

**GT Institute Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes, December 2, 2002  
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on December 2, 2002, at 8:00 a.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Mark Guzdial, Joseph Hoey, John McIntyre, and Farrokh Mistree. Lakshmi Sankar represented the Graduate Committee in Jeff Jagoda's absence. Russell Gentry, Paul Wine, Jim McClellan, and Steve Usselman 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. Discussion of the document presented to the EB on November 19<sup>th</sup> and the EB's reactions. Joseph said that the Provost was supportive of the idea of additional flexibility and also with separate graduate and undergraduate reviews. He was also supportive of loosening up the criteria for program reviews.
  - a. The EB requested that the IRC committee discuss whether a Standing Committee of the Academic Faculty should take the IRC's place and asked for a report to the EB in March 2003. The issue will be added as an agenda item for discussion at the January IRC meeting. A request was made that a longer meeting time be scheduled in January for the discussion.
  - b. The EB recommend that the IRC be increased by 50% to twelve people for the spring semester in order to provide continuity. The size of the group will go back to eight next fall in addition to the liaisons from the UCC and the UGC. The four new members will include:
    - 2 members from the College of Engineering
    - 1 member from the College of Sciences
    - 1 member from Ivan Allen CollegePreferably, the members from the College of Engineering will have ABET experience or trained as ABET reviewers. It is also preferred that the new members selected are not directly involved in the program review process of their particular schools.
  - c. A discussion of the role of the IRC Committee included:
    - i. The IRC should set the criteria and follow up the process as follows:
      - 1<sup>st</sup> year: to see that the process is in place
      - 2<sup>nd</sup> year: to look at closing the loop
      - 3<sup>rd</sup> year: to make sure that the loop is closed

The IRC also looks at the external reviews and self-studies, which form the substance of any further queries if there are concerns. The question was how to monitor the "closing the loop" aspect annually. It was suggested that because the schools are required to submit an annual assessment to the Provost, they could also address improvement needs highlighted in the program reviews on an annual basis. It was noted that the annual updates are also copied to the Office of Assessment, so Joseph would have copies of the updates for the IRC. It was suggested that the IRC send copies of the previous reviews to the schools undergoing review so they could address any prior concerns. An online process that is being developed with OIT will make this information available.

- ii. While the role of the committee is to define the process, a suggestion was made that someone needs to look over the program reviews to make sure they fit with the strategic plan of the university. Another concern raised was that with an increase in joint degrees, are the colleges responsible for the program reviews or who should be responsible for looking at them? The concerns should be the work of the deans and chairs, but also may be something to be brought up to the Council on Institutional and Academic Program Review and Accreditation, chaired by Jack Lohmann.
- iii. It was discussed whether the IRC committee should volunteer to assist the UCC—only if the UCC feels that it is appropriate—with the program reviews since the EB had not made a recommendation to increase the UCC's membership size.

**GT Institute Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes, December 2, 2002**  
**College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**  
**Page 2**

- d. The following action items or motions developed out of the discussion.
  - i. Joseph will speak to Joe Hughes informally to find out if the UCC would like a former or current member of the IRC to guide the UCC through the program review process.
  - ii. A motion was made and seconded to ask the deans from the College of Engineering, College of Sciences, and Ivan Allen College to submit names of individuals to serve on the IRC committee during Spring 2003. The members from the College of Engineering should have direct ABET review experience and/or trained as an ABET reviewer. The recommended members should not be directly involved in an ongoing program review in his or her school. All were in favor; none opposed.
  - iii. A motion was made that it should be part of the responsibility of the IRC to require that schools submit annual assessment updates that address points of concern identified in the program reviews. The requirement will be conveyed to the Provost and deans in a letter. All were in favor; none opposed.
3. Update on Progress of 2002–2003 Reviews
  - a. Biology—The external reviewers have completed their review. Neither Paul nor Joseph was asked to meet with the reviewers. The self-study has been completed and the review report is in progress. Biology is on target for its April deadline.
  - b. Architecture Ph.D.—Joseph met with Chuck Eastman. Because of a miscommunication, Architecture thought that the IRC would be responsible for selecting and contacting external reviewers. Because of that, they are now just beginning to select external reviewers.
  - c. Industrial Design—The list of external reviewers has been approved by the Provost and Dean and was sent to the Board of Regents (BOR) for approval.
  - d. Public Policy—The list of external reviewers has been sent to the Provost and Dean for approval.
  - e. BME—The program review will be continued until next year because of the search for a new chair.
  - f. ECE—The review has been continued until fall 2003 in order to align with the leadership review.
4. Developing recommendations on open information and timing of document disclosure for program review documentation.

Joseph handed out a memo from Willie Pearson, asking what the policy is for releasing the program review documents. None of the IRC members had any objection to the releasing program reviews, and all agreed that releasing the reviews should be the responsibility of the deans and Provost.
5. Scheduling of meetings for Spring 2003.

It was agreed that the first Friday of each month at 8:30 a.m. might be an appropriate time for IRC meetings during the Spring 2003 semester. Sue will contact the members this week to set up a schedule for next semester.

A motion was made and seconded to end the meeting; none opposed. The meeting ended at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Sue Woolard.