

General Education Reform between Hope and Cynicism:
Meeting the Challenge of the Twenty-first Century
Final Report of the GERA Committee

Phil Kraemer (Co-chair)

Ernest J. Yanarella (Co-chair)

Ruth Beattie (Biology)

Larry Grabau (Agriculture)

Richard Greissman (Provost's Office)

Jane Jensen (Education)

Deborah Moore (Office of Assessment)

Norman Pedigo (TASC)

Connie Ray (Institutional Research,
Planning and Effectiveness)

William Rayens (Statistics)

Rebecca Scott (Office of Assessment)

Gerald Smith (History)

Kaveh Tagavi (Senate Council Office)

Final Report of the GERA Committee

Introduction and Background:

General education is the keystone of the University of Kentucky's undergraduate curriculum. Since the middle of the decade of the 1980s, it has been delivered through the University Studies Program (USP).

With the launch of the first comprehensive program review of USP by the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness in 2004, an opportunity presented itself to consider needed changes and even possibilities for wholesale renovation of this general education foundation. Two committees were formed in this process—the USP Self-Study Committee and the USP External Review Committee (ERC)—and each prepared lengthy reports to the Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, as well as to the university community in general.

Occurring in tandem with the USP comprehensive program review was a general education initiative spawned by the Senate Council chair office and supported by the Senate Council. Preliminary activities included:

- sending a group of faculty and administrators on an information gathering trip to Miami University in the Spring of 2005 to learn about their program structure, how it evolved and is being sustained, and how faculty development and assessment activities are linked to the Miami Plan (<http://www.muohio.edu/academics/miamiplan/index.cfm>);
- interacting with a team from Indiana University-Purdue University--Indianapolis (IUPUI) about the framing of their program around 6 principles of undergraduate learning coupled with information about strategies for assessment in undergraduate education by Dr. Trudy Banta, an internationally known expert in the arena of higher education assessment (http://www.iupui.edu/academic/undergrad_principles.html); and
- conducting a series of informal summer meetings regarding strategies for sustaining attention on reform options.

Subsequently, an effort was made to formalize this initiative and solicit support from the Senate Council and the Provost's office and to integrate a new committee into the formal review process.

The General Education Reform and Assessment (GERA) Committee is an entity of the Senate Council and the Provost's office. Its membership was based on recommendations generated by the Senate Council and the interim Provost. It was instituted to address needs associated with information gathered from the preliminary work during the previous spring and summer terms. Its mandate was two-fold in nature:

to catalyze campus discussions about the reform of USP and to cultivate a culture of assessment surrounding this reform effort.

In nearly one year of committee work and service to the faculty and University, GERA has fielded a host of major activities including:

- the sponsorship of a faculty survey on attitudes toward USP using a tool made available for no cost by the American Association for Colleges and Universities (AAC&U);
- coordination of 15 College and other constituency forums focused on the framework of core learning outcomes tentatively proposed in the USP preliminary ERC report;
- the hosting of a GERA website to facilitate communication with faculty, administrators, and students across campus;
- underwriting participation of an eight-member team to the June 2006 AAC&U Institute on General Education in Washington, DC; and
- the directing of a mid-August 2006 planning process workshop for over twenty-five representative faculty and college administrators to explore basic skills, curriculum models, and assessment issues in preparation to support and sustain the initiative into its next phase of development.

This report seeks to comply with the Senate Council's expressed wish that the GERA committee prepare a report for the University Senate and its executive arm to review at the end of August 2006. This report is the culmination of GERA's work and committee life.

Fall Faculty Survey on Attitudes toward USP—Process and Results:

As suggested by its title, AAC&U's *Assessing General Education: A Questionnaire to Initiate Campus Conversations* is a survey tool to help generate discussion and facilitate improvement planning associated with general education programs. GERA was granted permission to administer this tool to faculty at the University of Kentucky during the Fall of 2005. Of the 1232 faculty invited to participate, 309 completed the electronic survey during the month of October for a 25% response rate. Although a higher response rate was desired, the respondents were fairly representative of the overall population with minor exceptions.

