

University of Massachusetts-Boston
Graduate Program in Learning, Teaching, and Educational Transformation (LTET)
Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD)
External Review Report
Mary Battenfeld (Wheelock College), Paul Jablon (Lesley University), and Joseph Check and Raul Ybarra (University of Massachusetts-Boston)
April 11, 2011

Overview of LTET Program and AQUAD Review

The Learning, Teaching and Educational Transformation program offers a Master's in Education without licensure. The program, housed in the Curriculum and Instruction Department of the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Massachusetts-Boston, provides methodological and practical tools for students pursuing "diverse inquiries and practical projects building on a foundation in curriculum development, research and writing, and collaborative action for change and social justice through education" (*Graduate Studies Catalog*, 144). The origins of what is now the LTET track can be traced to the creation in the mid-1990s of a focus area for students pursuing Orientation and Mobility licensure, and, in 2004, a "track A" path for behavioral analysis. However, the program in its current form is quite new (2009). This is the Program's first AQUAD Review.

The AQUAD Review Committee consisted of two external (Mary Battenfeld, Department of American Studies, Wheelock College, and Paul Jablon, School of Education, Lesley University) and two internal reviewers (Raul Ybarra, College of Public and Community Service and Joseph Check, Graduate College of Education). The Committee first read and considered the self-study provided by the LTET program faculty and accompanying attachments. Attached materials included surveys sent to current and former students, sample student capstone projects, profiles of faculty and selected students, course syllabi, advising materials, and information related to the operation of the LTET program. The Review Committee also requested additional materials, including a Graduate Studies catalog, information on the Critical and Creative Thinking (CCT) program, and more specific data on student enrollment. AQUAD faculty provided the catalog and materials on the CCT Program at the campus visit, and sent enrollment data, including names of individual students, via email on March 26 and March 28, 2011.

For the campus visit, the Committee convened for an all day meeting at the University of Massachusetts-Boston on March 23, 2011. Over the course of the day, the Review Committee met first with Felicia Wilczenski, Interim Dean of the CEHD, and Graduate Studies Dean Joan Liem, followed by a meeting with LTET faculty, and lunch with representative LTET students. Later we spoke via conference call with Jack Levy, the Chair of Curriculum and Instruction. Last, the Committee met with Provost Winston Langley and the two Deans, followed by a final meeting with faculty. Scheduling did not permit attendance at a class.

Summary of Findings

Both written materials and the on-campus visit revealed a program with substantial strengths, evident particularly in the expertise and commitment of the faculty, the high degree of student engagement and learning, and the centrality of the LTET Program and its curriculum to the campus-wide and more specifically CEHD mission of "education for a diverse democracy." We also found the curriculum to be relevant and current, with an important and purposeful emphasis on reflection and critical thinking, and on the larger societal and organizational contexts for educational reform and transformation. Evidence gathered by the Review Committee found that the LTET certificate did not replicate or overlap

substantially with other licensure or non-licensure programs at the University, but rather served the needs of a specific population of students whose curricular needs were not met by other programs.

At the same time, the Review Committee noted some areas of concern. The limited availability of centralized data related to the program, as well as lack of campus-wide communication about the LTET program and marketing of it were concerns. We also found that communication with and advising of students in the program could be improved. In addition, the committee identified curricular issues linked to a need for more options in some of the core requirements, and in strengthening the capstone. Last, program operation and assessment, advising consistency, and communication among the faculty have been hampered by the lack of a full-time administrator and the additional duties of the overburdened LTET faculty.

The Review Committee felt that the most significant issue was also the most obvious: the program lacks adequate resources. No faculty are assigned primarily to the program, and the LTET coordinator(s) do not receive a stipend or course reduction. This has resulted in an overworked faculty and fewer opportunities for students. One faculty member expressed this as concern with “our ability to provide adequate and consistent advising, build relationships with students, and support each other with program operations.” An administrator described the need for LTET to have core faculty as “absolutely central” to the success of the program, yet also wondered about underenrollment and redundancy with other programs. More generally, administrators voiced support for the program, coupled with concerns about limited resources and the need to align budget priorities to support licensure programs and accreditation needs.

