👍
01:03:53	Kristin Moser:	https://lehd.ces.census.gov/applications/pseo/?type=earnings&compare=postgrad&specificity=2&state=08&institution=00137000&degreelevel=05&gradcohort=0000-3&filter=50&program=52,45
01:03:57	Ali Tabei:	Thank you Alexa!
01:18:02	timothydooley:	I understand this is happening fast and over the summer. However, I hope there will be a mechanism to provide feedback on the light in which a particular program is being portrayed.
01:18:23	Christopher Martin:	Reacted to "I understand this is..." with 👍
01:18:31	Alexa Clements:	Reacted to "I understand this is..." with 👍
01:20:01	Jose Herrera:	Melissa, thank you for taking this on. Critical to have faculty voices and defining a mechanism would be great.
01:20:12	Kristin Moser:	Thanks everyone.
01:20:31	Stephanie Huffman:	Thank you everyone.
01:22:47	Christopher Martin:	Thank you for the statement!
01:41:55	Shelley Price-Williams:	I have class at 5pm and must leave the meeting.
01:42:29	Mark Hecimovich:	I need to leave due to a commitment
01:52:55	Susan Moore:	Thank you Tim.

01:53:09 Alexa Clements: Thank you, Tim

01:57:33 rebecca dickinson (she/her): I have a number of links I can provide about what other institutions are doing.

01:58:23 Susan Moore: I think having a spring faculty meeting is a good idea.

01:59:49 Alexa Clements: I am in favor of a spring faculty meeting