Faculty gave low ratings to 9 of the 28 dimensions associated with general education programs. The 9 dimensions with low ratings are listed below with segments of the survey statements defining the dimensions:

- Goals (*...is expressed primarily as a list of courses...*)
- Coherence (*...fragmented...up to the students to search for commonalities...make connection...*)

- Structure (*...reflects a distribution structure...*)
- Faculty Student Interactions (*...rarely interact outside the classroom...*)
- Faculty Community (*...each teaches his or her own...little or no consultation or dialogue...*)
- Coordination (*...exists...as a list of course offerings...staff who verify...the requirements...*)
- Image (*...regard...requirements as an obstacle...in the way of their major...*)
- Faculty Development (*...support... related to general education is minimal...*)
- Assessment (*...no evaluation of our program as a whole...*)

These values suggest our faculty view the current program as reflecting a distribution structure in which goals are expressed primarily as a list of courses. Faculty ratings of program coherence suggest that our students likely experience USP as fragmented and disconnected, leaving them to search for commonalities and to make their own connections across their USP learning experiences. Further, faculty seem somewhat isolated in their efforts, having neither the benefit of collegial conversation about USP/general education nor the satisfaction of student interaction beyond the classroom context. Coupled with low ratings on Coordination and Image, the courses may be perceived as obstacles for students and instructors alike.

Of note was the consistency of the pattern of responses across faculty subgroups formed around background characteristics such as tenure status, teaching assignments, and academic disciplines. A summary of the results is available at <http://www.uky.edu/gera/meachum/Key%20outcomes%20overview.pdf>.

Campus Forums and the USP Preliminary Framework of Learning Outcomes:

During the Fall 2005 semester, GERA committee members spent considerable time digesting the substance of the USP External Review Committee Preliminary Report (ERC Report) and deciding how best to promote campus conversation about its recommendations. The committee determined that a series of GERA-sponsored forums focused on individual Colleges and key constituency groups across campus would be effective in promoting open dialogue. In order to encourage greater involvement in each College forum, notable College faculty members were contacted and asked to serve as co-facilitators along with GERA members. A PowerPoint presentation was devised by the committee and a preliminary training session was scheduled to assist College co-facilitators in understanding their role.

These forums were conducted beginning in the first two weeks of the Spring 2006 semester. (The GERA website—www.uky.edu/GERA—enumerates the dates and times of each forum and presents a detailed summary of those colloquies assisted by staff members of the UK Teaching and Academic Support Center.) These campus

conversations included all of the undergraduate Colleges (Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Communications and Information Studies, Design, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health Sciences, Nursing, Social Work), the Health Care College associate deans, the Academic Advising Network, and a Business-Community summit. In addition, the two GERA committee co-chairs attended a Library College faculty meeting, gave brief presentations and facilitated a wide-ranging discussion among the Library faculty and their dean about general education and assessment reform. A student forum drawing from representatives of Student Government Association was planned for late in the Spring 2006 semester, but canceled due to scheduling problems and anticipated minimal attendance.

The value of these forums cannot be overstated. Although attendance ranged widely from a low of 5-6 to a high of 40 or more, the quality of these discussions was uniformly impressive. College faculty freely offered their assessments of the USP External Review Committee proposed preliminary learning outcome framework, noting its perceived virtues and shortcomings. Those in the professional colleges (e.g., Nursing) tended to be particularly supportive toward integrating assessment into any new general education program. Many in the College of Arts and Sciences, who believed that the brunt of any new general education curriculum would fall to their College, raised important questions about the proposed core learning outcome framework and its practical implications. College faculty in Design and Fine Arts were especially interested in involving themselves in the teaching of general education within a new framework. Faculty in the College of Education dwelt in particular on the long-term need of any general education revision to be linked to primary and secondary education changes, improvements, and reforms.

