

**GT Institute Review Committee
Meeting Minutes, January 10, 2003
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on January 10, 2003, at 8:30 a.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Russell Gentry, Mark Guzdial, Joseph Hoey, Jeff Jagoda, Farrokh Mistree, Steve Usselman, and Paul Wine. John McIntyre was unable to attend.

A. Minutes

1. The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed. Item 2.c. was questioned whether 1st year, 2nd year, and 3rd year follow up should be 1st review, 2nd review, and 3rd review follow up. The reason for the yearly follow up is to tighten the process. Otherwise the process would be spread across 15 years.
2. A motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved. All were in favor; none opposed.

B. New Members

Brian Woodall, Director of Graduate Programs in International Affairs, will be joining the IRC. He was unable to attend the meeting today. The Executive Board secretary, Said Abdel-Khalik, has given the deans until January 15th to submit names.

C. Discussion of role, structure, and function of IRC.

1. The questions that began the discussion were the following:
 - a. Does the IRC's mission change?
 - b. What happens to the consistency of this Committee?
 - i. When do the terms end?
 - ii. Which members will be replaced?
 - iii. Should the members be elected or appointed?
2. Joseph was asked if the Council on Institutional and Academic Program Review and Accreditation (the Council) is looking at program reviews. He indicated that it is. He was further asked to explain what the Council is and what its role is. The role of the Council is:
 - a. Serve as a centralized focus to get through SACS accreditation
 - b. Reflect on where the Institute is going, through
 - i. program reviews
 - ii. external reviews, such as ABET
 - iii. assessments
 - c. Advise the Provost

Members of the Council include individuals from both the academic and administrative sides:

- Associate Deans
- Jack Lohmann, Chair
- Charles Liotta
- Bob McMath
- Richard Barke
- Ralph Mobley
- Rosalind Meyers
- Lee Wilcox
- Gail DiSabatino
- John Mullin

3. Farrokh Mistree made a motion that the IRC be dissolved. Ron Arkin seconded the motion. Further discussion was requested.
 - a. Concerns about dissolving the IRC included the following:
 - i. The IRC just recently asked the EB to increase its committee size and now it wishes to be dissolved. However, the group did not understand the ramifications of the Council when it made the request for new members.
 - ii. If this Committee went away, Joseph was asked, what would the Office of Assessment lose? He

**GT Institute Review Committee
Meeting Minutes, January 10, 2003
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower
Page 2**

indicated the following:

- a. a credible procedure to ensure the reviews get accomplished
 - b. a sounding board that enables him to put forth process recommendations
 - c. credibility in putting forth recommendations.
- iii. The reason the IRC was initially formed was a) to get the faculty phase of the program review done, and b) because it was mandated by the Board of Regents (BOR). The UCC has not yet devised the mechanisms for program review. How will the job get done? The UCC has increased in size, but this was to handle the appeal process and before the program review phase. The UCC also handles curricular change and study abroad, and it has not gotten to program review yet. The IGCC also has a large number of petitions it hears. The group was concerned that the program review process in the UCC and IGCC should be monitored and that, perhaps, Joseph could be appointed as an Ex-Officio member to both committees.
- iv. There was also the concern for how the summative review would get to the Provost. The group recommended that it is the Council Chair's responsibility to present the findings to the Provost. The group also recommended that the April 15 program review presentations be made to the Council, with the IRC members in attendance to observe.
4. The role of the IRC in the future was then recommended to be:
- a. Continue as an ad hoc committee, monitoring the program review process through a full cycle.
 - b. Attend, as observers, the April 15 program review presentation to the Council.
 - b. Begin to phase out during the 2003–04 year, meeting only twice a year and taking on a much less active role by
 - Meeting at the beginning of the academic year to go over the schools that are up for program review.
 - Meeting at the end of the academic year to review the process.
 - c. End the services of the Committee in 2004.

D. Development of recommendations to the Executive Board (EB) for the future of the IRC

After the above discussion of concerns, the motion stands with amendments as follows:

- A motion was made by Farrokh Mistree to recommend to the EB that this Committee is phased out in 2003–04 and dissolved by 2004. Ron Arkin seconded the motion.
- An amendment to the motion was offered by Steve Usselman that recommends that the Council monitors the program review process and makes sure that the UCC and the IGCC follow through in the process.
- An amendment to the motion was offered by Mark Guzdial that recommends the Council proposes Joseph Hoey to be an Ex-Officio member to both the UCC and the IGCC.

A vote was taken, and the motion with amendments was unanimously approved.

E. Action Items

1. Ron Arkin and Russell Gentry volunteered to accompany Joseph to present the recommendations to the Executive Board at their next meeting.
2. Finalization of the wording of the recommendations will take place among the UCC members via e-mail.
3. Streamlining the assessment process will be added to the agenda for the next IRC meeting.

F. Meeting Adjourned.

Farrokh Mistree moved that the meeting be adjourned. It was seconded by Ron Arkin. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 a.m.