It is with tremendous pleasure that we bring to you the new issue of **CIES Perspectives**, three long years since the last newsletter was published. It has been a real joy working with my wonderful editorial assistant, Vanessa Sperduti, to compile the content for the January 2016 issue, made all the more exciting by the fact that everyone we were in contact with about the newsletter expressed tremendous enthusiasm and delight in the fact that CIES Perspectives was being ‘resurrected.

Kevin Kinser, in his September 2012 editorial introduction to CIES Perspectives, wrote that “Any scholarly society is fundamentally about communicating knowledge.” I couldn’t agree more, and our newsletter is an essential component of our knowledge mobilization strategy. We have in this newsletter included news about our SIGs and the Standing Committees, as well as the upcoming Vancouver CIES 2016 Conference, member publications and blogs. There are also some longer pieces, including the letter from our President, N’Dri T. Assié-Lumumba, outlining some of the historical background of the newsletter for our society; Robert Lawson’s speech upon becoming our society’s 2015 Honorary Fellow, Bjorn Nordtveit’s news about the CER, and Christopher Frey’s reflections on as CIES historian. We will feature 3 CIES Board members in each newsletter and for this issue, this includes our 3 outgoing Board members, Ali Abdi, Regina Cortina, and Joan DeJaeghere. As well, we will have a longer dialogue on a relevant topic in each issue. Our topic for this issue is the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with a focus on the education goal (#4), and I encourage readers to read through the entire dialogue between Steve Klees, David Post, Keith Lewin, and Antonia Wulff for a fascinating discussion on the background, merits, and (im)possibilities for success in implementing the SDGs by 2030.

For this new issue, we set out the structure based on previous newsletters and added a few new sections (e.g. media contributions), as well as many hyperlinks to relevant sources that were not present in our older, paper copies of the newsletter. There are pros and cons to producing only electronic versions of documents these days. It is enjoyable to hold something tangible in your hands, especially given the amount of time we all spend in front of a screen, both for work and pleasure. However, this electronic version of the newsletter has allowed us to increase the length, and include (as I just noted) hyperlinks to websites and blogs and photos that we might not otherwise have been able to do with a paper version. For those of you who prefer a paper copy in your hands, I encourage you to print out the newsletter.

N’Dri mentions in her letter that “the future viability and quality of the Newsletter will be determined by the intellectual support and contributions of the members”, so I encourage all of you to read and contribute to this, YOUR newsletter. We are aiming for 3 issues/year and you can expect your next one in April, following our conference in Vancouver. Hope to see you all there!

Marianne Larsen,
CIES SECRETARY, CIES PERSPECTIVES EDITOR
Dear Members of CIES

I am pleased that with this issue we have resumed the publication of the CIES Newsletter/CIES Perspectives. Besides the fact that the newsletter is a publication mandated by the CIES Constitution, historically it also fulfilled multiple and valuable functions for the membership. A recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on “Management and Delivery of Administrative Services” to resume the publication of the newsletter was endorsed by the Board of Directors at its retreat held in Washington, D.C. on 20-21 August 2015. In addition, a cross-section of CIES members had also inquired about the newsletter. Thus, the convergence of interest at multiple levels further reinforced the value of the newsletter in fostering communication and highlighted the importance of resuming its publication. I would like to thank Marianne Larsen for enthusiastically volunteering to serve as the editor of the renewed newsletter.

At least since its precursor called the CIES Newsnote evolved into the CIES Newsletter a little more than fifty years ago (1965) and into the CIES Perspectives in 2011, there has been continuity until the recent interruption. The fuller history of the newsletter is included in the forthcoming CIES Histories book in celebration of the 60th anniversary of the founding of our Society. For this brief introduction, suffice it to mention that the contents of the past issues of the CIES Newsletter/CIES Perspectives (accessible of the Website) varied in substance and scope. I remember, as a Ph.D. student at the University of Chicago in the late 1970s early 1980s, before the advent and popularized use of the Internet and World Wide Web, the key role that the newsletter played in intellectual networking, alongside the Comparative Education Review (CER) and the books published in our field.

At different stages, the CIES Newsletter/CIES Perspectives provided various types of information similar to the coverage of Weekly Announcements. However, specific issues included substantive feature articles by members on topics of interest to all. Others included the presentation of the members of the Board of Directors, and occasionally the profile of selected members. Whether in its earlier print form or the recent electronic version, the thought-provoking articles and occasional debates contributed to systematically bringing the members together and sustaining the conversation among them between conferences.

While the renewed newsletter builds on past experiences and achievements, it is envisaged to take into account the current and future evolving demographic composition of the Society and the expectations to make it a continually relevant part of our intellectual activities. The future viability and quality of the newsletter will be determined by the intellectual support and contributions of the members so that the excitement generated at the announcement of its resumption can be carried productively beyond this issue. The newsletter is envisioned to offer a space to publish concise, substantive, and well-written articles that, while they will not be subjected to the same requirements as articles in refereed journals such as CER, will be expected to have a certain rigor and relevant knowledge base. This way, the newsletter will constitute a useful space for all members with relevant information related to research and practice in comparative education in various parts of the world.

I would like to invite you to make each of the future issues of the newsletter a dynamic platform for vigorous intellectual debates and perspectives on praxis engaging recurring and emerging topics. Contributions from individuals and teams of researchers and practitioners, insights from students and generations of scholars and other professionals in the field, and arguments articulated from perspectives of standing committees and Special Interest Groups (SIGs) will enrich the debates. This newsletter is our collective project as an association. Let us make it remain dynamic and relevant.

As this first issue of the renewed newsletter, the CIES Perspectives, is coming out at the beginning of the New Year, during which we will celebrate the 60th Anniversary of CIES, I would like to take the opportunity to wish each of you the very best for 2016. In a troubled world in many regards, I wish you enlightened contributions to our collective search for improved and relevant educational systems and practices towards fostering and sustaining justice, universal human dignity, and peace.

N’Dri T. Assié-Lumumba
CIES PRESIDENT
The CIES 2016 Conference planning committee received over 2,500 proposals, demonstrating the strong interest in the field from scholars all over the world. Vancouver is itself a further attraction, renowned for its scenery and infrastructure.

The 2016 conference marks a special date in CIES history, because it celebrates the Society's 60th birthday. The CIES 2016 Conference theme - "Six decades of comparative and international education: taking stock and looking forward" - highlights this significance. CIES 2016 will consider how the Society and the field have evolved during the decades, and where they are (and/or should be) going.

The opening ceremony will begin with an acknowledgement of the land by a local Aboriginal elder, and will include the world première of a video entitled Comparative Speaking organized by Gita Steiner-Khamsi. This will be the sequel to the 50th anniversary video, and will present interviews of the CIES Presidents since 2006.