Other strong themes from the faculty forums included:

- expressed concern over how the stresses and strains of a dramatically increased undergraduate enrollment, the emphasis on graduate education, and the teaching needs of the undergraduate program might place too much responsibility for the instruction of general education into the hands of graduate students;
- the desire for any new general education curriculum to break out of the traditional curriculum structure of offering largely three- or four-credit hour courses in order to promote greater innovation and differentiation in offering both lower credit curricular or course enhancement opportunities (i.e., music appreciation, campus talks and colloquia, workshops, and short-term study abroad), as well as the need for more creative pedagogy;
- the value of integrating different kinds of literacy into substantive courses as part of general education offerings (i.e., media literacy, design literacy, information literacy, health literacy, literacy of the arts, political literacy, technological literacy, environmental literacy, etc.);
- the need for inclusion of a cross-cultural, global component within the stated objectives. Both faculty and employers stressed the need for UK students to be able to work ethically within multi-cultural settings;

- the need to incorporate an emphasis on basic skills currently found in USP into the list of core learning outcomes within any new general education foundation.
- the need to connect the curriculum across the board so that students can understand how the learning objectives and general education relate to their major, as well as to the “world of work”. This connection would lay the foundation for UK graduates to continue to be “lifelong – learners.”

The list of suggestions offered above is hardly exhaustive. More complete records of the forums are presented on the GERA website. In summary, these reactions, criticisms, and suggestions serve as a testament to the interest generated by the GERA hosted college and constituency forums and the engagement and thoughtfulness of those faculty who participated in these forums.

As a result of these forums, the USP External Review Committee, being informed by the responses to their preliminary report from the faculty, was able to work to prepare a final report that addressed or incorporated many of the issues and suggestions raised during the spring dialogues.

AAC&U Institute on General Education the UK Eight-Member Team:

With the completion of its major Spring activity, GERA’s attention focused on assessing the course of the general education initiative within a broader, national context. Seeking a way to evaluate the progress of the committee’s efforts toward mobilizing critical reflection on USP’s performance and the need for reform and possible renovation, the GERA Committee applied to send an eight-person team to the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) sponsored Institute on General Education. As an organization, AAC&U has been a champion of the value of a liberal education, sponsoring a variety of forums for institutions to focus on and advance their internal efforts with assistance from other institutions and national experts in reform. The team was composed of the following individuals: Suketu Bhavsar, Tony Hardin, Jane Jensen, Philipp Kraemer, Derek Lane, Deborah Moore, William Rayens, and Ernest J. Yanarella.

This institute presented itself as a signal opportunity to test where this home-grown initiative in revising general education stood in relation to national trends in thinking about the present and future landscape of general education and to similar campus campaigns working to achieve the same objectives elsewhere. The committee expected that such a five-day workshop sponsored and conducted by the AAC&U, perhaps the premier national association in higher education today, would serve this purpose well. In this hope, it was not disappointed.

The AAC&U brought to the institute a faculty of well-known, even renowned, experts in educational studies—noted specialists including Carol Schneider, Ann Ferren, and Lee Knepfelkamp. Although the institute content was often helpful, even illuminating, it generally proved to be better geared toward university teams who were a

year behind where the UK initiative was. Still, the institute proceedings proved to be valuable opportunities in which to discuss ideas and issues informally with key institute faculty (such as those enumerated above) and among UK team members. Many of the insights and positive steps generated in committee meetings and forums were reinforced in the plenary and workshop sessions by institute facilitators and through the experiences of faculty members on other teams. UK team members learned a valuable conceptual vocabulary (i.e., “intentionality”; “change agents as ‘carpenters,’ ‘quilters,’ and ‘glassblowers’”; “‘potholes’ which get in the way of successful reform”); discovered a number of “nuggets” (changing portraits of liberal and general education within the 19th century college, the 20th century university, and the 21st century academy; recognition of the emerging synthesis of academic and vocational streams of skills and competencies of the past into “intellectual/practical skills”; melding general education into the major where possible) that they brought back to the wider GERA Committee membership to share and integrate into ongoing discussion and debate of where this initiative should go and what form reform and renovation should take.