Discussion of AQUAD Core Criteria

The main focus of this report is on academic quality of the LTET program as related to the five AQUAD core criteria: mission; curriculum; faculty quality; teaching and learning environments, and use of resources. The remainder of the report is organized around those five areas. However, the question of resources for the LTET program was an overriding note, voiced at every step of the review by faculty and administrators and to a lesser extent by students. That the LTET program needs more resources seemed not to be a debate. But the Review Committee heard differing views about how to proceed given the complexities of the financial environment and the priorities of an institution of public higher education. At the end of our report we offer some commentary regarding our understanding of the place of the LTET program at the University of Massachusetts-Boston and the conditions under which it might continue as a viable and vibrant track for students pursuing graduate degrees in education.

1. Programs shall ensure that their goals and objectives are linked to the campus mission and strategic priorities.

Areas of Program Strength:

“This program and others like it are exactly what is needed if we are serious about improving public education in the United States.” This statement, provided by an LTET student for the AQUAD review, succinctly summarizes the Review Committee’s findings regarding strengths of the program as related to the campus mission. We found the LTET program to be uniquely and significantly aligned with the campus mission and strategic priorities, particularly through its capacity to integrate and support civic engagement in teaching and learning, and for the way the program prepares graduates to analyze and address “big picture” issues in education.

First, as noted in our opening summary, evidence on a number of levels underscored the LTET program’s direct and powerful connection to the CEHD college mission of “education for a diverse democracy” and to campus, college, and program missions and strategic priorities related to urban schools, access, and

community engagement. The students who come to the LTET program and the jobs or further education they pursue demonstrate this. For example, several students we spoke to are planning to go on to obtain a doctorate in education. These students all said that they had not thought of a Ph.D. as possible for them until they came to the LTET program, and praised the program for the way it helped them understand personal and societal issues related to equity in higher education. One graduate in her written comments said that the LTET Program had helped her “become more accepting of myself, my family, my community, and my roots in Cambodia. I am no longer trying to hide my heritage. I hope to pave a way for those who do not have equal or fair access to higher education and spread the knowledge of what I have learned.” The work of another student involves mentoring and developing curriculum related to the needs of Arab-American students, including many who are refugees. Another plans to return to the Southeast Asian country where she was born to bring her knowledge of educational transformation to an international community.

The LTET program serves a population deeply involved in education, but mostly not as K-12 classroom teachers. They work in community organizations, in higher education, and K-12 settings, but not as classroom teachers, or in some cases as classroom teachers with an additional focus on evaluating the whole structure of the school in which they teach. This program provides them with core curricular skills and greater understanding of educational transformation as well as a choice of courses where they can learn the particular skills to take on the requirements of their unique personal, educational and professional situations. The student in the program who works with refugees has very different curricular needs than the student who works with undergraduate students at a university, or the student about to return to a country in Asia to work there for social and educational change. This program is designed for them all. They support each other while enrolled in a shared program and curriculum, and at the same time work individually with an advisor to select elective courses which fit specific personal and professional needs.

The work of LTET faculty, not only in but outside of the walls of the university is also impressively aligned to campus, college and program missions and strategic priorities. Faculty are leaders in dozens of state, local, national and international organizations related to urban education, diversity, equity and access. These range from the Vietnam Veterans Family Services Project, to the Massachusetts Advisory Committee for the US Commission on Civil Rights, to the National Writing Project, and highlight the impact of faculty work as related to the mission and strategic priorities.

Areas of Program Weakness:

Since faculty work full-time in other programs, and many times direct other programs, they have not had the opportunity to meet and clearly articulate in writing the program’s mission. Nor have faculty had the time to collect and analyze data related to understanding which individuals are best served by this program and the types of job opportunities available to program graduates. They have also not been able to analyze enough similarities and differences among students, particularly between students who matriculate directly into LTET and those connected to such “feeder tracks” as Applied Behavioral Analysis, Critical and Creative Thinking, Instructional Technology Design, and Teaching Writing in the Schools. This Committee found that faculty and students in *conversations* were passionate and clear about the program’s mission and the needs it serves for an extremely varied population. However, such clarity did not come across as well in the written materials supplied for the AQUAD review.

We also found outreach to be an area of program weakness. Except for the department chair, few other individuals in the university seemed aware of the nature of the program and who it serves. Therefore, though the LTET program addresses the mission of the university extremely well for a population not served by other programs in education, it would be very difficult for many students to find out about its existence. Most students hear about the LTET track through informal channels, and marketing of the

program is very limited. Thus while we found clear evidence that the program met the self-study goal of serving “individuals who do not wish to be certified in Massachusetts (or who are already certified) but want to work in a broad range of education-related professions...such as adult and community based education, educational research, policy analysis, philanthropy, and advocacy,” we also felt it could better meet the goal of attracting students to the program.

