



## ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

### Minutes

February 2, 2026

10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Virtual – ZOOM

#### 1. Attendance:

- a. Members: Kim Dunn (Chair), Stacie Rossow, Meredith Mountford, Zhijun Yin, Sharon Darling, Christopher Beetle, and Ken Dawson-Scully
- b. Guest(s): Marie Claire DeMassi, James Capp, Iselgis Garcia

#### 2. Call to order at 10:01 AM by Chair, Dr. Kim Dunn

#### 3. Approval of the APBC Minutes from [January 9, 2026](#), meeting.

#### 4. [BSCGET degree](#)

##### [BSCGET New Degree Proposal Template](#)

Dr. Fred Bloetscher presented a proposal to create a Bachelor of Science in Construction and Geomatics Engineering Technology.

The proposal reflects direction from the Board of Governors to establish a new engineering technology degree program rather than modifying the existing Geomatics Engineering CIP code. The new program:

- Maintains the same curriculum structure and 120-credit requirement
- Utilizes existing faculty and existing courses
- Is designed for future ABET accreditation under ETAC
- Will allow graduates to pursue surveying licensure
- Provides a more hands-on pathway aligned with student career interests

The existing Geomatics Engineering program will remain active until currently enrolled students complete their degrees. Following implementation of the new program and graduation of enrolled students, the department intends to pursue formal sunset of the existing program through the appropriate governance process.

Revisions were made during the meeting to:

- Correct form inconsistencies
- Update faculty listing language
- Correct data table headings

**Motion:** A motion was made to move forward with a positive recommendation to steering, contingent upon the documented revisions discussed during the meeting. **Motion carries.**

## 5. SPOTS update

The committee continued its discussion from the previous meeting regarding the use of Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) evaluations in annual faculty evaluation processes.

Topics discussed included:

- Low response rates and resulting response bias
- Lack of correlation between SPOT Question 6 (“Rate your instructor overall”) and Questions 1–5
- Inconsistent use of SPOT scores across departments in annual evaluations
- Potential demographic and course-level bias in SPOT responses
- Impact of the current 21-day evaluation window on response consistency
- Reliance on Question 6 as a primary indicator of teaching effectiveness
- Alternative measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., peer review)

Members discussed potential approaches including:

- Eliminating Question 6
- Using an aggregate average of Questions 1–5
- Revising SPOT administration or question structure
- Providing departments with best-practice guidance while maintaining local evaluation autonomy

The Provost’s Office will:

- Consult with the Circle of Chairs regarding current departmental practices
- Collect feedback on how teaching effectiveness is evaluated beyond SPOT
- Identify opportunities for improved consistency and clarity in annual evaluation processes

Outcome: Discussion will continue at a future meeting pending additional data and feedback.

## 6. Academic Calendar

The committee revisited prior discussion regarding instructional contact hours and calendar alignment.

Concerns were raised regarding:

- Variability in instructional contact hours based on meeting patterns
- Ensuring minimum required contact hours across instructional formats
- Long-term calendar planning implications, including Fall Break scheduling

One suggestion included requiring the minimum and total contact hours for a course to be reflected in the syllabus to improve transparency and compliance.

Outcome: Discussion deferred for future consideration.

## 7. Future Agenda Items

Jason Iroff will attend the March meeting to discuss Clearwire-related matters at the committee’s request.

**8.** Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.