One work product of institute involvement by the UK team was its institute report (see appendix), which outlined the background to this reform effort, highlighted aspects of the USP External Review Committee final report, and sketched out possible future actions. As reported subsequently, the UK team came away from the institute with two strong impressions: (1) that while the UK team was no less confused than other Research I university teams in attendance on some issues like implementation, in many other respects, it was in better shape and more advanced than UK’s research extensive counterparts regarding the task of reform; and (2) that the GERA Committee and the USP External Review Committee have been following a parallel path with national trends in the thinking and reform of general education.

Mid-August Planning Process Workshop:

The summer GERA workshop was originally planned as a five-day event and with an ambitious agenda that included curriculum modeling both as a special focus of one day of the week-long enterprise and as an assignment for groups of participants over the course of the entire workshop. When a critical mass could not be mustered, the workshop was postponed, shortened in scope, and reduced to four half-day sessions culminating in a forum among participants and associate deans of different undergraduate Colleges.

For all the enthusiasm vested by the GERA Committee in the mid-August planning process workshop as its last major activity, its members remained keenly sensitive to the caveat issued by the Senate Council in its support for this event not to run ahead of University Senate and general faculty consensus. This concern shaped the scope of the workshop and the goals and intentions that were set for it. It was explicitly reflected in the topics chosen for special focus and the material product sought by its closing.

The three guiding topics of the GERA workshop were:

- an overview of USP reform from its inception to the present and curriculum models lite (i.e., presentation of some generic models of general education curriculum uncovered in the GERA Committee’s work and highlighted in Derek Bok’s recent book, *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should be Learning More*);
- an examination of the USP External Review Committee report as an essential point of departure for discussion and as a foundation for exploring the subject of basic or essential skills; and
- a review of the place and value of assessment as a driver of general education reform and improvement—including an outline of two different models for integrating general education and assessment (James Madison University and Rose Hulman Institute of Technology).

Along the way, the presenters and facilitators of these subjects sought to elicit ideas, reactions, and recommendations on the various perspectives and opened up discussion for critical reflection and dialogue.

By the last day of the planning process workshop, it was evident that a clear set of issues and questions was placed on the table for further and continuing discussion and debate in any second stage of the general education initiative dealing with curriculum design and implementation. These issues and questions were the following:

Faculty Involvement and Responsibility

1. Will faculty be willing to be more involved in the development of a new general education curriculum given the trends in general education reform nationally and pressures from external forces for more accountability in higher education (state legislators, CPE, national political forces)?
2. Can we expect faculty to teach differently in the face of a new or revised general education curriculum, especially where general education curriculum objectives and core learning-outcomes are extended into the major (e.g., writing and oral communications)?
3. Can we expect faculty to willingly shoulder responsibilities for better integrating assessment into general education in order to better understand strengths and weaknesses of any new program and to gauge student development?
4. What kinds of new programs in TA training and faculty development might be needed to assure quality teaching of a new curriculum and in what ways would such programs be supported by resources from the Colleges and University?
5. How reasonable is it to expect the faculty reward and incentive structure of the university (and of the academic community nationally and internationally) to

reflect the kinds of teaching and service responsibilities that might be generated by a new or revised curricular model, especially one that includes curricular objectives, learning outcomes, and assessment components?

College Commitments

6. Given that the first phase of this general education initiative has been quite transparent and open in its effort to frame the broad terms of such reform, how involved do the Colleges and their faculty wish to be in developing and implementing a new or revised curriculum model as this initiative moves into its next phase?
7. Do the Colleges have a vested interest in participating in a serious assessment regimen in ways that will improve delivery of College requirements and other contributions to a new general education curriculum?
8. In light of the USP External Review Committee's recommendations for expanding the list of essential skills to include other forms of literacy (such as health and information), can the Colleges cover these forms of literacy and perhaps even help shoulder some of the more traditional skills such as math, statistics, written and oral communication, and maybe science through one or more departments or majors?
9. Given the overarching principle enunciated in the USP ERC final report (prepare "students for lifelong learning, actively engaged in the global community of the 21st century"), what curriculum objectives should be expected of any new science requirement and what format would best advance those course goals?
10. Given that a significant majority of workshop participants believe that foreign language should be taught more as an aspect of global or cultural literacy than as a skill demanding proficiency, how will the Colleges react to this recommendation, and might this dialogue produce alternative approaches to traditional language requirements?