2. Programs shall ensure that curriculum is relevant, rigorous, current and coherent.

Areas of Program Strength:

Courses offer both depth and breadth and meet a range of student and curricular needs. The program offers coherence via the four core areas. Yet it also provides a flexibility (the seven electives) remarked on by all students as an important and positive feature of the program. At our meeting with students, several described connections between two or more LTET classes, suggesting at once the curriculum’s cohesiveness and its ability to engage students in learning that continues beyond the classroom walls. Core courses such as “Action Research for Educational, Professional, and Personal Change” and “Organization of School Curriculum” provide frameworks and assignments for students to better understand educational systems of the 21st century, and to become thoughtful and responsive educators, able to work effectively in urban schools. The major assignment in “Action Research,” for example, asks students to design and report on “an action or intervention in a specific classroom, workplace or personal teaching/learning practice, an educational policy, an educational institution, or a social policy.” This assignment and most courses in the LTET program include a similar linkage of practical skills and critical thinking, providing depth through analysis and action in a specific setting, as well as breadth, as students learn to place educational transformation in institutional, cultural and historical contexts.

A particular strength of the curriculum is its cutting edge awareness of changing educational contexts and the ability to provide relevant knowledge for educators of the future. As one student put it during the on campus meeting, the LTET program “offers things that are missing” in more traditional programs in education, and the flexibility to pursue those relevant yet “missing” curricular pieces. Course offerings and student comments about what they got from the LTET program emphasized two particular “things that are missing” from other graduate programs. One was developing a greater understanding of immigrant populations and the other related to analysis of the larger contexts of organizational change. One student said that a lack of cross-cultural understanding among educators means that immigrant “children are suffering,” and praised the LTET program for providing knowledge to help such children. Related to organizational change, one student said, “If I was to contribute to education in a meaningful way, I knew I would have to pursue a career where I could attack the problems at the organizational level.”

The four core areas of study combined with the individualized interaction with faculty advisors generate powerful individualized programs of study that are both coherent and steeped in academic, philosophical, and pragmatic skills and understandings. Students leave with practical and cognitive tools to apply to educational transformation. They have conducted research, collected and analyzed data, and synthesized findings in both written and oral formats. A number of recent graduates are applying for doctoral study, feeling well prepared for their future studies and jobs. Most are already applying their skills at their jobs or in their communities.

Areas of Program Weakness:

Though we found the curriculum to be coherent, logical and up to date, the curricular structure and course offerings seemed more linked to faculty strengths and existing courses in other programs than to purposeful organization informed by internal and external measures of review. Another curricular weakness noted by students and evident in the written materials is the variability in the number of course

offerings for the core areas. Ten courses are listed for the “Curriculum Organization and Innovation” core area, seven for “Research and Writing for Reflective Practice,” but only four for “Mediation, Dialogue and Collaboration,” and just three in “Urban and Social Justice Education.” Students (one in written comments, and one in the on campus meeting) also asked for more courses in administration, and this seemed a relative weakness to the Review Committee given how many students are working or plan to work in educational administration.

We also concluded that optimal use is not being made of the capstone. Even as a non-licensure program, the program could develop the capstone to better prepare its graduates for further employment by assigning a community-based project, internship or service-learning experience that requires students to implement the skills and understandings acquired throughout the program. We see as positive the addition of an option for a written paper with oral presentation rather than only a comprehensive examination, yet noted that most students at present select the exam option. The exam, the Review Committee felt, does not provide enough of a culminating experience. Having a more shared experience would also enhance community among students, and bring them together as a group of learners at the end of their program. In addition, the exam option does not provide the kind of advanced research and writing experience that would best prepare students for doctoral work.

3. Programs shall ensure faculty quality and productivity.

Areas of Program Strength:

Both written materials and our on-campus visit showed us a faculty with tremendous commitment and strengths in teaching, scholarship, advising, and service. Particularly notable is the high level of campus administrative responsibilities (both within and outside of the LTET program) and community service of this faculty. Faculty have served as department and program chairs, taken on leadership roles in curriculum development, helped develop student assessment systems, and procured grants from national funders like the Rockefeller Foundation and National Science Foundation. As noted in this report’s section on mission, a distinguishing mark of the LTET faculty is their commitment and generosity in lending their professional expertise to off-campus constituencies. Yet in spite of the demanding nature of their teaching, advising, and committee responsibilities, faculty also are engaged in significant scholarly activities, which enhance the intellectual community of their classes and of the LTET program as a whole.

