

**GT Institute Review Committee (IRC)**  
**Meeting Minutes, October 7, 2003 (corrected by 11/18/2003 meeting minutes)**  
**College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on October 7, 2003, at 2:00 p.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Kent Barefield, Brent Carter, Russell Gentry, Mark Guzdial, Joseph Hoey, Gary Parker, Steve Usselman, Paul Wine, and Brian Woodall. John McIntyre was unable to attend.

1. Final APR Handbook for 2003–04

Copies of the final version of the Handbook for Program Review at Georgia Tech were handed out. Joseph noted that the first section was added, and the guidelines for preparing self-study documentation has gone from 19 pages to two pages, but it also refers the reader to the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACS), and the Board of Regents (BOR) when describing the “viability, productivity, and quality” of each academic degree program (page 6).

2. Status of reviews scheduled for 2003–04

a. USG Triggered Programs

Georgia Tech received a USG Triggered Report that had over 140 programs marked for program review. Many were not “real programs” but had not been taken off Banner. The University of Georgia argued the same point. Joseph reported that Dr. Chameau had a conversation with Dan Papp, explaining to him that this would be an onerous process and that Georgia Tech currently does a unit-based review. No response has been received from the BOR at the time of this meeting, so the unit-based program reviews will move forward as scheduled.

b. Status of Reviews (as provided in handout)

1. Industrial Design

The self-study is in place, and the reviewers come this month.

2. City and Regional Planning

Continued to next year to coincide with professional accreditation visit.

3. HCI

Put on delayed schedule; self-study completed in spring; external reviewer visit in fall 2004.

Mark Guzdial commented that HCI is in good shape. They have a draft of the report and a list of external reviewers has been sent to Dr. Chameau for approval. HCI needs to know how to handle inter-disciplinary programs.

4. ECE

Self-study has been completed and sent to the external reviewers. The external reviewers are arriving this month.

5. BME

Self-study is in progress. The program review is on normal track.

6. MSE

Self-study is in progress. The program review is on normal track.

7. CEE

Continued to next year due to change in chair.

8. EAS

Self-study completed. External reviewers are arriving this month.

9. Applied Physiology

Continued to at least next year due to lack of students, newness of program, and having a new chair.

10. LCC

Self-study is in progress. The program review is on normal track.

Comments

- Liaisons want to know when they will get copies of the self-studies (without appendices of faculty resumes and vitas).
- A suggestion was made to make the reviews a two-year process: Tell the units what they need to do in year one so they can set up schedules for review in year two.

**GT Institute Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes, October 7, 2003  
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower  
Page 2**

- The need for a model for the inter-disciplinary programs was discussed, which would address the following issues:
    - What the focus of the review should be
    - How many administrators should look at it
    - How to provide inter-disciplinary program data (brought up at the Provost's retreat)
      - student headcount
      - faculty workload
    - How to constitute external reviewers
    - Where the review would be housed—Suggestions included:
      - New inter-disciplinary programs, when approved, must have a mechanism in place to suggest to the IRC where the program review will be housed; must identify who will write the report
      - Associate the program with the director's home department
      - Make it explicit that if bachelor's program is being reviewed then evaluate inter-disciplinary programs associated with the unit
      - Place the program review in the school that has the resources to do it
    - Tie the inter-disciplinary programs into the triggered programs scale—
      - Bachelor's—Ten graduates per year over three years
      - Master's—Five graduates per year over three years
- If a program is triggered, do another program review in two years to see if the program is healthy instead of the normal five-year span.

Other Comments about inter-disciplinary programs:

- ISYE included ACO in its program review, but it was not done formally
- ACO has a program committee that operates like other units and does a programs report
- Need a mechanism to protect the good programs and ferret out the other stuff
- Some inter-disciplinary programs have died due to lack of leadership and funding, and a program review might have pointed out the weaknesses

Joseph will e-mail the following individuals about meeting to discuss the internal program review process for inter-disciplinary programs:

- Gary Parker
- Ron Arkin
- Beth Mynatt
- Brian Woodall
- Kent Barefield
- Dick Duke
- John McIntyre

3. Expectations of the EB for IRC

Per an e-mail from Said Abdel-Khalik to Joseph Hoey and Russell Gentry, the Executive Board (EB) voted at the 5/13/2003 meeting to extend the term of the IRC to August 2004 to transition the IRC into a Faculty Committee as presented in Russell Gentry's presentation to the EB on 4/8/2003. To accomplish the recommendation that a standing committee be established would take two readings by the Faculty Senate. The committee would be operational in January 2005 and members elected to the committee in Spring 2004. (Copies of the e-mail and the EB 4/8/2003 meeting were provided.) Comments included the following:

- The IRC would need to get the documents in early enough to do content review and make a synthesis judgment.
- The IRC needs a definition of synthesis
- The synthesis would contain content analysis and would point out dominant themes
- If the dominant themes conflict with each other, then the IRC would send it to Jack Lohmann

**GT Institute Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes, October 7, 2003  
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower  
Page 3**

- Several of the members of the IRC committee voiced that they were uncomfortable with the role of passing judgment on other programs; felt there would be a need for a change in the charter to take on that charge
- Recommendations would be kept at the unit level, not at a cross-program level
- Members had a concern about whether the members of the committee would be appointed or elected
- Some of the members of the committee voiced strong opinion that it should not be used to provide strategic information to Provost and the President (stated on Page 6, Paragraph 2 of the EB 4/8/2003 minutes handout), nor a strategic role
- Members again questioned whether the IRC committee should disband rather than increasing its role

The discussion of the role of the IRC was to be continued through an e-mail discussion.

4. Schedule.

Three of the units will finish their program self-studies in the fall, so it was recommended that they be reviewed during the fall semester and four programs reviewed next spring. The next meeting is scheduled for 11/18/2003. It was recommended that the IRC also meet in January and February. Members felt that not enough time was allowed for the review process for the last April 15 meeting. Many members commented that they had not received the self-study reports in advance of the April 15 meeting.

The next IRC meeting will be Tuesday, November 18, 2003, 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. in the College of Sciences conference room.

/sw