

## **Review Team Report**

External members: Ada Jaarsma (Chair); Joseph Price

Internal members: Karen Suyemoto; Sheila Fesko

Site visit: February 5-6, 2018

Dear Dean Philip DiSalvio and Dean Bala Sundaram,

Thank you for the opportunity to serve as reviewers for the certificate and M.A. programs in Critical and Creative Thinking (CCT) at UMass Boston. In our assessment, CCT is an outstanding interdisciplinary program that is uniquely situated to offer students rigorous conceptual education and project-based training in twenty-first century skills that are directly relevant to current-- and likely future-- employment and market needs. The program is an extraordinary incubator, both for students and for its broader network of faculty, alumni and community participants. The program receives exceptional direction from Peter Taylor, and it contributes directly to the university's mission, as we discuss below. Overall, our findings are consonant with the program's self-study and with multiple prior AQUAD reviews, and we endorse several key recommendations that would secure the program's capacity to continue its innovations in creative and critical thinking, learning and teaching.

We have structured our review in line with the four areas that we were encouraged to emphasize: the health of the program; the quality of faculty and students; the appropriateness of the curriculum, and the relevance of the program in the contemporary employment climate. Each section speaks to the queries and issues outlined in the Template for Program Self-Study. Our review concludes with a list of recommendations from the review team.

### **1. Health and Value of the Program**

In addition to the four broad categories the review committee was asked to focus on, this review committee was specifically charged by University of Massachusetts Boston's Graduate Dean and the Dean of the College of Advancing and Professional Studies, the current collegiate home of the *Critical and Creative Thinking/Science in a Changing World* program, to comment on the value that the program brings to the university.

Value of a program's contribution can be defined differently by different constituents. It can be narrowly defined by administrators as nothing more than the production of student credit hours, generation of tuition revenue set against the cost of program delivery, number of students admitted, matriculating and completing the program, and other quantifiable economically based metrics. Equally, value can be narrowly defined by academics in a program as only the rich educational experiences students receive, regardless of the number of students enrolled or the utility of the education provided.

The review committee sought to respond to the question of value broadly, and in doing so, the review committee had to also ask, “What are the values of the University?” Each of the seven values, listed on the University’s website, are lived out in the *Critical and Creative Thinking/SICW* program. While addressed in more detail in other parts of this report, it is clear from the abundant and various artifacts presented that the program fosters imagination, creativity, and intellectual vitality; it transforms lives of students and results in career opportunity and growth. From the review committee’s perusal of curriculum, its meeting with faculty and students, and its participation in the program’s community event, diversity and inclusion are evident in the demographic profile of its faculty, students, alumni, curriculum, and produced research. Students are engaged, and contribute to their communities and professional organizations, in big and small ways. The program’s *Science in a Changing World* track is uniquely focused on environmental stewardship and sustainability. And, although not always obviously, the program contributes to economic and cultural development, for the students, but also in the immediate urban environment, as well as in all types of communities. Therefore, as measured against the stated values of the University, the program is healthy and valuable.

Other indicators of vigorous health also exist. For example, the commitment of the faculty, their enthusiasm for the program, and their investment in the program is very strong, particularly among the part-time faculty. In one review committee member’s experience, meetings with part-time faculty members often devolve into complaint sessions, where adjunct faculty comment about the lack of support or the feeling of being isolated or marginalized. This is not the case with the CCT/SICW program. These adjunct faculty had high praise for both the director and assistant director of the program and felt not only supported but actively nurtured.

The academic rigor and the positive student experience, addressed in other parts of this report, also indicate health of the program. Administrators, too, admitted that there was no denying the impressive intellectual contribution to the University made by the program’s faculty and students. Simultaneously, there does seem to be a disconnect between administrators’ stated appreciation of the program’s intellectual contributions and whether they truly value the program. One administrator referred to CCT/SICW as a “boutique program,” a loaded moniker at the very least. Another administrator stated that after several AQUAD cycles, review committees were always overwhelmingly impressed by the program’s students, its faculty, and its academic production, but that administrators continued to perceive the program to be in a state of “failing to thrive.”

The committee found these comments troubling and incongruous with the observations and impressions gained during a two-day virtual visit to Boston. The committee spent over six weeks doing a “deep dive” into nearly every aspect of the CCT/SICW program, reading hundreds and hundreds of pages of materials that continually pointed to the same conclusion: an excellent program doing excellent things, living the mission and values of the University, helping students develop marketable skills, and transforming the very lives of the students it serves. As one 694 Synthesis Seminar student stated in the course evaluation, “Working with a professor who pushes you to be a better version of yourself is what this course is all about.”

