

**GT Institute Review Committee (IRC)
Meeting Minutes, April 4, 2003
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower**

A meeting was held in the College of Sciences Conference Room on April 4, 2003, at 8:00 a.m. Members present included Kent Barefield, Russell Gentry, Mark Guzdial, Joseph Hoey, Jeff Jagoda, Jim McClellan, John McIntyre, Farrokh Mistree, Gary Parker, and Paul Wine. Ron Arkin, Brent Carter, Steve Usselman, and Brian Woodall were unable to attend.

1. Minutes

The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed. Russell Gentry moved that the minutes be accepted, seconded by Kent Barefield. All were in favor; none opposed.

2. Presentation to the Executive Board—Russell Gentry

Joseph will be unable to attend the upcoming Executive Board (EB) meeting. In his absence, Russell will make the IRC presentation. The meeting will be held in the Wardlaw Center on Tuesday, April 8, from 3:00–5:00 p.m. Russell asked that those IRC members who could attend to please do so. Russell noted that Said Abdel-Khalik requested and has received a copy of this presentation. The following discussion took place and recommendations for changes were made regarding the presentation handout.

- a. Slide 1—Add the names of the members of the IRC committee.
- b. Slide 3—Emphasize that there is no process in place for reviews by the UGCC to avoid the appearance of blaming the UGCC.
- c. Slide 5—Emphasize that the IRC is not a commentator on the content.
- d. Slide 6—Explain why the IRC wants to disband—CIAPRA.
- e. Slide 6—Use past tense to show that the IRC requested more members in Fall 2002; the IRC is not currently requesting more members.
- f. Slide 7—Since Bill Green signed the proposal, change the slide to read “Hughes/Green Proposal.”
- g. Slide 10—Farrokh Mistree moved that the Director of Assessment remain as Chair of the IRC Committee. Russell Gentry seconded the motion; all were in favor; none opposed.
- h. Slide 10—Include in the Makeup of the IRC, one representative each from the GCC, IUCC, and CIAPRA.
- i. Slide 10—There should be a memo of understanding between committees.
- j. Slide 10—There was a discussion of having a minimum of two persons for each program review. Opinions stated included the following.
 - Two people would be a huge amount of overhead.
 - ABET uses a one-person review.
 - One person’s opinion might carry too much weight.
 - One person could take the lead with the second person as the sounding board.
 - The Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) uses two people and that works.
 - UGA uses three people.
- k. Decide whether the acronym should change—IRC going forward could be confusing.
- l. Change the acronym “UGCC” to “IUCC” in all cases where it appears.
- m. Add the goal is to facilitate strategic planning by making recommendations to CIAPRA and ultimately to the Provost.
- n. Add that one of the roles of the IRC is to support CIAPRA’s policy-making administrative activities within the context of program reviews.
- o. There was discussion about not only making recommendations about each program review but also making recommendations across programs. Some of the comments included the following:
 - Administrators should be doing that.
 - The IRC should give them the information to make decisions. This is an opportunity for faculty to get involved.
 - The IRC should be careful how it makes recommendations so that two committees are not doing the same thing—conflicting roles.
 - The IRC should have at least two years of solid individual program reviews before making recommendations across programs.

GT Institute Review Committee
Meeting Minutes, April 4, 2003
College of Sciences Conference Room, Tech Tower
Page 2

- The IRC would make recommendations outside of curriculum. Reviews based on curriculum stay within the GCC and the IUCC. The IUCC could delegate program review to the IRC to assist.
- The IRC should have an advising role—to synthesize the information and put it forward, bringing the administrators' attention to things that should be noted.

Russell will make changes to the presentation and send out to everyone for their review.

3. Flowchart

Joseph handed out a "Program Review Process Flowchart." Some of the changes that should be made to it include the following:

- Add box for soliciting follow up from last year on actions taken from recommendations.
- Add box for April 15 presentations (run parallel to UGC and IUCC reviews).
- Add box for IRC liaison to initiate process by contacting schools.

4. End-of-Year IRC Tasks

- a. IRC members who will be reviewing program reviews include the following:

Biology—Paul Wine and Mark Guzdial
Public Policy—Farrokh Mistree
Architecture Ph.D.—Jeff Jagoda

The Office of Assessment will send out the program review materials to the IRC reviewers, as well as to Joe Hughes (IUCC) and Bill Green (UCC). Joseph will send out the review format.

- b. The report is due to the Board of Regents by June 30.

- c. Membership Continuation:

IRC members who were present at this meeting and who will continue on the committee next year include:
Russell Gentry
Mark Guzdial
Jim McClellan
John McIntyre
Gary Parker
Paul Wine

5. Other Items

The April 15 meeting will take place in the College of Engineering conference room, Tech Tower 3rd floor, from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. *The following was not discussed at the meeting but is added for your information:*

Schedule of Presentations:

11:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Chuck Eastman, Architecture Ph.D. program review
12:00 p.m. – 12:30 p.m. Join us for lunch (we provide)
12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. Roger Wartell and Terry Snell, School of Biology review
1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. Susan Cozzens, School of Public Policy review

Minutes prepared by Sue Woolard.