Among numerous workshops, panels, symposia, individual papers and poster presentations, the CIES 2016 Conference will offer various special events. One will be the launch of a 60th anniversary book entitled Crafting a Global Field: Six Decades of the Comparative and International Education Society, edited by Erswin Epstein. The book analyzes the Society's development trajectory, its major structural components, and its professional impact. The book launch will bring together the chapter authors to reflect on and discuss their perspectives. Professor Epstein will also deliver the Kneller Lecture on the theme: Why Comparative and International Education? Reflections on the Conflation of Names.

Ali Abdi from UBC will be delivering a plenary talk entitled "Knowledge Designs in International Development Education: Retrospective and Prospective Analyses". A special panel for CIES Honorary Fellow Jack Schwille on the last afternoon will focus on "The future of the integration-infusion approach to comparative education". The event will draw on Schwille’s forthcoming book (Michigan State University Press), and will identify variations and experiences in structures for teaching comparative and international education.

Another featured panel will focus on C.E. Beeby’s famous book entitled The Quality of Education in Developing Countries. This book was published precisely 50 years ago. The panel will discuss Beeby’s definition of the quality of education, and ways in which themes have evolved during the decades. And in this season of anniversaries, the CIES Special Interest Groups (SIGs) will organize various special events to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the creation of SIGs.

Alongside these activities will be exhibitions, institutional receptions, and a film festival organized by the Open Society Foundations in cooperation with the SIGs.

News and updates are available on www.cies2016.org. We look forward to seeing you in Vancouver!
We have a number of exciting pieces of news and a few questions for you. Our team took up the editorship in July 2013 for a five-year term, and if there is a lesson we have learned since then, it is that running the Comparative Education Review is teamwork. This teamwork is not only important at the administrative and content-related level of the editors and with the University of Chicago Press; we also depend on the Advisory Board as well as on external reviewers volunteering their time. The latter often provide pages upon pages of helpful advice to authors. Without them, the whole principle of double-blind peer review would fall apart. In a competitive academic world, where time is such a scarce resource, we still have people willing to review. However, it is increasingly difficult to find enough reviewers, especially when we receive a growing number of submissions. Consequently, our team has been stricter during the initial review of submissions (on the positive side, this also ensures quick initial feedback to authors, who can decide whether they would like to revise their manuscript or re-submit immediately to another journal). We try to provide helpful comments on papers that we reject without peer review, and, more substantially so (because we can draw on the external reviews), to papers which are being sent back for revision after peer review. We also work directly with authors whose first language is not English, trying to help them move papers forward (incidentally, as a new academic in the field, I benefited greatly from such help from the former CER editorial team). However, we currently seem to get more submissions than when we started our editorship – and more high-quality papers. With time being ever scarcer, we feel it is increasingly difficult to incubate new submissions with potential. Since our journal is relatively small in size (after all, we are publishing only 24-28 papers per year), occasionally, we must make choices with which we are not fully comfortable, i.e., choices that at times may favor well-established scholars with English as a first language.

As an editorial team, we have discussed how to deal with this issue, and how to help “bring forward” new scholars, assisting them to develop their ideas and arguments in their submissions. We feel that many papers have dormant ideas, which could be “activated” through tighter and more substantial follow up. And we feel that these papers could bring in fresh new ideas, new perspectives, and new readers – because they would enhance the diversity of the Journal. As a first step in that direction, we launched a special issue on “Rethinking Knowledge Production and Circulation in Comparative and International Education: Southern Theory, Postcolonial Perspectives, and Alternative Epistemologies.” We are looking forward to seeing this issue in print later this year, as we’re celebrating, with CIES, our 60th anniversary. In addition, we have been creating a “CER Guide to World Literature on Comparative and International Education” (compiled and written by Kathryn Anderson-Levitt), as well as, for the first time, a searchable expanded bibliography of the field (for 2014), using RefWorks. This latter has been developed by Peter Easton and his team at FSU, and can be found on the UCP/CER website.

All of this expands access and knowledge about “what is out there,” and, we hope, helps new scholars navigate the expanding field. However, we would also like to provide concrete advice to specific papers which would normally have been rejected, but in which we – and reviewers – see the potential for innovation and originality and for bringing a fresh look at the field. And this is where you come in, reader and contributor to the CER. We would like to call for interest for serving on the Advisory Board. This will include the reading and reviewing of up to one paper per month – in fields that not necessarily are within your field of expertise. It will also involve offering help to someone to develop a paper. This may, in some cases, involve editing, or assisting to develop the literature review, discussion of findings, or again help in refining the methodology section. Being on the Advisory Board will also involve participating in shaping the future of the Journal, through discussions about policies and ways forward.

If you are interested in serving on the Advisory Board, we will be considering expressions of interest on a regular basis: please send your CV and a cover letter to the Comparative Education Review.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.
When I started my education career, I was intellectually somewhere between my love for literature and writing and wanting to upgrade my hard, analytic skills. I ended up taking my advanced degree in education because after-hours was only available in that field, and started to teach because I needed income to support a family.

The transition from Thomas Wolfe and Elizabeth Barrett Browning to education “how-to” inanity and thence to Isaac Kandel gave several shocks to my mental system, but one does need to grow up sometime. At the same time, wisdom comes, allowing us to keep our dreams, and to continue to seek the mysteries below and above what our computers tell us. Like Cathy in Wuthering Heights, we experience agonies of life and soul beyond science, beyond theory, certainly beyond talk – raising questions of the spirit whose answers require humility rather than pride.

Now, after a lifetime in social science and education policy, and after observing the social and political changes that have radically altered the social and moral culture of the West, and the environment of the world, I am fully convinced of the centrality of the institution and study of Education. It is not peripheral or derivative as I initially assumed but most necessary among the social institutions of a moral society and just polity, central to combating ignorance and criminality in a free world.

To the question: What is education? I would say it depends on why you look for answer. However the methodology is a dynamic of disciplinary loops, intended not only to advance knowledge but to advance praxis. The loops that I am most interested in, and which go to its center are:

- How education drives the polity/civil society
- The politicization cycle: socialization through Education
- The dynamic of indoctrination and generation

Beyond referring to authorities, classical or current, comparison is the only route to social knowledge and purpose. Objectives and methods cannot be reduced by categorization; they are inherently idiosyncratic. Disciplines are inherent in the respective inquiries. One can compare learners, schools, policy documents, political/professional connections, etc. in the compared entities. My own preference has been for macro-comparisons of selected institutional examples, over a thematic period characterized by dynamic institutional change within a defined socio-political environment. (My work in Western Europe, in Eastern Europe, in Australia and Canada, and in Africa required respective differences in assumptions, methods, and purposes.) Outcome
HFC CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6

from a study specifies what Education does, which in turn places it in the context of policies and institution, and points to causation. For a given hypothesis, and correcting for historical time, specific actions and consequences are inexorable and will show how Education, broadly conceived, becomes the key variable in social transformations.

The primary vehicle for our communication on comparative and international study is the Society, its organs and its people. Besides respect I have an emotional attachment to my mentors, my professional brothers and sisters, my student descendants, and to the organization. Much as I would like to elaborate, from respect for Claude Eggertsen who started me on this path, to Ratna Ghosh, dean of my students, I can only say here how much I honor your friendship.