In sum, we disagree with the perception that the CCT program has failed to thrive, given our assessment of the program's value, relevance and quality, described in the following sections. Simultaneously, we agree that the CCT program has not been able to fulfill its extraordinary potential. However, this is not at all because of the faculty, students, curriculum, or opportunities within the program. While administrators intimate that the program has failed to thrive, there is little acknowledgement of the lack of nourishment that contributed to that perceived failure. The CCT/SICW program has undergone substantial cuts to its program during (and prior to) this review cycle. These cuts include, most notably, the loss in 2015 of a .50 FTE professional staff line to support development of SICW, the 2017 loss of ¼ time GA line, and even the loss of the program's modest \$3,000 annual discretionary budget. To be fair to University administrators, however, the review committee understands the bind that they find themselves in. It may not be whether various administrators truly value the program, but, rather, if they feel they can afford to value the program and its type of educational mission and excellence, given the "dramatic fiscal distress" the University is currently facing.

In terms of the CCT/SICW program, Professor Taylor has provided documentation that the program does produce a positive return on investment, or ROI, of 1.55 (page 20 of the self-study). While this may be lower than the two other CAPS programs compared in the self-study, it is higher than the two comparable scenarios of newer and established programs within the College of Liberal Arts. It should also be noted that those higher ROI CAPS programs also appear to have a higher reliance on unbenefited adjunct faculty. The review committee feels that care should be taken and the consequential trade-offs be considered when evaluating a program solely by its ROI, no matter how positive.

In terms of the lower enrollment numbers that administrators pointed out, the CCT/SICW program has seen a drop in class enrollments from 230 in June 2011 to 173 in both June 2016 and 2017. The self-study lays out an adequate explanation of why this has taken place (pp. i and 16). During this period, course offerings have been adjusted downward and averages for number of students per section have remained consistently the same from 2011 through newly adjusted numbers for 2018 (11.5 students per class, which is relatively healthy for a graduate program).

Both deans and provosts had indicated a desire for the program to increase its marketing, recruitment, and enrollment efforts; however, while both Professor Taylor and Mr. Szeiter indicated the ability to continue the program with its current resources, marketing requires time, resources, and expertise that the program cannot execute, given its current personnel. Teaching, student mentoring, and direct program administration is and should remain Professor Taylor's and Mr. Szeiter's primary focus. Professor Taylor indicated that marketing efforts beyond the program (those handled by CAPS or by the University) were often opaque in terms of what was happening. Initiatives at the college or university level had changed or those persons in charge of those initiatives had moved on to other jobs or even other positions.

Certainly, the potential for expanding the number of students exists, particularly with the national emphasis on advanced science, engineering, technology, and mathematics (STEM) education, which the SICW certificate and MA track is posed to address. The question is whether the University would be able to commit the additional resources to realize that potential. Even direct recruiting, which is done at the program level in addressing individual students interested in the program, takes time away from the important tasks of advising and teaching current students. The review committee also sensed that there has been an “uneasy” alliance between the CCT/SICW program and its current CAPS home and wondered if CAPS was indeed the best home for the CCT/SICW track. This appears not to be isolated to CCT/SICW and CAPS: where to house and how to support all inter- and transdisciplinary programs seems to be a University-wide challenge.

Overall, while the program itself is very healthy and indeed thriving, the health of the program vis a vis the University structure and University resources remains a central question for administration to consider. The review committee wanted to make special note of Table 8 in particular. The deans and provosts were astonished at the inclusion of the table and Professor Taylor’s candid and clear-eyed ability to lay forth all possible scenarios for the program, including the possibility to phase out the program he has dedicated a career to. Administrators said that no other self-study in their collective memories ever put forth such a frank set of proposals. The review committee thinks that this frankness is part of a genuine effort on the part of Professor Taylor and the CCT/SICW program to have more open and clear lines of communication with current deans and administrators, so that he and other faculty may make thoughtful plans about the program’s future and meeting student needs.

## ***2. Quality of faculty and students***

As part of the review process, the team was able to meet with core faculty, part time and affiliated faculty, current and former students. The reviewers were all extremely impressed with the quality of the faculty and the students (both current students and alumni), as well as the level of impact that the program was having and has had on students. This impression was confirmed by administrators that were interviewed who acknowledged the significant contribution of the program and the transformative effect it has on students.