This is also a faculty of excellent teachers. Without exception, students at both the campus visit and in the written comments found in appendices described the LTET faculty as accessible, knowledgeable, and challenging teacher/scholars. Two faculty members have received the Chancellor’s Distinguished Teaching Award and one has one both the Chancellor’s Teaching Award and a Distinguished Service Award. Though we did not attend a class, course syllabi, as discussed in the curriculum section of this report, highlighted the teaching strengths of the faculty particularly as related to their ability to deliver current content in ways that help students to reflect, analyze and apply knowledge in a variety of educational settings.

In addition to engaging and reaching students through teaching, the faculty shoulder an impressive and important advising load. With four core areas and seven electives, this is a program which requires advising that is flexible to student needs, while at the same time offering consistent advising so that students can complete a cohesive program. Faculty have met this challenge, as evidenced by the self-study, and by student comments during our visit. The self-study also demonstrates that this commitment to students continues after graduation, as faculty have successfully mentored graduates in job searches and encouraged students to pursue a Ph.D.

Areas of Program Weakness:

The central issue we noted is that faculty are profoundly overworked, at the potential peril of both teaching and advising. We say "potential" because evidence gathered throughout the review demonstrated that despite the extremely limited resources for the program, each faculty member is continually doing innovative, challenging and committed teaching. Each is also involved in a large number of campus and community service activities, and on top of these teaching and service commitments, faculty also somehow manage to publish in high-quality peer-reviewed journals.

Our review also made clear, however, that faculty are holding this all together through sheer dint of energy, and that they are stretched as thin as they can possibly go. Our discussion with LTET faculty and students showed a program brimming with passionate, creative and informed ideas about educational transformation. Faculty choose to be part of the LTET program out of commitment to the goals and types of teaching, learning, and educational transformation which drives it. That direction and energy, however, did not come through clearly in the self-study, a fact which we attributed to the lack of time available to reflect on program goals and purpose. Similarly, although students thought that the quality of faculty advising was remarkable, there were instances where faculty were just so busy with their other departmental responsibilities that they were not always as accessible as would be desirable. Given the absence of a true director of the program who could focus mainly on these students, there is no one to assist those students who may be getting lost a bit along the way given the individualized nature of the program.

4. Programs shall ensure teaching and learning environments that facilitate student success.

Areas of Program Strength:

Our review, and particularly the meeting with students, confirmed that the LTET program enables students to gain advanced skills and knowledge related to the program focus on educational transformation. The written self-study includes student essays and other materials which confirm our observations of these positive learning outcomes. Comments by students cited in the self-study and made during the campus visit demonstrate that the program facilitates success for students from a variety of educational backgrounds and experiences. The students we met with were remarkably and almost uniformly pleased with the faculty and course offerings. More, students described how the program had changed them. One wrote: "Five years ago, I wasn't certain what my goals and aspirations were, but today I can confidently claim: I am an educator." Another said that enrolling in the LTET program was "the best decision I ever made." Yet another spoke of the way the program had helped him develop "innovative teaching tools for children with autism." Such testimony from students, both in informal comments provided for the AQUAD review, and in capstone projects, provided powerful evidence that the LTET program has created successful teaching and learning environments for a range of students. Of particular note is the ways students commented on the program in terms of personal, intellectual *and* professional growth. Whether finding the coursework "personally rewarding," learning specific skills related to using media in the classroom, or gaining a degree that enabled the student to achieve a promotion or higher level of professional certification, the LTET program facilitates student success in a range of ways.

The program by definition serves a varied student population. Some are established professionals, while others transfer in because they were unable to meet licensure requirements. Yet a striking feature of our conversations with students and of the written materials related to student work was the degree to which all students praised faculty and the LTET program for its support of them as learners. As one student put it, "I gained knowledge from my classes to apply [to professional situations] but I also became a leader."

Types and variety of course offerings also facilitate student success, from courses with a special focus on reflection and writing, to those which both employ and analyze educational technologies.

