GT Institute Review Committee
Meeting Minutes, September 12, 2002
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on September 12, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Russell Gentry, Joseph Hoey, Jim McClellan, Farrokh Mistree, Paul Wine, and Minami Yoda. Joe Hughes, John McIntyre, and Steve Usselman were unable to attend.

Joseph introduced Minami Yoda, who represented the Graduate Committee (GC). She was sitting in this week only. A new representative of the Graduate Committee will join the IRC. The new representative for the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) will likely be Mark Guzdial.

1. The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed. A motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved. All were in favor; none opposed.

2. Election of IRC officers
   Discussion included:
   - The reason that this committee was started was to lend faculty feedback to the program review process and was originally solicited by the executive board
   - Need to know what the plan is for the continuation of this committee
   - Make a way for this committee to succeed itself
   - Need to create two or three-year terms and rotate off two people next year who are currently on this Committee to keep continuity and build on what was accomplished last year

3. Meeting times for fall semester
   The meeting times listed on the agenda will not work for fall semester. Joseph asked the committee members to contact Sue with their fall schedules.

4. Update on progress of 2001–02 reviews
   Joseph sent the HTS report out and has received comments from the IRC members. The next five reports will be more concise and are to additionally include answers to the following:
   - Was the process followed through?
   - Who were the visitors?

5. Upcoming Reviews for 2002–2003.
   Joseph handed out a schedule of upcoming reviews.
   - Paul asked if Biology had been notified about the upcoming review. Joseph said that memos were sent to Deans and Chairs in the schools including Biology.
   - Farrokh asked if the deans know they are responsible to make the reviews happen by providing resources and setting up a budget for that. It is spoken to in the guidelines for selecting outside reviewers.
   - A suggestion was made that Dr. Chameau institutionalize the process and provide resources.
   - The date of the final review will be April 15.

6. Structural Changes.
   Farrokh asked who receives information gathered on faculty contentment. Joseph said that as a result of some structural changes, that information would be passed along to the Council on Institutional and Academic Program Review and Accreditation, chaired by Associate Provost Jack Lohmann. The first meeting will be on 9/23/02. The Council will also receive the results of the program reviews and serve as the deliberative body for that information and create policies.

7. OIT program review data entry display system
    Joseph handed out copies of a request made to OIT and sponsored by Academic Affairs to create a
    web-based program review data entry and self-study display system. Some of the discussion from the
    committee included the following:
    *   Ron—Could provide flexibility for units to submit/respond in different ways
    *   Farrokh—Could have video/sound—Use the NSF website as an example
    *   Ron—Video/Sound would require additional resources from the provost—Who does the site
        benefit
    *   Farrokh—Schools could get faculty to look at it
    *   Ron—Have it available for faculty to look at
    *   Minami—Provide supplementary information
    *   Ron—It should be posed to people who went through the process
    *   Russell—Schools that went through the accrediting process have formats already, so there could be
        hyperlinks to accrediting documents
    *   Jim—Schools should be polled, especially the smaller ones
    *   Ron—Would it be detrimental to the process
    *   Farrokh—It would be a way to facilitate the process
    *   Ron—Could include a checklist to see if schools have complied
    *   Russell—Like the idea of hyperlinks to Word documents
    *   Ron—Make it optional the first year
    *   Russell—If IRP links are included, that will make people use it
    *   Ron—Get feedback from people who went through the process last year
        -   Capture the information on CD/DVD
        -   Show archives
        -   Have paper documents available for external reviews
        -   Include IR data

8. Revision of criteria based on IRC and unit input
    Joseph handed out copies of the program review self-study guidelines that were revised after receiving
    feedback from the committee members and based on last year's program reviews. He also included
    criteria in the guidelines that the Board of Regents (BOR) used to read the reviews. Joseph said that
    Frank Butler at the BOR said that he would work with us; he just wants the material. We can expect
    feedback from the BOR. Some comments from the IRC members included:
    *   An executive summary has been added
    *   The assessment process is now one-half page instead of one and one-half pages
    *   Guidelines for length is good, except in the executive summary
    *   Good to include expectations in the guidelines
    *   Section V on academic programs should be run by the liaisons of the UCC and GC to see if the
        document works for them
    *   Sections VI, VII, and VIII could be available in another report with notation that would point the
        reader to the other report
    The SACS visit is scheduled for 2005 and a compliance audit expected in 2004.

9. No other items were discussed.

10. A motion for adjournment was made by Ron Arkin and seconded by Farrokh Mistree. The meeting
    was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Sue Woolard.