The CCT self-study reports that the core faculty include one full time tenured faculty member and one full time professional staff member with teaching responsibilities. The full time faculty member (Peter Taylor) has an academic home in CEHD. (And, from 2011-15, the program had a 50% position funded by CAPS with teaching and administrative responsibilities). There is also a CCT faculty member that has a 50% teaching load from Philosophy, Arthur Millman. Two additional CCT faculty members from other university units retired in 2014 and 2015. During the creation of the SICW program there was a greater commitment of faculty from the sciences to the CCT program, but that has reportedly changed as SICW track affiliated faculty from CSM have been pulled into leadership roles in other units. Faculty associated with the SICW are not available for advising and instructional roles. A challenge of the current structure is that, as

priorities shift in other colleges, the commitment to CCT is impacted, resulting in uncertainty in personnel resources.

The core and affiliated University faculty, both tenure-stream and adjunct, are inspirational in their commitment to the program as well as the field. They accept responsibility well beyond the demands of other faculty to maintain, support, and grow the program. Evaluation of the quality of faculty's teaching from the course evaluations, syllabus and material review, reports from students, and direct observation suggests exceptionally high quality of faculty's ability to develop and teach the curriculum. The lack of administrative and marketing support has impacted the extent to which the program has been able to recruit students, but the faculty and students have certainly taken many steps to get the word out about the program. There have been increases in the numbers of students entering the program in the last year, but the goal is to stabilize the student enrollment number. While the faculty continue to make contributions to the field in their research, the administrative demands of the program have potentially negatively impacted their productivity. This is unfortunate since the faculty are quite inspired in their thinking and approach to the field, and their research would make a major contribution.

One area in which the faculty are particular exemplars is their innovation in pedagogical, collegial and instructional change. They have not only implemented these innovations in their own program, they have generously shared this information throughout the University and broader educational community. In addition to informal information sharing and collaboration, the CCT faculty formally support the University through their involvement in the Center for Improvement of Teaching and the InterCollege Seminar in Humanities and Science.

Some CCT courses are taught through a network of non-tenure track (NTT) faculty that are clearly committed to the mission of the program. Many of these NTT's were interviewed as a part this review, and the discussion with them was inspiring, especially in terms of the passion in which they describe their teaching and the students in the program, as well as the impact the program has had in their own work. The NTT faculty come from varied backgrounds, and a number are alumni of the program. For some programs, a dependence on NTT's may be problematic, but the NTT faculty in this program bring academic and applied expertise and a richness of experience and therefore are able to link content to lived experiences and skills development for career development. The faculty point out the importance of dialogue and project-based learning as strategies in the program. The process of exploration and creativity requires a level of vulnerability that is not typical in other academic programs, described by one faculty member as the point at which "you start to see different options."

NTT faculty feel well connected to the program and report that the program director and assistant director are extremely effective in keeping them informed. The program director was described as exceptional because of the "pure love he has" for it. Information is shared and learning occurs through sharing workshops where faculty and students participate in collaborative exploration. The faculty feel the program is sustainable and that, since the

program director has established a shared culture, the program could adjust to a new leader when that time comes.

NTT faculty expressed concern that the University administration does not value the program and that this results in a lack of support. Without this support, they feel the program has not been able to grow as it should to meet its potential for impact on students. They would like to see greater promotion of the program that is not dependent on the program director and that highlights accomplishments of alumni. An additional recruitment approach suggested would be to reach out to corporate entities and encourage supervisors to refer employees so they can learn how to approach thinking in a more critical manner.

The program has done an excellent job of highlighting the capstone projects of their students through the UMass ScholarWorks. These capstone projects reflect the diverse and accomplished nature of the students. One challenge that the program experiences is that there are a number of students who begin but depart the program before completion. The program director reported that there is one group that does all of the course work but then stops before completing the capstone and a second group of students who take a few courses and then don't continue. For the former group of students, the program has identified that students have left the program because of financial pressures with the tuition increasing between semesters, as well as because of personal variables such as family life. The program is working at conducting program check-ins to connect with students before they drop out, but limits on program faculty and staff time means that there are not the resources to advise students that the program would prefer. Additional resources for advising and monitoring the factors that contribute to students leaving the program will be important in the program's ongoing development.