University Support

11. Can we reasonably strive to develop excellence in undergraduate education and its central component, general education, while pursuing top 20 status among public research universities by 2020?
12. Is this the wrong way to ask this question and would it be better to put it in this fashion: Can we reasonably strive to develop excellence in undergraduate education in the context and with the special strengths and idiosyncrasies of a public research university?

13. In the event that a new General Education curriculum is created, where is the money going to come from and where should it go? Will the Arts and Sciences College bear the brunt of the burden of general education or are other Colleges willing to shoulder more of the heavy lifting?
14. Are there ways to integrate extracurricular activities into fulfilling general education objectives, learning outcomes, and skills that provides the possibility of breaking out of the typical 3 or 4 credit hour curriculum structure of courses?

These fourteen queries then became the foci of wide-ranging discussion, first, by the twenty-five workshop attendees and then later in the morning with the associate deans and academic support, residence life, and student affairs administrative staff who joined the group.

Discussion on these topics was lively, probing, and enlightening. Representatives from three of the largest Colleges—Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, and Business and Economics—pointed to serious discussion and reform efforts currently underway for the improvement of their undergraduate college curriculum. In some cases, these discussions and efforts are parallel with the direction that the USP ERC final report pointed towards in several of its recommendations. Others addressed the knotty issue of the balance between the University’s reach for top 20 status among public universities and the pursuit of undergraduate excellence. It may not be too strong a claim to argue that a consensus in the room seemed to materialize around that both goals *could* and *should* be pursued but with the understanding that general education reform and undergraduate curriculum improvement in general must be achieved in the context and through the special assets of the University of Kentucky as a Research I or research extensive university.

As to the question of what could be expected from their College faculty, the strong message that was evident was that faculty would support general education reform only if it meant that they would be able to teach differently and with the prospect of freeing up more of their time for research and graduate teaching. They would not be supportive if it meant that such curricular revision entailed that they would have to do “more with less” (i.e., more time and responsibility, fewer resources, etc.). A qualification to this message was the voice of one assessment practitioner who underlined that implementation of a new program and serious assessment mechanisms might initially require more faculty time and energy, though once implemented such costs would decline. After the initial front loading of resources to set the assessment work in place, improvements in student learning and program cohesiveness would begin to accrue benefits. None of the associate deans, support staff, or faculty members suggested that an updated and improved general education curriculum could be put into place without the necessary resources to meet the new requirements. Nor did anyone argue that general education reform could occur without recognizing the need to redistribute resources among the Colleges to reflect the relative contribution of each College to those new responsibilities.

Conclusion:

The end of the first phase of this general education and assessment campaign brings to a close the work of the GERA Committee and that of the USP External Review Committee in advancing the guiding goals and purposes animating each. The GERA Committee has worked vigilantly to address its twin purpose: stimulating campus dialogue and debate over general education reform; and highlighting the value and virtues of integrating strong program and student assessment into any such curricular reform or renovation. Any new phase must:

- look to ways to assure continuity with the initial conceptual phase of this initiative;
- institute faculty committee mechanisms to turn to the difficult, but necessary tasks of curriculum design, course generation and implementation planning;
- determine the place and relative roles of general education and Colleges and majors in the designing and satisfying of curricular and accreditation requirements of any new program;
- consider how opportunities for faculty development and graduate student teacher training can be incorporated into general education reform; and not least of all
- work with the Provost and President in calibrating faculty resources and monetary support for such general education reform in the context of significantly increased undergraduate enrollment.

