ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
Minutes
September 28, 2026
10:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Virtual – ZOOM

1. Attendance:

   a. Members: Kim Dunn (Chair), Sharon Darling, Ramesh Teegavarapu, Fred Hoffman, Stacie Rossow and Ken Dawson-Scully
   b. Guest(s): James Capp, Iselgis Garcia, Marie Claire DeMassi

2. Call to order at 10:00 AM by chair, Dr. Kim Dunn.

3. Approval of the APBC Minutes from August 24, 2026 meeting.

4. SPOTs
   The committee reviewed recommendations from the SPOT Instrument Review Working Group and SPOT Education Campaign Working Group. Discussion focused on proposed revisions to the SPOT instrument, improving student participation, establishing consistent use of SPOT results in faculty evaluations, and addressing concerns regarding the administration window.

   SPOT Instrument Review Working Group
   The committee reviewed proposed revisions to the SPOT instrument, including a consistent 1–5 rating scale, separate evaluation of the course and instructor, and revised questions addressing course design, learning, and instructional practices.

   The proposed instrument would include questions addressing course expectations and objectives, course organization, alignment of materials and assignments with course objectives, opportunities for higher-order thinking, and instructor communication, feedback, and treatment of students. Members also discussed incorporating effective course pacing into the instructor-related questions and revising wording to reduce overlap and improve clarity.

   The committee discussed removing the current overall Question 6, noting that departments and colleges frequently rely on this single measure rather than considering responses to individual questions. Members expressed concern that an overall rating may

be influenced by bias or subjective perceptions and may not adequately reflect specific elements of course design and instruction.
Motion: A motion was made to remove Question 6 from the SPOT instrument. The motion carries.

Members discussed the potential use of composite scores or separate averages for course-related and instructor-related questions. Additional information regarding how other State University System (SUS) institutions calculate and use SPOT results will help inform decisions regarding scoring and reporting.

The committee also discussed removing the student-effort question and revising the instructions provided to students. The proposed instructions would encourage students to consider the course as a whole, including instruction, organization, assignments, feedback, resources, and learning experiences, rather than focusing on an isolated assignment, grade, or experience. Open-ended questions would also be revised to encourage constructive feedback and ask students what would most improve the course or its instruction.

Implementation and Use of SPOT Results in Faculty Evaluation
The committee discussed the implementation timeline for the revised instrument. Spring 2027 was identified as the target, with Fall 2027 serving as a more conservative implementation goal if additional time is needed for system changes, review, and communication.

Members discussed the importance of aligning implementation with faculty evaluation cycles and ensuring that faculty understand how the revised instrument and resulting scores will be used.

The committee noted that existing Promotion and Tenure Review (PTR) evaluation language references the current SPOT structure and may require review and potential negotiation. Additional guidance will be needed to establish consistent practices for using SPOT results across academic units.

The committee also discussed reviewing Spring and Fall 2027 SPOT data following implementation to evaluate the revised instrument and determine whether further adjustments are needed.

SPOT Education Campaign Working Group
The committee reviewed the working group's recommendations for a comprehensive education campaign to improve student understanding of SPOT evaluations and increase participation.

The proposed campaign would include three phases:

1. **Early semester:** Educate students about the purpose and value of SPOT evaluations and how feedback can inform instructional practices and course improvement.
2. **Mid-semester:** Encourage students to reflect on their learning and consider how feedback can improve course design and instruction.
3. **Before the SPOT window opens:** Remind students to participate and provide specific, purposeful, objective, and thoughtful feedback.

The campaign would use multiple communication channels, including Canvas, email, digital signage, social media, and other student communications. Members also discussed potential university-, college-, and course-level incentives to encourage participation, as well as highlighting examples of faculty who have used SPOT feedback to improve their courses.

The Provost expressed support for the working group's recommendations and emphasized the importance of implementation and tracking results over time. The committee discussed beginning the education campaign as soon as possible, potentially in Spring 2027, to evaluate whether improved communication and student awareness increase response rates.

SPOT Administration Window

The committee identified the SPOT administration window as an issue requiring further review. Members expressed concern that the length and timing of the window may affect student responses, particularly when evaluations are completed before students finish their courses.

The committee also discussed potential administrative or technical approaches to encourage participation. Members noted that any such measures would need to be evaluated carefully to avoid introducing additional bias or negatively affecting students' access to grades and academic progress.

The committee agreed to revisit the administration window at a future meeting and requested that members identify data needed to inform the discussion.

Motion: A motion was made to forward the proposed revised SPOT instrument to the Steering Committee for consideration and subsequent governance review. **Motion carries.**

Action Items

- **SPOT Instrument Review Working Group:** Continue refining the proposed instrument and reviewing scoring and reporting approaches used by other SUS institutions.

- **Provost's Office:** Assess the feasibility of Spring 2027 implementation, with Fall 2027 as the more conservative target.

- **Provost's Office:** Develop guidance regarding the use of revised SPOT results in faculty evaluations, including consistency across academic units and implications for PTR and annual evaluations.

- **Provost's Office and working group:** Coordinate development and implementation of the SPOT education campaign.

- **Committee members:** Submit requests for data needed to evaluate the SPOT administration window before the next meeting.
- **Committee:** Review SPOT results following implementation to assess the effectiveness of the revised instrument.

5. AI Updates
Due to the extended discussion regarding SPOTs, the committee was unable to address AI Updates during this meeting.

6. Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.