In addition to matriculated students in the masters and certificate program, CCT is very effective in engaging students from other programs. Students from education, nursing, public policy, gerontology, global inclusion and social development and applied linguistic have taken CCT course as electives. In the past year, CCT has developed a formal partnership with the TCCS program, such that TCCS students may take CCT courses or certificate to fulfill their electives, and CCT students may also enroll in TCCS core courses. The engagement of students from other program contributes to the diverse perspectives that benefit CCT students and enrich the educational experience of students from other programs. Students from other programs are reflected in course registrants' data but are not adequately reflected in most numerical tracking since these students are not matriculated in CCT. The CCT program has real value for matriculated students in their own program but also a significant contribution to the learning in other programs, which may not be sufficiently tracked or acknowledged.

### ***3. Appropriateness of the curriculum***

During our site visit, we were struck by the strengths of the CCT curriculum, especially in terms of its interdisciplinarity and the direct ways in which students deploy the knowledge and skills

gained in the program to solve workforce challenges. We heard a great array of stories about the quality, efficacy, and relevance of the CCT curriculum, from students, graduates of the program, and faculty. Everyone we spoke with, from administrators to program instructors and students, agrees that the CCT program yields long-lasting transformations in its graduates. As one of the deans put it, during our visit: “No question about the quality of the program.”

The review team was able to meet with current students and alumni as well as review student feedback reports, course evaluation and student capstones. Students spoke of the transformative nature of the program and had multiple examples of how they have integrated the knowledge into their work and their lives. One student reported starting a writing blog that ultimately led to publishing a book. Other examples reported included: a tutor who learned how to navigate a new space and use technology to transition from solely in-person tutoring to digital tutoring, opening new employment possibilities and revenue; a PhD student in public policy who developed a critical lens to balance out a creative lens in organizational dynamics; a senior full professor who developed a graduate certificate concentration in strategic thinking and planning for his University; a fine artist who was able to expand her subject matter and talk with more authority about her work; and a former art teacher, now hospital employee, who began facilitation for cross generational creativity in a hospital setting and used CCT learning to develop staff trainings for hospital staff.

The creativity and variety of these examples speaks to the diversity of interest and accomplishments of the students. The synthesis projects, completed by students in their capstone seminar, present direct evidence of the real-life applicability of the curriculum. Based on discussions with both faculty and students, we encourage the program to advise students to take the two foundational core courses early, rather than later, as a way to optimize the sequencing of course offerings and support the depth of their capstone projects.

Our overall assessment is that the curriculum is powerful, relevant and applicable to an impressive number of professional and vocational situations. The CCT program makes use of internal and external measures of review, and its curriculum is reflective of changing knowledge, trends, and professional contexts. This program exemplifies the utility of the liberal arts and critical approaches to science, social science and knowledge-acquisition more broadly to diverse, real-life work and career applications. It is its emphasis on process that is especially effective: the process by which critical and creative thinking develops and can be applied.

CCT’s curricular contributions to the university also include monthly workshops that bring together current students, graduates from the program and faculty. Just as faculty are actively mobilizing their research and curriculum in ways that extend beyond the program (as in the case of the recent monograph, published by a part-time instructor), these events point to the program’s commitments to ongoing reflexive and inclusive participation beyond the conventional classroom. The program’s continual innovations in modes of instruction, seen for example in the effective combination of online and in-person seminars, is exemplary for any program, not just for CAPS programs.

The question that arose, during our site visit, has to do with the quality of fit between the CCT curriculum and its current home in CAPS. There are challenges between administrative and program vision that are not linked to the curriculum itself, which is excellent, but rather to a broader structural question of the homes of transdisciplinary programs at the University. Given the high caliber of CCT's curriculum, faculty and students, we encourage a general conversation about the "homes" of trans- and interdisciplinary programs. During our site visit, CCT faculty suggested possible connections or homes by expanding the Honors College to include interdisciplinary graduate programs, and this is one possibility; collaborative discussions with CCT faculty, University administration, and perhaps other interdisciplinary programs, might result in other innovative solutions. Given the importance of securing technical support for students, we wonder if more resources would enable students to take more advantage of the strong curriculum offered by CCT.

#### **4. Relevance in contemporary employment climate**

In our assessment, this program is directly and demonstrably relevant to the contemporary employment climate. Indeed, this program responds to a need that is not met by other programs: namely, the need to support individuals who are negotiating mid-career changes, transitioning from expertise in a given discipline towards positions in administration or consulting, and, in addition, preparing those individuals to become effective coaches or mentors of others. We were continually impressed, during our site visit, by the great range of professions represented by students in the program and by the obvious value that the program offers to students and their employers. One example that attests to the applicability of CCT to employment needs is that of a current student who successfully asked the Boston Medical Center to invest in his graduate studies in CCT; this meant that he provided a convincing rationale of how this particular program would benefit his work at BMC.