When Stewart Fraser first talked to me about the idea of “honorary fellows”, I vehemently opposed it as another of the endless exercises in self-congratulations that characterize cocooned professorship. But here I am, proud and grateful. I take it all back, Stewart.

Here, I would like to touch briefly on questions of method, context, organization and criticism which define the discipline. Our method uses a dynamic of purpose and theory. Education is seen in the context of a culture, shaped by and shaping the persons, tools and practices of that culture, a focus for academic understanding of the human sciences and civic virtue. It has the practical purpose of comparing actions and effects, locating failures and successes, deriving principles for individual action and intelligent policy. In this dynamic, contrasts, oppositions are inherent. The opposites need to be understood in light of their respective shadings and value connotations. But their complexity cannot be submerged in a (post-modern) denial of absolutes, realities, and consequences.

As an undergraduate student, I had the learning shock of selecting in the same semester courses by the anthropologist, Leslie White, and the literary-biblical scholar, Bennett Weaver. The first emphasized on-the-ground reality, approaching culture through the study of man’s works, by the way injecting, even mocking religion. The second taught the significance and literary beauty of the English Bible, approaching culture through beliefs beyond “man’s works”. Both enlightened my understanding of “culture” through intellectual engagement with its respective differences. To fully understand their difference is a basic step in comparison, requiring use of discrimination and of synthesis. We, in our work, take the dimension of Education, including institutional and pedagogical practice, and study its reciprocation with given other dimensions of the culture, in order to see what the relationship is. Our science is qualitative, but finally exact (for the time being). It is not presupposed or abused by pretentious, rhetorical interpretations or by ideological whimsy. Frederick Hess (AEI) has written “evidence doesn’t interpret itself”, and I would add: interpretation is hollow without evidence.

Where has our work brought us over my professional lifetime? What have my experience, study, wisdom of age revealed of use to my colleagues and my grandchildren? Are we ahead now? What have my experience, study, wisdom of age revealed of use to my colleagues and my grandchildren? Are we ahead now? — probably “yes” in principle, not in what became the means and resulting distortions. We have undoubtedly critically advanced our science, and broadened the reach of Education, and can use our work to find some synthesis of positive possibilities for the future. But the advances of science and philosophy have also seen a pervasive weakness and vagueness which results in bizarre social and moral consequences. I have always lived and worked with optimistic confidence, guarded by pessimistic realities. It is to criticism of some potentials for macro- and micro-breakdown that I now turn.

We were taught that we had the ability and the tools to contribute to a better world, once labeled “progressive”. We lost sight of what that meant over the deep changes in demographic constellations internationally, in structures of policy and governance, and most fundamentally in the moral basis and bases of social behavior. The dangerous effects, direct or latent, cannot simply be swept away by blind optimism or selective nostalgic forgetting. Stephen Graubard has referred to the lack of appreciation of the conditions that created a “chaotic and cruel 20th Century”.

Loose use of the term, “progressive”, so important in American educational development, exemplifies how much words count. In the surrender of formal institutions of education, particularly universities over the last 50 years, to ideas and taught
behaviors of “political correctness”, education came progressively to favor, then foster corruption of the culture – in its academic meaning as “everything that is thought and said...”. The change now signals a breakdown in the honesty of language, the stability of economy, the social relations that guide a predictable individual propriety, the international relations that hold. The labor-industrial progressivism of the 1930’s was far different from the ambiguous revolt of the 1960’s and 70’s, which turned progressivism into antagonism and license. Increasingly institutions and intellectual, traditional ideas were attacked by youth, first actively, then through the disabled functionaries of the school system and universities. The slogans were about race and sex (oppression and freedom), but the political tools were attacks on the West, Western institutions and ideas (colonialist) and on Christian religion (missionary indoctrination); chief content targets were recorded history (one-sided and exclusive), and the English language (to be equalized, profaned, and dismantled). Europe left the period without a culture, barely identifiable.

From the 1920’s into the present, our society retains something of the progressivism of the past, but the present progressives are not generally characterized by labor, by institutional inventiveness intended to represent advancement of unrealized and understood “democratic” reform, or by youth as a ‘class’. The progressives of today are the elite recipients or exploiters of the good intentions of their predecessors. They are the intellectual (and ‘tenured’) elite most firmly anchored in higher education. Using the language and the ideals of earlier progressives to advertise political and social change, indoctrinating the young, redefining history and economics to their supposed progressive goals, they carefully protect their manipulated privilege. It is a Goebbelian dream. The “progressivism” of today is a confusion on the edge of reality.

So, are we swimming along? Because we are caught in the in the poetry, or in the politics, or in our own fear of opposing, of recognizing evil even in our little islands, or have we come to believe it? Is it time to take back the academic and civic virtues which built our bridges between community and world, between theory and practice, between creativity and collaboration.
Tell us about some of your recent research and teaching in comparative and international education.

My scholarly work and professional practice are concerned with gender, class and racial inequalities in education and how education can provide possibilities for individual and societal change toward equality. My work draws on Amartya Sen’s capability approach and critical feminist scholarship to understand the processes and pedagogies that foster not only economic wellbeing, but social and cultural wellbeing. I am currently the principal investigator of a 6-year evaluation of a youth livelihoods program in East Africa funded by The MasterCard Foundation. This research project has involved more than 50 graduate students who analyze and publish from this work. A recent publication from this study is “Encountering friction between liberal and neoliberal discourses of citizenship: A non-governmental organization’s entrepreneurship education in Tanzania”, Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, (2014). I am also co-editing a volume that features the work of many former students and young scholars, Education and Youth Agency (forthcoming by Springer).

Tell us about your work as a CIES Board member.

As a board member, I have served on the finance and investment committee for the past 2 years, and in this capacity, I feel that our society is on very solid footing and able to make strategic investments to improve the society’s work and impact. I look forward to continuing to serve the society in a variety of roles, as a mentor to junior scholars, as a member of the Gender and Education committee, and in other ways that will advance our collective work in this field.

Can you tell us one fun fact about yourself?

I have competed in road races (5, 10 and 20 K) and received medals in three different continents: Asia, Latin America and Europe.

What book are you reading now?

I’m reading A Postcapitalist Politics by J. K. Gibson-Graham. It offers a feminist critique and alternative to a neoliberal political economy. I find it hopeful, generative and thoughtful. It is also useful to make sense of my research in which I examine how presumed neoliberal forms of education and training encounter local social and economic relations in East African communities (the focus of a book that I am writing).

Do you have any words of advice for new scholars in the field of CIE?