On behalf of the membership of the GERA Committee, the co-chairs would like to thank all those University and administrative faculty who participated in the committee-sponsored forums, who quarreled with us, who enlightened us, and who challenged us to give a significant measure of our thought, energy, time, expertise, and hope to this first phase of what we see as the last best chance for major structural reform of UK's general education curriculum for the foreseeable future.

Appendices

Appendix 1: GERA Committee Composition

Phil Kraemer, co-chair, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

Ernie Yanarella, co-chair, Senate Council Chair/Faculty member

Ruth Beattie, Faculty member

Larry Grabau, Faculty member

Richard Greissman, Assistant Provost for Program Support

Jane Jensen, Faculty member

Deb Moore, Director, Office of Assessment

Norman Pedigo, Director, Teaching and Academic Support Center

Connie Ray, VP for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness

William Rayens, Faculty member

Rebecca Scott, webmaster/support, Office of Assessment

Gerald Smith, Faculty member

Kaveh Tagavi, Senate Council Chair, Ex-Officio

Appendix 2: USP External Review Committee Members

Alan DeSantis, Committee Chair Emeritus, Communications

William Rayens, Committee Chair, Statistics

Tony Hardin, Theater

Jeff Osborn, Biology

Jane Peters, Art

Jane Wells, Accounting

Appendix 3: UK Team Report to AAC&U Institute

Background

In February of 2005 a faculty committee was charged by the Provost to generate a series of guidelines and ideas, in an abbreviated document, that would serve as an intellectual springboard for further discussion about reform and revitalization of our current general studies program. The report brought forth by that committee was publicly vetted in 15 faculty and constituency forums, revised and then submitted to the Provost and the Senate Council. It called for the establishment of a set of four *core curriculum objectives* – and a host of associated learning outcomes - which would allow for an articulation of the skills and knowledge desired for all graduates of the University of Kentucky, regardless of major. The essential message was that a coherent framework for describing these shared objectives and outcomes must be conceptualized *before* the design of a curricular model and implementation issues can be sensibly debated. This conceptual framework has not been officially adopted by the University; that process is ahead of us. But we are proceeding on the assumption that this set of principles or one that is very similar in spirit and intent will be adopted.

Looking Ahead

The abovementioned report also listed a series of recommended next steps and a timetable for completion of various broad phases of our reform process. The specifics are still a little uncertain, since the plan and the timetable are undergoing constant revision as we better understand the process, and as we absorb more of what we have heard at the Institute. In broad terms, however, the plans for advancing our project once we return to campus are delineated below.

1. Summer Workshop – we have been working on this idea for several months and a lot of time has been devoted to identifying the key individuals on campus to invite. One of the primary purposes of the workshop is to communicate what we have learned at the Institute. But we also want to:
 - a. Link the ERC proposed framework of curricular objectives, learning outcomes, and encompassing mission to national trends in designs for liberal and general education.
 - b. Conceptualize alternative curricular models and begin to debate their pros and cons.
 - c. Open a discussion on which skills are truly essential skills for our undergraduates, and begin the process of convincing faculty that it is no longer rational to dichotomize intellectual and practical skills, which is something new that we picked up at the Institute.
 - d. Familiarize participants with different assessment strategies and begin to debate their strengths and weaknesses.
 - e. Initiate open conversations with each of individual stakeholders within the colleges.

We also feel that it is critical that we get vigorous and visible buy-in from our new Provost and involvement from the Colleges (and by implication Departments) in the design of a general education curriculum working from the ERC framework. The success of much, if not all, of what happens next will depend on that.

