

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

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on February 7, 2003, at 8:30 a.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Russell Gentry, Mark Guzdial, Joseph Hoey, Jeff Jagoda, Jim McClellan, Farrokh Mistree, Steve Usselman, Paul Wine, Brian Woodall. John McIntyre was unable to attend.

**A. Minutes**

1. The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed. Ron Arkin requested a correction to the order of the motions under D. (*check with Joseph*)
2. A motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved with changes. All were in favor; none opposed.

**B. Progress of Current Program Reviews**

1. Biology—The program review is done. Paul Wine has had conversations with Paul Wartell regarding the program review.
2. Public Policy—The self-study draft was forwarded to Sue Rosser who has made a point-by-point commentary.
3. Industrial Design and Architecture Ph.D.—There was some confusion with Chuck Eastman as to who would notify the external reviewers. The architecture self study is completely written, but it is not known if Tom Galloway has reviewed it yet. Industrial Design has a high-level accreditation visit. The documentation for that visit will cover GT criteria as well.
4. BME—The review has been continued until next year after the new chair has been appointed.

Joseph will know by the next IRC meeting whether two or four programs will be ready for the April 15 presentation. Farrokh recommended that a cover letter go out to the deans with the name of the person responsible for each action item so that there is no misunderstanding like the one with Chuck Eastman.

**C. Continuation of Discussion of Role, Organizational Makeup, and Function of the IRC**

Options include:

1. Disband
2. Remain a twice-a-year committee
3. Become a standing committee of the UCC and the IGCC
4. Become a standard committee independent of the UCC and the IGCC

Discussion included the following points:

1. FM—Next year, do an oversight and then this committee is done.
2. FM—New committee put together as a subcommittee of UCC and IGCC, nominated by the faculty. The chair should be the Office of Assessment. Every five years, there should be a review what the committee is doing and what Jack Lohmann's committee is doing. Accept a model first, and then talk about the detail points.
3. SU—Refer to this committee as the Program Review Committee (PRC).
4. RA—Need a committee that presents the Institute priorities to the Provost, made up of faculty who are disengaged from the deans. That cannot be done in elections. The question is how to get people who are interested at the institute level. They have to be protected—It may require constitutional bylaws.
5. MG—The question was asked what is the role of Jack Lohmann's committee?  
JH—
  - The committee is called Council for Institutional and Academic Program Review and Accreditation (CIAPRA).
  - CIAPRA's main goal is SACS accreditation.
  - The outcomes of IRC should go through the Council as recommendations—it is unclear as to how it will work.
  - The Executive Board empowered the IRC to conduct the process on a one-year trial basis to see how program reviews worked.
  - The IRC's role is to also provide a series of recommendations to the Provost.
6. FM—The PRC would be a role model.

**GT Institute Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes, January 10, 2003**  
**College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**  
**Page 2**

7. MG—The role of the PRC should be to police—to be a traffic cop—speak to the Provost as well as the UCC and the IGCC.
8. JJ—In the IGCC, two people took 15 minutes to review each review. Two people wrote up the report. Don't see a need for another committee. The effort should be put into the UCC and the IGCC to do it right and into Lohmann's committee. Assessment should take the responsibility.
9. MG—Would it pass ABET review if not talking to IGCC and UCC?
10. JJ—Have IGCC and UCC elect a subcommittee. Choose people who show interest.
11. JM—What power would committee have? We do numerous reviews. Why would people worry about it? Who would enforce it? No need to add to other things being done.
12. RA—Have ear of the Provost. Potential power comes from that.
13. JM—Should become more institutionalized part of the UCC and the IGCC.
14. SU—PRC instead of having faculty committee—a body of people friendly to the Provost. The committee cannot make decisions that reside with the Provost. The committee should provide some kind of memory—meaningful input in faculty governance.
15. RA—Jean-Lou should appoint an administrator to look at the reports.
16. RG—Make a recommendation to the EB that the PRC take on substantial review and comment role.
17. JH—IGC works fine. The UCC has too much to do—so many responsibilities.
18. RA—Restructuring could help with that.
19. FM—Two people looking at the program reviews over a weekend is not adequate. It requires time and people who can look at it institutionally with no politics involved. It has to be an appointed committee with cost relief to show that it is a serious job. It should be an advisory committee that gives good information to the IGCC and the UCC.
20. RG—Condensed information.
21. FM—The information then goes up to Lohmann or whoever.
22. JJ—He disagrees. We already have SACS and ABET. This is the third review.
23. SU—Already have ourselves.
24. JJ—There is a limit at how qualified they are going to be to look at it. If they spend more than one weekend, it won't make a difference.
25. RG—IRC program review is done on a broad level. Don't see as our place to make that recommendation.
26. MG—Last time the UCC didn't have time for the summation process. How much time should be put into the program review? If more than one weekend, then they need another committee.
27. FM—Go back to Said and report what happened.
28. JH—We just asked the EB for four more members and now we want to ax it.
29. FM—Joseph should go back to the EB with other suggestions in an informal sort of way.
30. RG—Without a motion from the EB, this committee would have folded.
31. PW—It would have been done before the Lohmann group.
32. RA—Get some agenda time with the UCC and the IGCC.
33. FM—That is a great idea. Touch base with the EB and the UCC and the IGCC.
34. JH—He would be happy to go to the UCC and the IGCC and present where we are.
35. RG—The IRC should meet again before Joseph goes to the EB.
36. JH—If invited, he will attend the IGCC and the UCC. He will contact Said and engage Lohmann in a dialogue.
37. FM—Go to a listening mode now.
38. RA—This committee is on the verge of dissolving itself.
39. FM—Get rid of the people thing—Call it IRC.
40. MG—UCC does not meet until March.
41. BW—When asked what he thought about the group, he answered that regarding content review, he didn't think many were competent to review another program other than their own.
42. RA—Have a set of experts who have done that.

**D. Follow Up to be Done:**

Joseph will contact Jack Lohmann to discuss the PRC informally and contact Said (through Joe Hughes) about attending the IGCC and the UCC to discuss the status of the PRC. He will report back to the PRC at the next meeting before going to the EB meeting in March.