CIES and the larger field are exciting and dynamic and new scholars can find a niche in various SIGs or groups in the society. I also think it is important to be connected with scholars in other comparative education societies by attending comparative education meetings elsewhere to see how the field is framed and shaped differently.
Featured Board Members

Regina Cortina
Teachers College, Columbia University
Website: https://www.tc.columbia.edu/faculty/rc2472/

Tell us about some of your recent research and teaching in comparative and international education.
I am a Professor of Education in the Department of International and Transcultural Studies. I have been coordinating this Department’s Program in International and Comparative Education since 2009. My latest book, *The Education of Indigenous Citizens in Latin America* (Multilingual Matters, 2014), describes unprecedented changes in education across Latin America that resulted from the endorsement of Indigenous people’s rights through the development of intercultural and bilingual education. In this line of research I will be teaching a new course on “Critical Theories in Latin America and Latino Education,” in the Spring of 2016. This course explores the application of critical theories to Latin American and Latino Studies to advance new perspectives and knowledge in comparative education. My other areas of expertise are gender and education, the education and employment of teachers, public policy and education, and the schooling of Latinos in the United States.

Tell us about your work as a CIES Board member.
Through my participation in the Board of Directors I have gained great respect for the dedication with which all members in the board provide their knowledge and perspective to improve the management and reach of CIES.

What book are you reading now?
On a personal note, I am reading a new book *Mexico from the Inside Out* by Enrique Olvera, the most successful Mexican chef both in Mexico City and in New York City.

Do you have any words of advice for new scholars in the field of CIE?
My word of advice for new scholars in the field is to work and write on the issues that you most care about.
The intent of the CIES Board retreat was to learn more about one another, create teamwork, have time to address a few big picture issues in depth, develop a sense of common purpose, a strategic framework for the coming period, 3-5 priorities, and agree upon an action plan to achieve results in those priority areas.

The agenda was generated through a process of prior consultation with nearly all the members of the Board, and the retreat was more a workshop than a formal meeting. During the retreat, Board Members were active in identifying issues/topics to be addressed and the best process for doing so. The Board went into a formal session at midpoint of the second day to formalize agreements and take decisions. By that time, enough of a collective vision had formed, deeper discussions had taken place, and clear priorities had emerged.

A key outcome of the retreat was the agreement to take a transformational approach in Board leadership. This involves rethinking the founding and prevailing assumptions/mental models, power relationships (inequalities), organizational structure and decision-making—redefining the fundamental premises, values, organizational form, and decision-making to better reflect a more equal, respectful, and transformed CIES.

As a starting point, members in group and plenary brainstorming discussions made the follow contributions in which all possible ideas for our vision and priorities were put forward. We talked about a variety of values and worldviews that could inform our vision and priorities including: dannung, bildung, justice, humanism, Ubuntu, and activism.

Some possible ideas for our vision include that the CIES:

- Be a welcome space for all to foster informed discussion (family, community, and academic home base)
- Be transformational and forward-looking, decolonizing and critical perspective on identity, power and knowledge
- Critically engage, reflect on and promote the CIES role and presence globally (beyond North America)
- Be inclusive and accessible (support and mentor scholars, students and communities that often have been excluded or marginalized within CIES research and practice)
- Provide intellectual/knowledge leadership that is outward looking
- Be both externally connected and internally cohesive
- Provide more intersections between a changing CIES/academia and international organizations (GOs and NGOs), other academic societies, private organizations, foundations and philanthropy, knowledge communities, WCCES, higher education institutions, individual scholars, teachers, practitioners
- Influence teacher education, educational policies and processes across the board and higher education on the purpose of education.
- Grow in providing intellectual spaces, size, and inclusivity
- Advocate on educational issues, respond to education crises and emerging issues
Some key priorities and points for the CIES Board in the coming 2-3 years are:

1. Foster, promote, disseminate and advance the learning, thinking, and research gained from comparative, cross cultural, interdisciplinary and international education studies, across different regions, sectors and disciplines…and within broader political, economic and social contexts.
   - Support diverse forms of knowledge production
   - Develop communication strategy/knowledge dissemination

2. Critically engage and reflect on the CIES role and presence globally
   - Engage and involve different partners and diverse groups
   - Engage in decolonizing practices

3. Promote, foster, and facilitate the exchange of ideas/dialogue and debates about CIE across a variety of sectors (e.g. academic/practitioners; K12/higher education) and across different regions, disciplines, etc.
   - Become more active between conferences (e.g. regional and mini theme/topic based conferences)
   - Support CIES publications
   - Knowledge production, mobilization and dissemination
   - Supporting SIGs and Standing Committees

4. Advocacy role for CIES:
   - Support advocacy of issues of concern to CIES members (e.g. influence educational policy and programs)

5. Support and mentor scholars, students, and communities that have often been excluded or marginalized within CIE research and practice.

6. Respond to the changing technological and “actor” educational landscape

Action Steps and Organizational Features to engage these ideas.

The discussion prior to the last session on action planning recommended more broadly that the Executive Director/President/Board provide leadership in agenda-setting research activities and cutting edge research, that the Board restructure the ways and frequency the CIES meets, and develop administrative structures that foster more academic/research activities. Concretely, the plenary in the last session recommended:

- the Board establish a subcommittee to promote cutting edge, innovative research;
- restart the Quarterly newsletter/book series (Secretary will look at past examples and move forward)...this will be a living, breathing document.
- provide Weekly updates/announcements
- form a Member Engagement subcommittee to support mini-conferences and seminars, regional conferences etc.
- investigate how the budget could include an ‘opportunity fund’ to fund some of the above initiatives
Upcoming Vancouver Conference

During the course of the two days, several discussions focused on the Vancouver conference, and how to make it exceptionally good, considering that this (our annual conference) is our flagship and what we do very well. We talked over a range of ideas: restructuring some of the sessions to make them more dynamic and like workshops and fewer power point presentations; the idea of town hall meetings; assigning rooms and room size. We also talked about the problem of ‘no shows’ at the conference (people whose papers are on the program, but do not show up to present their papers). We want to encourage members to show up and present their papers. Overall, the feeling was that this was not necessarily the best time to go into depth about the process and content of Vancouver as there are other spaces to do so.

SIGs

The Board also had time to have a good conversation about the role and future of SIGs in our society. Board member, Regina Cortina, presented the results of the recent study about the SIGs. Most SIG members are U.S. and Canada based, and SIGs ranged in size from 60-236 members. We discussed how the creation and support of SIGs aligns with our goal of promoting and facilitating dialogue between different sectors, regions, groups, etc. within our society. The Board approved the application for the Youth Development and Education SIG; and requested revisions/additional information for 3 other applications to be reconsidered later in the fall (African Diaspora; Education, Conflict, and Emergencies; Economics and Finance of Education). However, the Board also felt that it is time to reflect more deeply on the purpose, roles and functions of the SIGs in relation to our broader goals as an academic society and to that end a motion was pass to not accept any new SIG applications until further notice, and another motion to ask the SIG Committee to review the current status of existing SIGs, propose any changes to the SIG policies, and present a report to the Board by January 2016.