Students and faculty all attest to the value of the program's emphasis on project-based learning, as well as the interdisciplinary cross-pollination of insights and methods that takes place through coursework and the highly effective networking that the program organizes and facilitates. In particular, we see great opportunity in the *Science in a Changing World* track for global impact, for attracting STEM-focused students, and for responding to a broader market-based call for more STEM training opportunities. Moreover, given market projections about increasing automation across many employment sectors, CCT's ability to teach students how to become responsive and reflective creative practitioners, in whatever professional realm they occupy, means that it will likely become even more relevant to changing employment needs.

Overall, while the program may not be entrepreneurial in its description, it produces deeply entrepreneurial graduates. In the seminar that we attended, for example, students spoke from their own critical and impassioned perspectives about their lives and their work in Boston, Australia, Mexico and across the United States. We observed the concrete ways in which the program helps students to integrate theoretical research with specific professional practices and projects. In particular, we note the program's effective use of ongoing reflections and exit



assessments as ways to develop ongoing innovative methods for teaching and learning. The capstone synthesis projects, in particular, demonstrate the value of this program for “employment”: students develop projects that are directly relevant to their own employment positions and ambitions.

According to how students assess the program, the CCT program changes students’ lives, equipping them to make transformative decisions about their own professional trajectories-- and to help others do the same. During our site visit, one student told us, “I use what I learned in the CCT program in everything I do.” In other words, CCT’s director Peter Taylor’s description of the program as an “incubator” seems exactly right: this program serves as an incubator for students, prompting incalculable benefits to their own professional trajectories, and it also serves as an incubator for the faculty in the program, who are continually developing innovative strategies and models for effective, transformative teaching practices. Given that the program is net positive, in terms of its budgetary health, our review team is unanimous in assessing CCT as an effective and successful graduate program.

### **Recommendations:**

The CCT program is already a highly successful program, with over seventeen currently matriculated students and many other students who are served through specific courses and the certificate program. In 2017/18, for example, 74% of students registered in CCT courses were CCT students and applicants; 21% were from other programs, and 5% were non-degree students. The program could expand if it received modest support, and we endorse several of the suggestions that are laid out in the self-study. (We note that our recommendations concur with the overall conclusions from the last AQUAD review: p. 8, <http://www.cct.umb.edu/AQUAD10Review.pdf>)

1. Our strongest recommendation is that this AQUAD review result in a transparent set of decisions about the future of the program and the support it will be offered, communicated by the University administration to the CCT Director and Assistant Director who have made tremendous investments in the program. While we would like to argue in favor of small but significant investments that will help the program to continue thriving, we are above all advocating for a process in which the ramifications of decisions are carefully considered and, in turn, fully communicated and explained to the core faculty of the program.
2. We support the claim, made in the self-study, that it is important to return the .5 line that was removed. While the program can maintain itself at its current economically positive and educationally successful levels (as explained in detail by the self-study), the program’s success is due to truly exceptional commitments of two major full-time core faculty. The program director should be able to secure more research time than is currently available in order to advance his or her own research, as well as to reflect on how best to advance the program’s response to pressing scientific and social issues. In

addition, the assistant director should be able to balance administrative and advising tasks with the high teaching load in ways that are equitable and reasonable. A return of the .5 teaching line will go a long way in securing these key objectives.