2. Report to the Vice-President on Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness – this entire process of reform has heretofore been facilitated by the General Education Reform and Assessment (GERA) committee—a general oversight and planning committee. This committee will facilitate the summer workshop. However, it is also the responsibility of this committee, overlapping largely with the Institute team, to be informed by the report mentioned at the start of this document, by the AACU Institute visit, and by the summer workshop and submit a formal report to the Vice-President.
3. Return to the faculty – this step is not yet clear. We have had a couple of alternatives that have been fairly detailed, but no consensus has been reached within our group on the best way to proceed. This will be determined as the summer unfolds. However, the general plan is to take the various curricular models that were brought to or generated by the summer workshop, along with the workshop discussions, to the larger faculty at the University, probably through the Colleges and to the specific Departments. Subject to rules of engagement, Departments (perhaps assimilated at the College level) will be asked to react to the different models and if they prefer one over all the others, give some detailed feedback on how their program can contribute to a general education curriculum that follows such a model, as well as comment on the effect this would have on their major. One of the issues not yet resolved is what group or committee will be in charge of this process. Such things are important, obviously, and we are still debating the best way to proceed.
4. The Senate – the hope at this point is that a clear pattern of preference will emerge, that one type of model will be clearly preferred to all others. The appropriate committee (not yet determined, but likely a standing, university-level curriculum committee that reports to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education) will then polish a proposal to take to the floor of the Senate for debate and, with luck, adoption.

[In the original team report, an appendix appeared that summarized the USP ERC final report. That report is available on the GERA committee website—www.uky.edu/GERA]

Appendix 4: College and Constituency Forums

1. **Health Care Colleges Academic Deans Forum:**
Time and Place: January 18, 2006, 307 Wethington Building
Attendance: 15
Facilitator: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair)

2. **College of Communications and Information Studies Forum:**
Time and Place: January 30, 2006 Lexmark Room Main Building
Attendance: 26
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Enid Waldhart
(Communications director of undergraduate studies)

3. **College of Education Forum:**
Time and Place: February 14, 2006, Taylor Education Building Auditorium
Attendance: 40
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Steve Parker, Kinesiology and Health

4. **College of Health Sciences Forum:**
Time and Place: February 22, 2006, Common Room of Wethington Building
Attendance: 8
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Jody Deem, Communications Disorders

5. **College of Social Work Forum:**
Time and Place: February 28, 2006, 230 New Student Center
Attendance: 13
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Melanie Otis, Social Work

6. **College of Fine Arts Forum:**
Time and Place: March 3, 2006, Briggs Auditorium, Fine Arts Building
Attendance: 40
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Dick Domek, Music

7. **College of Design Forum:**
Time and Place: March 7, 2006, 205 Pence Hall
Attendance: 8
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Steve Deger, Architecture

8. **College of Agriculture Forum:**
Time and Place: March 9, 2006, Williams Auditorium, Plant Sciences Building
Attendance: 30
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Lee Edgerton, Animal Sciences

9. **College of Business and Economics Forum:**
Time and Place: March 24, 2006, 209 Gatton Building
Attendance: 15
Co-facilitators: Gerard Smith, History and GERA Committee member and Scott Kelly, Marketing

10. **College of Engineering Forum:**
Time and Place: March 24, 2006, 453F Anderson Tower
Attendance: 8
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Tony Baxter, Computer Science

11. **College of Nursing Forum:**
Time and Place: April 3, 2006, 313 Nursing Building
Attendance: 22
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Patricia Burkhart, Nursing

12. **College of Arts and Sciences Forum I:**
Time and Place: April 13, 2006, 200 Funkhauser Building
Attendance: 7
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Jonathan Golding, Psychology

13. **College of Arts and Sciences Forum II:**
Time and Place: April 17, 2006, 110 Classroom Building
Attendance: 18
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Jonathan Golding, Psychology

14. **Academic Advising Network Forum:**
Time and Place: April 18, 2006, 149 ASTeCC Building
Attendance: 25
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Richard Greissman, Provost's office

15. **Business Community Forum/Corporate Leaders Summit in Higher Education**
Time and Place: April 18, 2006, Stuckert Center
Attendance: 10
Co-facilitators: Ernie Yanarella (GERA co-chair) and Phil Kraemer (GERA co-chair)