

**GT Institute Review Committee (IRC)  
Meeting Minutes, March 21, 2003  
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on March 21, 2003, at 8:00 a.m. Members present included Ron Arkin, Kent Barefield, Brent Carter, Russell Gentry, Joseph Hoey, Farrokh Mistree, Paul Wine, and Brian Woodall. Mark Guzdial, Jeff Jagoda, Jim McClellan, John McIntyre, Gary Parker, and Steve Usselman were unable to attend.

1. Minutes
  - a. The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed. It was noted that references to PRC are premature since the current committee is still the IRC. Ron Arkin moved that the minutes be accepted, seconded by Paul Wine. All were in favor; none opposed.
2. Progress of Current Program Reviews
  - a. Biology—The program review is done. Kent will follow up to see if Biology has received the external review report. BME—The review has been continued until next year after the new chair has been appointed. ECE – the review has been continued until next fall to permit the recruitment of a qualified panel of visiting external reviewers.
  - b. Architecture Ph.D.—The external reviewers will be here April 5, and the report will not be back until April 15.
  - c. Moving the program review presentations to May 15 was discussed. However, it was decided that a precedence would be set if programs were allowed to move back their presentation deadlines. Presentations will take place on April 15, from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. with lunch provided. Sue will check for availability of the College of Engineering conference room. Roger Wartell has a College of Sciences meeting that date, but we will try to schedule his presentation around that.
3. Continuation of Discussion of Role, Organizational Makeup, and Function of the IRC  
Discussion included the following points:
  - a. Discussion of Hughes Proposal
    1. Joseph said that he went to the Institute Graduate Committee (IGC) meeting with Joe Hughes. The proposed changes to the IRC were rejected by the IGC because the committee feels that it already has
      - a process in place
      - good content review
      - turned in the reviews on time.
    2. Members discussed the notion that the Hughes proposal is still very workable. It was noted that if the Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (IUCC) wants it, it could be the undergraduate committee that uses the standing subcommittee structure. The Hughes draft requests the creation of a content review process by which content should be reviewed. Said Abdel-Khalik thought it would be useful if the committee would create templates for the IUCC.
    4. Members liked very much the fact that the Hughes draft fits with the bylaws of the curriculum committees already in place; it is thus less worrisome about the people who do the reviews. The model described is the one that is already in place for study abroad and joint programs.
    5. Discussion of the proposal included the following points:
      - Need people who are competent, who know how to do the review work.
      - Some members of this committee could be assigned to the committee.
      - Could start with people with little experience. There is enough flexibility to go either way.
      - Could make recommendations for people that should be put on.
      - The IRC was formed at the request of the Executive Board (EB), but the Hughes memo suggests the way of doing it?
      - It expands the charter to include reviewing content.
      - If this committee reviews curriculum, it would be a violation.
      - No one was doing program reviews at the Institute level; it was being done on a college-by-college basis.
  - b. Future of the Institute Review Committee  
Discussion turned next to the future of the IRC. Members noted that originally, this committee was set to dissolve at the end of the year. It was mentioned that if this committee morphs into the next

**GT Institute Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes, March 21, 2003**  
**College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**  
**Page 2**

committee (as under the Hughes proposal), these people won't necessarily be on the next committee. A number of points were brought up in the discussion:

- The EB doesn't want the IRC to go away.
- Have at least one more year in existence for the IRC or whatever it becomes named. The EB will decide how big the committee is.
- Don't like the twice-a-year meeting proposal in context of what has happened here. Tailor it to the IUCC. Joe Hughes has a sound proposal; he knows what is doable.
- What does review mean? We have not been clear on an operational definition of what it is to "review" a curriculum.
- The review process should include basically comment on the strength of the program. It is the function of the review committee to
  - Ensure they do the review.
  - Collect the information.
  - Pass it along to Jack Lohmann who passes it along to the Provost.
- A strength of the standing subcommittee approach is that it is faculty driven. Using this system, if the PRC develops recommendations for action that are passed on to Lohmann's Council and then to the Provost, the GT administration becomes accountable to the faculty for carrying out those recommendations.
- The external reviewer's report looks over the entire spectrum of curricula, including self-study.
- The committee would have the Dean's commentary or reactions to the report, the Curriculum review by the IUCC or the IGC, packaged program-by-program for the Provost.

c. Communicating Findings of Reviews

Members discussed the "handshake" process by which the IRC or PRC communicates its findings to the Council. Comments included the following:

- Jack Lohmann is looking at the process. His committee is made up of academic support services, student support services, and associate deans, primarily to get ready for SACS.
- How does this committee and Jack Lohmann's committee intersect?
- High-level summarized report we deliver to the EB and to the Council.
- The Council is there to get SACS done. Provides the quality improvement piece.
- The Council looks at the work presented to them, but they are not there to do the grunt work.

d. Discussion of the "Master Schedule" document

Members next turned to a discussion of a "Master Schedule" of reviews being developed by the GT Office of Assessment. The handout is a first attempt to combine professional accreditation, unit review, leadership review, and Board of Regent's (BoR) review. The goal is to get a handle on the inventory of all review processes at GT and enable a redesign of the process to move forward so that as much efficiency as desirable can be built into the system.

- The IRC oversees the BoR review. All four could be the same if we choose.
- Try to be flexible to capture how others use it to do the review process.
- This will be used to develop a master schedule of review elements.
- If a program passes the standards of one accreditation agency, it will meet the BoR requirements.
- This should be used to develop a list of best practices.

e. Discussion of "Tasks for Institute Review Committee" handout

*The handout is a summary of the notes taken of a telephone conversation Joseph had with Said Abdel-Khalik on 3/20.*

- Dean Rosser created a flowchart that could be used as a process model for the further development of the program review process.
- Templates should be recommended but not required. People did not like the required templates. Guidelines should be provided.
- However, it is interesting to note that ARCH Ph.D. and Public Policy used the templates.

4. Further Development of Recommendations to the EB for the future of the IRC

**GT Institute Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes, March 21, 2003**  
**College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**  
**Page 3**

- a. Ron Arkin moved that the IRC endorse Joe Hughes's memo with a friendly amendment that either the IUCC or the IGC could opt out of the process at any stage. Paul Wine seconded the motion. All were in favor; none opposed.
  - b. In Joseph's absence, Russell will present the motion to the EB on April 8.
5. Next Regular IRC Meeting  
The next meeting will be on Friday, April 4, at 8:00 a.m. Note that the remaining regular meetings will be held at 8:00 a.m. instead of 8:30 a.m. to accommodate those who have classes.

Minutes prepared by Joseph Hoey.