3. Along similar lines, we recommend considering a new joint appointment or a specified MOU with existing full-time faculty in the University that would contribute to teaching and service within the program. This would help significantly with the program's need for a clear and transparent plan for the future. As the self-study states, at the point at which the program's director gives a three-year notice about retirement plans, there should be adequate resources in place to hire (if needed) and train the next director. While part-time faculty express tremendous confidence in the program's sustainability, especially in terms of its culture and core values, there is currently a gap in the program's core faculty in terms of the future leadership. These resources will also support the Provost's interest in raising the annual cohort to 15 students.
4. We also support the call to restore the \$3,000 discretionary budget that was removed from the program in the last year. This small but important fund enables the program to offer events and support students, as well as provide opportunities for the assistant director to participate in professional development and keep the program and its regular community events sufficiently funded.
5. We strongly recommend that the core faculty's judgment be deferred to in matters related to the cap of courses, especially the capstone course. While courses average over eight students per section, it is crucial that the capstone course have a cap that enables faculty to advise and mentor students effectively. CCT has worked hard to develop a structure that enables individualized oversight for students with very limited faculty, eschewing the usual committee structure that requires multiple faculty commitment with minimal credit. The transformative effects and immediate employment relevance for students relates directly to the individualized and project-focused nature, which is culminated in the capstone. Maintaining the capstone course student cap at faculty determined levels seems like a key resource-issue for faculty and for students.
6. The value of this program seems incontrovertible to us, in terms of its import to the university's mission and to the current employment climate. During our site visit, part-time faculty suggested that the program could be marketed directly to schools, companies, and community organizations (through questions like, "Do your workers need additional skills in critical thinking, flexibility, and creativity?") precisely because of its relevance to many employment-contexts. We therefore recommend additional promotional and marketing resources from the University for the program, as a way to draw attention to its value as an incubator in 21st century skills, training in STEM-related issues, and critical and creative thinking and reflective practice. Based on one of the review team's experience, it can make a quantifiably large difference to invest in and support a program like CCT. Given the provost's interest in increasing the number of

students matriculating yearly into the program, we strongly affirm the importance of investing in additional promotional resources. We would, however, like to emphasize that should a major increase in students take place, the program will need additional faculty to teach those students. Finally, given the program's historic expertise in and effective use of hybrid online and in-class teaching by the program, and the observation by one of the deans that this model is exactly where the campus hopes to move in the future, additional investment in promotional materials will advance the university's own interests and goals as well.

7. To the program director, assistant director, and associated faculty, we recommend that the program work on articulating its central focus more clearly, directly, and succinctly. While the program's focus is clear in terms of the curriculum and student experiences, a more direct statement of its mission and applicability would enable the outsider to see the program's vision, depth and impact. The benefit of the program would likely be more accessible to prospective students, to teachers, to higher education administration and to administrators at the university. We recognize that the program's transformative effect is highly individualized and contextual in students' experiences, but simultaneously feel that there are central foundations that create these transformations that could be more directly and succinctly communicated, and that examples of impact would be helpful as well.
8. During our site visit, the deans commented on the strength of the *Science and Changing World* track in particular, noting the significance of its focus on interdisciplinary issues related to science and policy. Judging from the range of students attracted to the program and the outcomes that students describe, the program provides them with unique and complex perspectives and skills. Given the timely relevance of the program, and the science track in particular, we recommend strengthening ties between the certificate and the M.A. programs and other science-related programs.
9. The CCT program was significantly impacted by the licensing changes in the Learning, Teaching and Educational Transformation program. The dean's response to the last AQUAD review suggested the combination of the LTET and CCT program. A significant component of the CCT cohort are in education, and the combining of the resources of the two programs may help support the administrative and teaching demands. The educational transformation could be created as a track similar to the *Science in a Changing World* Track. Several tracks such as this that share core courses would create efficiency so the core courses have larger numbers. Each track would continue to offer some specialized classes as well. For tracks such as this, that involve partnership with other colleges, it will be critical that there are specific faculty identified to support teaching and administrative responsibilities. Faculty need to make a serious commitment to this partnership, and such planning needs to reflect a collaboration between the other colleges and CCT.

10. The University's mission aligns beautifully with the kind of interdisciplinary work accomplished by CCT. We noted throughout our site visit, however, that there seems to be a structural weakness in how the University currently supports interdisciplinary programs. And so we recommend that the University look in general at how it encourages and supports interdisciplinary programs. These programs are consistent with the direction of higher education and provide their students with a richness of perspectives and experiences, yet the manner in which they are implemented continues to be challenging. Rather than embracing the value of these interdisciplinary programs, the current structure and support of them within the University is ad hoc. Non-core faculty are engaged almost through a barter system with other colleges or programs; there are special deals to allow faculty to teach in the interdisciplinary program, but these deals can shift at any time depending on the needs of the other colleges. This does not provide the stability to the program or allow faculty to fully engage in their interdisciplinary work. This is an issue that is broader than CCT, but certainly impacts it.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this program review. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require additional information.

Ada Jaarsma  
Philosophy  
Mount Royal  
University

Joseph Price  
Master of Arts in Creative  
and Critical Thinking  
University of Nebraska  
Omaha

Sheila Fesko  
Institute for  
Community Inclusion  
UMass Boston

Karen Suyemoto  
Transnational Cultural  
and Community  
Studies Program  
UMass Boston