

**GT Institute Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes, November 4, 2002  
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on November 4, 2002, at 8:00 a.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Russell Gentry, Joseph Hoey, Jim McClellan, John McIntyre, and Steve Usselman. Lakshmi Sankar represented the Graduate Committee in Jeff Jagoda's absence. Farrokh Mistree, Paul Wine, and Mark Guzdial were also unable to attend.

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. Update on outcomes of 2001–02 review reports.
  - A. Joseph said that the excerpts of the reports have been sent to the Board of Regents (BOR). He will meet with the Executive Board (EB) on November 19 to discuss the outcomes. The seven reports were also sent to Dr. Chameau, who sent a letter to the deans saying what can and cannot be done within the institution's strategic plan. The total budget suggestions in these seven reports exceed the budget for the whole program. Dr. Chameau asked for recommendations on how to narrow the budget suggestions down.
  - B. Joseph said that Bob McMath and Jack Lohmann met with Frank Butler, who is the BOR Interim Vice Chancellor since Dan Papp has left. Frank Butler indicated that the report content to the BOR should include:
    1. Evidence of faculty review
    2. Evidence of actions taken based on reviewThe maximum length of time allowed by the BOR between reviews is 10 years for graduate review and 7 years for undergraduate reviews. Problem: while a 10-year cycle meets BOR graduate review requirements, it does not meet SACS requirements for continuous review and improvement of programs.
  - C. Joseph asked should we do these program reviews on a program-by-program basis or a unit-by-unit basis. The BOR recommends the program-by-program model. Should we make it optional? Discussions included the following:

Themes emerging in the discussion:

    - Incorporate more flexibility in review process, using extant accreditation reviews and the possibility of doing separate graduate/undergraduate reviews, but still adhering to an agreed-upon schedule
    - Self-study should focus on clarifying strategic direction of program. Data included should be sufficient to allow external reviewers to get a sense of the unit and programs, but should still bring to light flaws such as low enrollment or students not prepared.
    - Criteria for self-study should be more flexible and general.
    - Units are waiting to see outcomes of review. Follow-up is vital to ensuring that the process is taken seriously.
  - D. Focus was turned to the "Reflections on the First Year of Program Review at Georgia Tech" handout. A short discussion was directed at the second paragraph, third bullet, "A greater focus needs to be made on the strategic plans that speak to the Institute's objectives," and on 7a. "Prioritize recommendations received, based on the mission and strategic plan of Georgia Tech." Comments included:
    - should state "should be consistent to the institution's strategic plan
    - interesting that none of the plans relate to education—what happens with SACS?
    - unit's priorities are different than college's priorities

Time ran out for the discussion, but Joseph asked that the discussion be continued by e-mail. Meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Sue Woolard.