Administrative/Management/Conference Services

During the retreat, the Board also engaged in discussions about our administrative services, which are currently provided by Talley Management Group (TMG). We talked about need to clarify what we need in terms of management/administrative/conference services; as well as the pros and cons of different providers of these services (e.g. university-based secretariat vs. professional management company vs. Executive Director). Many noted the need to figure out what we need at this particular point in our history/growth as a society. We decided to arrange an evaluation of TMG’s performance to be completed this fall, and then make a decision about our management/administrative services.
As part of this 60th anniversary panel discussion, our distinguished guests will reflect on the changing place, nature and significance of gender, as well as other intersecting social categories, including race, ethnicity and class, in the context of CIES, as a professional organization and CIE as a field of inquiry and practice. Questions and topics to be addressed include:

• What drew these past-presidents to the field of comparative and international education and what has sustained their interest in the field.
• What they might tell their young(er) selves about their work and experiences in the field and in CIES now 20, 30 or 40 years later?
• The shifting role(s) and statuses of women in CIES through the years.
• The extent to which the inclusion of more women leaders has changed the society.
• Past and present barriers/challenges, as well as opportunities for further organizational change in support of equity and inclusion.

We look forward to seeing you at this special 60th anniversary event, and hope that you will join us for our Business Meeting immediately following, where you can learn about more opportunities to get involved in the work of the GEC. For more information, please contact the GEC at gender@cies.us

At the CIES 2016 Conference, the GEC is also hosting a pre-conference workshop: “Designing and implementing gender responsive pedagogy and school programs.” The objectives of this pre-conference workshop are four-fold: a) to raise awareness and understanding of key principles and good practices with respect to gender responsive pedagogy and schooling reforms b) to support and provide space for participants to review and pilot existing tools and strategies used for teacher and school administration capacity-building, but also those used with students themselves c) provide an opportunity for participants to brainstorm potential innovations/new tools and strategies for promoting gender responsive, inclusive and quality schooling and d) provide an opportunity for guided reflection on the challenges and issues at stake in such work and thinking through ways to address these.

In addition to several exciting highlighted panel sessions, the GEC is participating as a contributing author for the launch of a 60th anniversary book entitled Crafting a Global Field: Six Decades of the Comparative and International Education Society.
New Scholars Standing Committee

The New Scholars Committee (NSC) has been actively engaged in promoting the scholarship of the CIES members who are in the early stages of their career development. Whether one is planning for a career as a faculty member at a college or university, working in a non-academic position, transitioning from academic career to outside of academic or vice versa, or weighing competing job offers, the NSC offers guidance while bringing senior researchers, professionals and emerging scholars together.

Events at CIES 2016:

- **Orientation Session:** Monday, March 7, 2016 @ 8:00 PM Tips to successfully navigate the CIES 2016 Conference and maximize your CIES experience! Session will close with an opportunity to network.

- **Dissertation and Publication Mentoring Workshops:** Mornings, Monday-Wednesday. These sessions are closed. The application process selects scholars for an opportunity to go over works-in-progress with a group of peers and mentors. Attendees are eligible for NSC Travel Awards. Lunch provided.

- **Essential Series sessions:** This year’s offerings will help recent graduates and new scholars make realistic assessments about job positions, build the “right” CV, pursue non-academic careers, and balance life, work and health. There will be ample time for participants to ask questions of the workshop facilitators, who have served on numerous search committees and have advised many students who have become faculty members.

- **Business Meeting:** Wednesday, March 8 @ 1:15 PM. If you would like to get involved with the organization of the Committee or share your perspective on the role that New Scholars should play within CIES, please join us at our annual business meeting! The meeting will include electing representatives to lead the New Scholars Committee in preparing for the next CIES conference. Currently, the Committee uses an organizational structure that pairs returning representatives with new representatives.

For more information, please visit our website: [https://ciesnewscholars.wordpress.com/](https://ciesnewscholars.wordpress.com/)

If you have any suggestions for items to be discussed as part of the business meeting agenda, please email them to newscholars.cies@gmail.com. We look forward to seeing you in Vancouver!

UREAG (Underrepresented Racial, Ethnic, and Ability Groups) Standing Committee

Mentorship Workshop:

Underrepresented Faculty and Students in Higher Education (8:00 a.m.- 9:30 a.m.)

The UREAG Mentoring workshop will serve as an opportunity for senior faculty to connect with PhD students, junior, senior and higher education faculty and administrators from underrepresented groups. In this session, Mentors and Mentees will be matched depending on their research interests and needs. UREAG continues their efforts to support underrepresented faculty and encourage mentorships as new faculty seek to navigate academia.

We invite you to UREAG Corner of CIES 2016 Conference!

- **Reception and Hangout** - Tuesday, March 8, 7:30 p.m.
- **Travel Grant Award Ceremony and Business meeting** - March 8, 3 - 4:30 p.m.
- **All day symposium** - Wednesday, March 9th 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
- **Opening session** - UREAG/CIES orientation and continental breakfast
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Highlighted Session 1: LGBTQ community college students, Academic Outcomes among Latino and Latina students and role of race and discrimination in teacher hiring practices (9:45 a.m.- 11:15 a.m.)

Papers for this session include the following:

• Promoting persistence among LGBTQ community colleges
• The intersection of empathic and nationalist discourse in 20th century history textbooks: Analyzing U.S. discourse in an international context
• Academic Outcomes among Latino and Latina students
• A diverse teacher corps? The role of race and discrimination in teacher hiring practices

Highlighted Session 2: Academic leadership of African HE, Marginalization of HIV teachers, and importance of educating African youth Diaspora (11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.)

Papers for this session include the following:

• Leadership Styles of African higher education institutions: A case study
• Marginalization of HIV+ Teachers
• Negative impact of ignoring the importance of educating youth Diaspora,
• Female Literacy and Development
• Where do you come from?” Navigating Identity Formation in 2nd Generation West -African Youth in Alberta.

Highlighted Session 3: Access, Identity, inclusion of Underrepresented groups from national and international perspectives (3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.)

• Access to Higher Education For Chinese Students With Disabilities.
• Negotiating educational identities: Life histories of Karen women in Minnesota.
• Socio-economic inequality in higher education among different ethnicity groups in China.
• College Education for Students with Disabilities: India and the United States.
• Educational Rights for Foreign National Students in Japan.
A Decade of SIGs
(Special Interest Groups) at CIES

JOAN. OSA OVIAWE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, CHAIR, CIES STANDING COMMITTEE ON SIGS

In 2004/2005, the Board of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) adopted a proposal for the establishment of Special Interest Groups (SIGs). The first SIGs were thus approved in 2005/2006 and they organized their inaugural panels and business meetings at the 2006 conference in Honolulu, Hawai’i. The SIGs are: Africa, Citizenship and Democratic Education, Cultural Contexts of Education and Human Potential, Globalization and Education, Language Issues and Peace Education. Since the inception of SIGs almost a decade ago, the numbers have risen exponentially. Four SIGs were approved in 2015: African Diaspora, Education, Conflict, and Emergencies, Economics and Finance of Education and Youth Development and Education. There are currently a total of 23 thematic and six regional SIGs. You can read news about the SIGs following this overview in the section called SIGnatures.