Another way the LTET program creates a learning environment that facilitates student success is through course scheduling and delivery. The variety in types of courses and when they are offered helps make the LTET program accessible to many types of students. Recognizing that most of its students work, regular courses are offered after 4 p.m. Courses are also offered online, in the summer, and in intensive three or six week sessions to accommodate the scheduling and learning needs of the diverse student population of the program. The capstone, with its two options, offers choices helpful to students with different experiences and learning needs. The capstone also serves as a location for assessment of student achievement with, for the exam, a clear rubric, and for the written capstone, an oral presentation before advisors and peers. Student progress and needs are also monitored through advising, as well as through annual review of student data by program faculty.

Areas of Program Weakness:

Though being open and accessible to different kinds of students is a strength, the fact that the program appears to have never turned an applicant down was somewhat problematic. As described in the self-study, the LTET coordinator will “approve/deny obvious cases” and then consult “with another LTET faculty member on borderlines (incl. all with a GPA <3.0).” Presumably some students with a lower GPA are admitted, yet we did not see any specific supports in place to ensure those students’ successful progress through the program. In fact the high number of electives and the limited availability of advisors suggests that certain students could struggle to complete program requirements. The data submitted related to students, particularly the average time to complete the degree (2.8-2.9 years) did not indicate that students were struggling, although we did not see figures related to students who do not complete the program. Nonetheless we concluded that a program which admits everyone, is loosely organized around individual student interests, and has a faculty with multiple responsibilities, should have clearer structures in place to ensure that all students can succeed.

Similarly we found that the LTET program could more clearly articulate, track and review student learning outcomes. Written materials that we accessed demonstrate clear descriptions of the overall content and goals, and individual courses articulate specific learning outcomes. Less clear, however, was what students should have accomplished by the end of the program. Granted, the program is individualized, and the above learning outcomes are embedded to an extent in the capstone rubrics. Nonetheless, more visible and clearly articulated “umbrella” learning outcomes for the LTET program would enhance the program’s ability to understand what students are gaining from the program, and help faculty further improve student learning and engagement. The same holds true for evaluating student success after graduation. The written materials and oral discussions with students gave the review committee access to an interesting sample, including some students who are graduates of the program. But a clearer process for collecting and evaluating data related to LTET graduates would help the program anticipate and respond to the professional needs of students and graduates.

5. Programs shall ensure that curriculum resources are used wisely.

Areas of Program Strength:

This is a program that smartly utilizes the resources of the university in a frugal manner. The program has no core faculty, and even the foundation courses are not particular to this program, but reside within other programs. In fall 2010 a ¼ time G.A. was assigned to the program, which also has received “occasional assistance” from department and college staff. Such basic facts, along with other evidence collected in this review strongly support the claim made in the self-study that this graduate program “serves its students very economically” and successfully “leads students into courses from an array of options not

typically accessed through one program” (40). Furthermore, the way this “array of options” operates means that additional faculty are not necessary to teach most of these courses as LTET students fill underenrolled sections from other programs. In these times of financial exigency a program with no assigned faculty that serves students from many different campus constituencies is not just “wise” but a creative and exemplary model for maximizing resources.

Moreover we found that the LTET program does not duplicate or take from other programs but rather leads students, as the self-study argued, to “an array of options” and a graduate degree not available elsewhere in the university. LTET faculty have wide-ranging expertise and connections to other graduate certificate programs, and have creatively crafted a program for students interested in education, but not necessarily classroom instruction. Students clearly articulated how the LTET program was different from both licensure programs in education and other certificate programs like CCT. That difference lay in the flexibility of the program to, as one student said, individually “scope and mold” the master’s degree, and in the program’s focus on education in settings and opportunities beyond classroom teaching.

Areas of Program Weakness:

Data given the Review Committee (provided in the self-study and in a March 28 email communication from Peter Taylor) shows that numbers of students enrolled in the program have ranged from a low of 57 in 2010 to a high of 88 (or possibly 70-79, depending on when and how students were counted) in 2009. Thus the program serves an adequate number of students, especially given its minimal resources. At the same time, efforts to explain the program and recruit new students have been limited. Though program administrators have utilized existing formal mechanisms such as the Office of Student Services and graduate open houses to recruit students, the main recruitment method is informal word of mouth.

