GT Institute Review Committee (IRC)
Meeting Minutes, November 18, 2003
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on November 18, 2003, at 2:03 p.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Kent Barefield, Brent Carter, Mark Guzdial, Joseph Hoey, John McIntyre, Gary Parker, Steve Usselman, Paul Wine, and Brian Woodall. Russell Gentry was unable to attend.

1. Minutes—October 7, 2003
   Changes to the minutes include:
   2b.   Change "Steve Usselman commented that HCI is in good shape" to "Mark Guzdial commented that HCI is in good shape."
   2b.   Comments—Add John McIntyre to the list of individuals included in a meeting to discuss the internal program review process for inter-disciplinary programs.

2. Recommendations for IRC roles, makeup, and manner of selection: A draft memorandum to the EB regarding the function, roles, charge and makeup of the IRC was presented to the committee members present, and was discussed. Salient points of the discussion included the following:

Ron Arkin—   "Synthesis Review" is a great phrase. In favor of the document.
Steve Usselman—   Also in favor of the document, but we should also determine if there were any problems in the review.
Ron Arkin—   We might need to talk to people in unit about recommendations from unit.
Gary Parker—   What if the recommendations do not match? What if there are other goals?
                    Need timeline!!
Ron Arkin—   Ad hoc members to help with writing as possible third member of review subcommittee.
Paul Wine—   One major contributor and one minor should be the makeup of the subcommittee.
Steve Usselman—   Can we double the membership when we need it?
Joseph Hoey—   Said Abdel-Khalik indicated he would support this.
                    The Chair's Role: Pre-screen and set up the things to look at in the documentation.
Ron Arkin—   Voluntary participation—Faculty ex-officio members of the IRC can serve as long as it is not of a unit to which that faculty member belongs. Faculty ex-officio members are able to assume group duties. Our role: To make clear and lucid the facts in the summary report. We synthesize the judgments of others.
Paul Wine—   Reflect the judgments of others.
Brent Carter—   Room for someone to read through and even it out. We look for evidence—
Ron Arkin—   Is there support in multiple sources for the recommendations?
Steve Usselman—   We abstract, summarize, and some judgment is inevitable, but we all need to examine the reports to make sure we have not gone beyond the data.
Paul Wine—   Needs to go back to the Dean's level before it goes to the Provost?
                    No. It should go back only for errors and omissions.
                    If there is the perception that it has been reported improperly, that will come forward in the commentary from the dean.
Gary Parker—   Should allow for errors of fact. No iterative process.
Paul Wine—   One more iterative process would be a disaster.
Gary Parker—   We'll know when a report is over the line when we see it. We can challenge each other. The Provost deserves better than Cliff's notes.

A motion to accept the proposal as amended was made by Gary Parker and seconded by Brent Carter. The motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Joseph Hoey.