

## **Consolidated EREC Comments on the Programs**

One overarching concern cutting across the programs was the observation that the substantive coherence between the programs and their constituent projects is rather limited. The Committee noted that this gap occurs in all programs and concluded that stronger substantive integration is needed. It was suggested that projects are more explicitly developed to align with the main thrust of their programs.

### **Program 3**

The three projects in Program 3 are in full swing, engaging in real-world problem solving in a wide range of sites in Japan, Asia and Africa, while the Program Director is also actively involved in developing and implementing the Future Design methodology. This was noted with much appreciation.

The Committee, however, observed a disconnect between the program and the projects, leading to a situation where the projects cannot build on one another. The programmatic framework is not clearly established in the projects and there is a need to enhance the internal coherence of the program. The Program Director's presentation on Future Design was interesting and full of potential, but the activities appeared more like an additional project than an overarching framework. In principle, the Program's five key words – design, lifeworlds, wellbeing, sustainability, and future—could provide a framework to guide the projects. The Program is investing considerable energy in the development of Future Design and it would be useful if other connections, for example between lifeworlds and wellbeing, were also further explored.

It was also pointed out that conventional academic evaluations are important but that nonacademic indices are also needed for such projects that are active in problem-solving.