We found this reliance on informal recruiting and the connected low profile of the program to be a weakness. As previous discussions show, the LTET is a unique and important program. Yet few people outside of the program seem to know that it exists or what it does. To the extent the program is known, there appears to be misinformation, particularly in the view that most LTET students have failed licensure exams. Yet LTET program data shows that only 13% of students come to the program because they were not able to complete licensure requirements. There also seemed to be a perception that the degree earned in the LTET was “terminal,” yet three out of the five students we met said they planned on pursuing a doctorate.

It is understandable that currently faculty lack the time to market and advocate for the program, but there are other ways to utilize resources to this end. Most important, students could be used more to explain the program and to bring more students into it. All the students we met were passionate advocates for the LTET, and their experiences and understanding of the program provide persuasive evidence of the program’s importance and impact. Other existing “costless” methods to give the LTET program a higher profile would be to give it a separate page in the graduate catalog instead of hiding it without an index entry beneath the “Teacher Education” heading. This catalog organization is especially confusing given that an attraction of the program to students is its ability to decouple classroom teaching and education. Explaining and publicizing the LTET program to a wider audience, something that could occur with minimal additional resources, would help bring more students and potentially more support to the program.

Conclusions:

It was clear to all of us on the LTET External Review Committee that the LTET Program is both valued--by students, faculty and administrators--and valuable. In terms of academic quality, the LTET program meets and indeed we believe exceeds the expectations described in AQUAD guidelines. The success of

the program rests in its ability to deliver a unique and transformative curriculum to students who seek a non-licensure pathway to careers in education and who, without the LTET track, would likely not earn a graduate degree, and in the leadership and teaching of a highly qualified, dedicated, and intellectually engaged faculty. It does this while serving mission goals related to urban education and access, providing skills and understandings vital to 21st century learning, teaching, and educational transformation. Adequate resources will help the LTET program grow so that it can even better serve students, the College of Education and Human Development, the wider campus community, and the local, state and national constituencies to which it is connected.

The self-study provided the Review Committee outlines a number of possible futures for the LTET program. Option 5 in the self-study (a regular faculty appointment to LTET) is clearly the best possible choice for sustaining and growing this important and high-quality program. But acknowledging the complexity of funding priorities, LTET faculty also in the self-study suggested other futures for the program. Several of these, including disbanding the LTET Program, merging it with another program or department, or moving it to University College, were raised during the course of our review. Rather than comment directly on the possible options which emerged out of our review of the LTET program, we will end with an extended metaphor.

The LTET program as we observed it offers a unique example of curricular cross-pollination. That cross-pollination moreover is intentional, and not random. Students come to the LTET program for a variety of reasons, but become united in seeing themselves as transformative educators. Students also are united in understanding teaching and learning as located in places and processes broader than a traditional classroom. LTET students thus are different “plants” but not different “species,” and hence the cross-pollination is successful, creating stronger students and professionals. Faculty likewise have a range of expertise, but their syllabi and teaching strategies are seeded in the core areas of reflective writing and practice, curriculum organization, mediation and collaboration, and urban and social justice. Cross-pollination also happens more personally, through the program’s opportunities for collegiality and its fostering of connections among faculty and students from very different experiences and academic disciplines. Yet again that pollination is successful because there is a shared understanding of questions, methodologies and strategies essential to educational transformation. Much would be lost if the LTET program were disbanded, subsumed by or merged with another program, or moved out of its home in CEHD. Cross-pollination increases genetic diversity, and without an LTET program, the campus and CEHD loses curricular diversity. Cross-pollination cannot occur between different species, and if moved to another department or college, the LTET program likely will not survive.

Our review has led us to conclude that the LTET program should continue as its own non-licensure path in the College of Education and Human Development. At the same time, it is hard to imagine how LTET can continue without focused leadership and meaningful support. Our review suggests that some small steps, such as giving the program more visibility in the graduate catalog, as well as other changes, such as a required internship that might lead students to understand the professional possibilities of the program, could increase enrollment and make funding of the program more feasible. The program has already made significant contributions to teaching and learning with the very limited institutional support it has, and with additional resources could do even more.

We were delighted to provide a context for the discussions that will surely continue about the Graduate Program in Learning, Teaching, and Educational Transformation. We hope our work has been helpful in understanding the LTET program and its present and future place at the University of Massachusetts-Boston, and would be happy to answer any additional questions about our process, evidence and conclusions.