From the above diagram, it can be observed that SIGs have grown steadily almost every year since 2006. The size of membership, and the types of activity that each SIG engages in varies and can include: book publications, journal special issues, podcasts, and online repository to archive course materials in our field. In addition, a good number of SIGs publish their own newsletters, while others regularly invite renowned scholars and practitioners to speak at their events.

At its August 2015 retreat in Washington D.C., the CIES Board made a decision to place a temporary moratorium on the approval of new SIGs. An announcement to that effect was sent to the membership, through the Secretariat. The primary rationale for the moratorium as announced by the Board is to pause and reflect on how best to enhance the substantive contributions of SIGs to CIES, and how to consolidate these gains without necessarily increasing the existing number of SIGs. The SIG Committee is currently reviewing the SIG Handbook and Bylaws. At the end of the exercise, it will recommend some substantive changes, for subsequent adoption by the Board. These changes will help to improve the governance and structure of SIGs, as well as develop mechanisms to support their growth.

CIES members and conference attendees are encouraged to sign up for SIG membership online. The cost is $10 http://www.cies.us/?page=Join. For more information about the regional SIGs visit http://www.cies.us/?page=RegionalSIGs and go to http://www.cies.us/?page=TopicSigs to learn about the thematic SIGs.

The CIES Standing Committee on SIGs is comprised of the following members: Christopher J. Frey (Bowling Green State University), Mousumi Mukherjee (University of Melbourne), Oren Pizmony-Levy (Teachers College), and Jayson Richardson, (University of Kentucky).

SIGs and the CIES 2016 Conference

At the 60th annual 2016 conference of the CIES, several activities are planned to celebrate a decade of SIGs. In commemoration of this important milestone, the SIG Committee, in collaboration with the SIGs, has planned the following events:
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• **SIG Open House**: Launched at the CIES conference in Washington D.C. by the organizers of the 2015 conference, the SIG Open House provides an opportunity for SIGs to interact with conference attendees and showcase their activities as well as highlight valuable contributions to the vibrant community of scholars and practitioners at CIES.

• **SIG Reflection Panel**: Panelists will discuss the history of SIGs and examine their growth over the years while analyzing the interconnectedness of the groups, with particular attention to the convergences of SIG activities and scholarly output. Other topics to be addressed will include: collaboration among SIGs, leadership and mentoring opportunities for emerging scholars, junior faculty and practitioners and the role of technology to disseminate information about SIG events and research projects.

• **Launch of SIGnatures**: SIGnatures is a publication that is conceptualized to promote and inform the membership of the activities of SIGs. Beginning with this issue of the CIES newsletter, SIGnatures will appear in a designated section of the newsletter.

• **SIG-sponsored Documentary Screening**: Some SIGs will participate in the 2016 festivalette for the screening of education documentaries that address a SIG’s thematic or regional focus.

• **10th Anniversary Reception**: A reception is planned to celebrate the achievements of SIGs and to also reflect on the topical issues in education often addressed through their highlighted panels and publications. Conference attendees are invited to participate in these activities and use the opportunity to engage with SIGs, learn more about their work and become a member.

As several CIES members belong to more than one SIG, our menu of activities will offer a common forum and vibrant learning spaces for SIG members to engage and interact with other SIGs without having to choose which SIG activity to attend.

---

**REFERENCE**

Africa
As CIES celebrates its 60th anniversary, the Africa SIG is celebrating its 10th. We are very excited about this landmark in our SIG and invite all CIES members to learn more about us. We have four invited panels to celebrate our anniversary in addition to panels on language, post-colonialism, primary education, education in emergencies, higher education, health, gender, and more. We will also host a reception and a business meeting at which we hope non-SIG members will come to learn about us. We look forward to welcoming you to Vancouver!

East Asia
East Asia SIG currently has about 100 members from the East Asian region and other regions across the world. We share and strengthen intercultural, interdisciplinary, and international research on education about East Asia. Scholars, practitioners, professionals, education leaders, policy makers, and students share knowledge and foster academic and social development through research. At the CIES 2016 Conference, East Asia SIG members will present 40 individual papers and hold 7 group panel discussions. The East Asia SIG plans to develop networking opportunities and promote research collaborations among its members as well as the conference participants at CIES 2016.

Eurasia
The Eurasia SIG is a fast growing group of emerging and established scholars who conduct research on educational transformations in Eastern and Central Europe and Central Asia. In the recent years, the SIG has provided a platform for two large collaborative projects. One project has examined theoretical and methodological dilemmas of conducting educational research in post-socialist contexts. The project has resulted in the forthcoming scholarly volume, Reimagining Utopias: Theory and Method for Educational Research in Post-Socialist Contexts (Sense Publishers). The book launch will take place during the CIES 2016 Conference. Another project on which the Eurasia SIG members are currently working explores memories of post-socialist childhood and schooling. You can learn more about this project at the Eurasia SIG website. Follow us on Facebook to learn more about the scholarly activities of the Eurasia SIG members. We have also recently published the inaugural issue of the Eurasia SIG’s biannual electronic newsletter.

Latin America (LASIG)
The Latin America SIG (LASIG) is a multicultural and transnational space for the promotion and dissemination of educational research in Latin America. You can now like LASIG on Facebook and check out our new website. We have extended the deadlines for nomination for the LASIG Outstanding Scholar Award and the LASIG Outstanding Dissertation Award to February 1st, 2016. You can read more about the requirements for both awards on our website. Please consider volunteering your time to the Review Committees for both awards. If you are interested in self-nominating or nominating someone else—or in volunteering—please contact us at lasig.cies@gmail.com.
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Middle East (MESIG)

The Co-Chairs of the Middle East Special Interest Group (MESIG), Nagwa Megahed and Elizabeth Buckner, successfully initiated the organization of joint SIGs’ panels at the CIES 2016 Conference. The MESIG in collaboration with the Africa SIG and the newly established Education in Emergency SIG have organized a joint panel and a joint highlighted session that include respectively: “Insiders’ Reflection on Decades of Comparative Education in Africa and the Middle East: A Geopolitical Perspective” and “Challenges and Opportunities in Bridging the Humanitarian-Development Divide in the Syrian Education Response”.

South Asia (SA-SIG)

The South Asia SIG at the CIES 2016 Conference honors its members with three initiatives: Best Dissertation Award, Best Article and Best Field-based Initiative. The dissertation award was started in 2012, best article in 2013 and field-based initiative in 2014. An annual dinner is hosted by the South Asia SIG for its members every year. Apart from these annual events, the SA-SIG maintains close relationship with its members through the monthly newsletter and Facebook group updates. Please become a member of our group by visiting our Facebook page.

African Diaspora

The newly formed African Diaspora SIG is pleased to announce the establishment of the inaugural Henry M. Levin African Diaspora SIG Lecture, honoring Dr. Levin, William Heard Kilpatrick Professor of Economics and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and Past CIES President, for his unwavering commitment to equality and social justice. The inaugural lecturer will be Dr. Ernest Morrell, the Macy Professor of Education and Director of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. The title of his lecture is, “Educating the African Diaspora: A Critical, Comparative Perspective.” We welcome the CIES community to attend and engage with the experiences of the African Diaspora at the CIES 2016 Conference.

Citizenship and Democratic Education (CANDE)

The Citizenship and Democratic Education SIG is pleased to announce its highlighted sessions for the upcoming CIES 2016 Conference! The first panel is called “History Learning and Conceptions of Citizenship” and will include presentations on critical historical consciousness, patriotism and national identity across a range of curriculum and textbooks from countries including Canada, Croatia, Guatemala, Japan and Singapore. The second panel is “Teachers’ Understanding and Practices of Democratic Education”, with presenters addressing teachers’ attitudes on democracy, ethnic diversity and citizenship education. Individual papers will focus on results from Canada, China, Indonesia and Norway. In addition, the preliminary results of the Global Doing Democracy Project, involving over 50 researchers in 25 countries, will be shared.

Please contacts co-chairs Kassie Freeman (kfreeman@adcxchange.org) & Nafees M. Khan (nkhan04@gmail.com) for more information.
Contemplative Inquiry and Holistic Education (CIHE)

Great things are coming out of the Contemplative Inquiry and Holistic Education SIG. In summer 2015, Professor Jing Lin, the SIG co-chair, taught a graduate and undergraduate level course on this topic for the first time, with great feedback from the students. Students from the class implemented what they proposed for the final project later on. For example, Natalie Vinski, Program Manager of the Global Communities, a learning-living program at the University of Maryland, adopted Labyrinth as a tool in contemplative education to help undergraduate students to gain self-discovery and wellness, and Yuyun Peng conducted a contemplative project for enhancing mindfulness with Kindergarteners.

Cultural Contexts of Education and Human Potential (CCEHP)

The new Co-Chairs of Cultural Contexts of Education and Human Potential, Cristina Jaimungal and Maung Nyeu, would like to recognize Dr. Kassie Freeman for her solid leadership and dedication to the successful growth of CCEHP. Building on this foundation, Jaimungal and Nyeu will continue to center unheard voices to promote better learning between and about different groups. Looking ahead, the Co-Chairs aim to contribute a robust understanding of equity (for example, scholarship on culture, race, gender, indigenous knowledges, language, and disability) to the forefront of conversations on education. All members are encouraged to shape the future direction of CCEHP. For further information, please contact Co-Chairs Cristina Jaimungal c.jaimungal@mail.utoronto.ca; Maung Nyeu mtn553@mail.harvard.edu

Economics and Finance of Education of Education (ECE)

We are delighted to introduce our new Economics and Finance of Education SIG in the upcoming CIES 2016 Conference to be held in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The EFE SIG focuses on investigating, conceptualizing, and theorizing the links between Economics and finance of education and educational policies. Our SIG offers a new opportunity for scholars interested in the field. We would like to invite you to join us in the SIG’s business meeting. Looking forward to seeing you. Additional information can be found at http://efe-sig.wix.com/efe-sig

Education, Conflict, and Emergencies (ECE)

Please join us at the CIES 2016 Conference to celebrate the launch of a new SIG on Education, Conflict, and Emergencies. We have a number of great panels and presentations lined up and are looking forward to building a CIES community of scholars and practitioners interested in issues around education, conflict, and emergencies. We’ll be holding our inaugural business meeting in Vancouver, so keep a look out for it on the program – we look forward to seeing you there. Please consider becoming a member of this new SIG when registering for the conference. The SIG is co-chaired by S. Garnett Russell (Teachers College, Columbia University) and Mieke Lopes Cardozo (University of Amsterdam). In case you have any questions, please contact Julia Lerch who runs our SIG secretariat: jlerch@stanford.edu.

Environmental and Sustainability Education (ESE)

The Environmental and Sustainability Education SIG is the new name of Education for Sustainable Development SIG. After a year of democratic dialogue--culminating in a panel “What’s in a Label? Interactive Discussion on Environment, Sustainability, and Education” at the 2015 conference--it was decided that a name change was desirable. We are very excited, as
the renaming provides an opportunity for deliberation about the direction and mission of the ESE SIG. The new name more accurately reflects the SIG’s focus on the environmental and sustainability issues. We are looking forward to continuing the discussion at the CIES 2016 Conference.

Global Literacy

The Global Literacy SIG is expanding! Our numbers are going up, and the interests of our SIG members are increasingly broad: from early grade reading to social uses of literacy, and everything in between. This variety of interest is good for the SIG, as it helps us to offer the CIES audience an increased understanding of the many facets of written language use. Papers given in our SIG sessions cover a range of research issues related to literacy around the world. Join us!

Globalization and Education

The Globalization and Education SIG has had a busy 2015. We launched a new website, podcast series, and book award. The SIG’s website is located here and stores all of the information and news related to the group. We’ve also launched “FreshEd with Will Brehm,” a weekly podcast that makes complex ideas in educational research easily understood. You can listen to episodes here or search iTunes for “FreshEd.” The guests from the first three shows, which focused on educational privatization, were brought together for a webinar. Additionally, the first annual Globalization and Education SIG Book Award competition was launched. The Book Award reflects the SIG’s mandate to recognize and expand the reach of theoretically rich research addressing timely and provocative topics in our subfield. The award will be presented in Vancouver at the CIES 2016 Conference. Also during the conference, the SIG will host a keynote lecture by Prof. André Elias Mazawi who will speak on “Unveiling globalization: Landscapes of military conflicts, geopolitics, and teachers’ lives and work.” If anyone in the society would like to participate in any of the SIG’s activities, please email us at gesig.cies@gmail.com.

ICT for Development (ICT4D)

The ICT for Development SIG has a vibrant and growing membership. Around the globe, our members are engaged in research and field work about the uses for computer technology for the sustainable development of schools and communities. The ICT4D SIG has launched a new logo, which is pictured below, to increase the recognition and profile of our SIG. The SIG encourages its members to stay connected via the SIG’s social media platforms on Facebook and Twitter @ict4dsig.

Inclusive Education

The Inclusive Education SIG is pleased to report collaborations with the International Journal for Inclusive Education and the International Journal of Disability, Development and Education. At this March’s CIES 2016 Conference, one graduate student will be selected for our SIG’s “Emerging Scholar Award” and receive mentoring from the editorial board from one of the journals. All graduate students who submit papers for the CIES 2016 Conference are eligible for this award. A call for candidates for two open positions in the SIG will be distributed in January. The SIG Chair and Program Chair positions will begin in 2016 for three-year terms.

Language Issues

The Language Issues SIG and the University of Minnesota are pleased to announce the publication of the special Language and International Development issue of Reconsidering Development. The issue
A DECADE OF SIGS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 22

was guest edited by Language Issues SIG co-chair, Anna Farrell, and includes articles by Language Issues SIG members Carol Benson, Kevin Wong, Joy Peyton, Fabrice Jaumont, and Katie Lazdowski. The articles cover a range of issues related to language and development including, funding, the role of English, medium of instruction policies, and fieldwork. We hope these articles will start thought provoking conversations at the CIES 2016 Conference. Congratulations to all who were involved!

Large-Scale Cross-National Studies in Education

2016 is an exciting year for international large-scale assessments. Results of TIMSS and PISA are scheduled for release and will surely spark interesting discussions. And this year our SIG will be holding a number of stimulating talks by some of the top scholars in our field. One that may be of particular interest is entitled “55 Years of International Large-Scale Assessments: A Moderated Panel Discussion among Testing Pioneers.” As the name suggests, some of the early architects of international assessments will discuss their personal stories as well as the current state of international assessments. Please join us!

Post-Foundational Approaches to Comparative and International Education

The Post-Foundational Approaches to the CIE SIG is a new group that began to take shape in 2013, aiming to create a space for theoretical explorations, which challenge the modernist foundational assumptions of the field. We sponsored our first panels at the CIES annual meeting in 2015, and the SIG’s main activity since has been to recruit new members. In Vancouver, we are sponsoring six sessions as well as holding a business meeting. Newcomers are invited to attend to learn more about the SIG and contribute to its growth.

Religion and Education

Najwan Saada’s article on religious education in public schools was recently published in The International Journal of Religion and Spirituality in Society. He teaches at Beit Berl College of Education in Israel. Marc Wisnosky recently earned a PhD from the University of Pittsburgh. He researched Orthodox theological education in the USA. Robert Osburn recently addressed South Sudanese leaders who are seeking to help resolve conflict in their home society. Bruce Collet will be a Visiting Research Fellow at the Refugee Studies Centre at Oxford University (Michaelmas term of 2016). He will research forced migration and religiosity. His book Migration, Religion, and Schooling within Liberal Democratic States will be published by Routledge in 2017.

Teacher Education and the Teaching Profession (TETP)

A relatively new SIG, the CIES Teacher Education and the Teaching Profession (TETP) SIG addresses four main themes: teacher education programs, curriculum and instruction, professional development, and the teaching profession for PreK-16. We are excited to be able to offer our first annual travel awards this year, which will be presented in Vancouver. Two awards of $300 each will be presented, one to a graduate student and one to a scholar or practitioner. Awards will be given to candidates who present exemplary work related to the CIES theme and highlighting teachers and the field of teaching. We are also planning other exciting events at this year’s conference, so stay tuned for more information. Please visit our website at http://tetpcies.weebly.com/ for information as plans are finalized. Feel free to contact us anytime at ciestetpsig@gmail.com.
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TEACHING COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

The book *Teaching Comparative Education: Trends and Issues Informing Practice*, edited by Patricia K. Kubow and Allison H. Blosser who co-chair the CIES Teaching Comparative Education SIG, is the newest volume in the Oxford Studies in Comparative Education series published by Symposium Books. With chapter contributions from seminal scholars in the field of comparative and international education, the book examines the ways in which comparative education is being taught, or advocated for, in teacher education within higher education institutions worldwide. It will be available at the CIES 2016 Conference. In addition, the Comparative Education Instructional Materials Archive (CEIMA), an initiative of the Teaching Comparative Education SIG, is seeking syllabi and/or assignments for any courses (graduate or undergraduate) in comparative and international education. CEIMA collects and posts comparative and international education instructional materials from universities worldwide on a web-based archive. Resource sharing will assist in enhancing instructional practice, facilitating inter-university dialogue, and documenting the dynamic and evolving nature of the field. Submission instructions are available via the Teaching Comparative Education SIG website.

Youth Development and Education (YDE)

YDE is the newest Special Interested Group establish at CIES. YDE invites scholars and practitioners from around the world to join this diverse community so that we may collectively increase our understanding of the opportunities and challenges facing today’s youth, build new knowledge contextualized by the lived experiences of youth and discuss, and debate new directions for youth development and secondary education. In December 2015, YDE launched its website. Please visit the site to get more information, join the SIG, access previous YDE newsletters, read blogs and access resources on issues related to youth development and education.

WCCES Update

MARIANNE A. LARSEN, EDITOR

The CIES has been an active member of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES) since its establishment in 1970. Over the last 45 years, numerous WCCES Presidents, Secretaries General and Executive Committee and Bureau members have been CIES members. Indeed, the current WCCES president, Carlos Torres, is a long-standing CIES member and past CIES President.

According to the bylaws, the broad goals of the WCCES are: to advance education for international understanding in the interests of peace, intercultural co-operation, mutual respect among peoples and observance of human rights; and to improve education systems so that the right of all to education may be more fully realized. To this end, one of the main activities of the WCCES is to organize the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, normally at intervals of three years. The next World Congress will take place in Beijing, China from 22-26 August, 2016 with the theme: ‘Dialectics in Education: Comparative Perspectives’. CIES members are encouraged to submit proposals, which are due by 15 March 2016.

Over time, organizations of all kinds go through processes of change and renewal, as has the WCCES over the past 2+ years. Meeting the challenges of organizational renewal is never easy and can sometimes lead to upheavals and dissatisfaction. However, without renewal organizations remain stagnant and unable to adapt to changing external pressures. Those involved with the WCCES over the past few years will know that the Council has been through a rocky road. There is not space here to reiterate the challenges that the WCCES has faced recently, nor is it my role as editor to provide CIES members with a synopsis. Besides, it is virtually...
impossible to remain and/or be perceived as being neutral within the space of controversy. I simply urge CIES members to communicate with those involved in the changes that the WCCES has experienced, and to read material about those challenges on the WCCES news column.

However, I will take a moment here to reflect on a particularly noteworthy aspect of the controversies surrounding the WCCES at this point in its history. Some individuals who have been deeply committed to and actively involved with the WCCES for many years no longer hold leadership positions within the organization due to the current tensions within the Council (e.g. Suzanne Majhanovich, Vandra Masemann, Diane Napier, and Heidi Biseth). Many of these individuals are also CIES members, and readers will note that all of those just named are women. Some have suggested that there are elements of sexism in the accusations these individuals faced. Others deny this. And others even suggest that there might be complexities in identity and power structures including race and Global South and North/colonial domination dynamics. What is important, in my mind, is to recognize the contributions of these and others to all of our academic societies, who often undertake their responsibilities with humility and a profound sense of passion for bettering the world.

Other women who are CIES members have also come forward and volunteered their time and expertise to guide the WCCES through these times of change. For example, Karen Biraimah, member and former President of CIES is serving as Co-Chair of the recently formed WCCES’ Election Task Force. Another woman who is a member of this Election Task Force is Samiha Peterson former Dean of the Graduate School of Education of the American University in Cairo. And Lauren Ila Misiaszek is the Chair of the Finance Committee. Furthermore, our current CIES President, N’Dri T. Assiè-Lumumba, is a member of the Standing Committee which has been charged with revising the WCCES’ statutes and bylaws. N’Dri was also recently elected by WCCES member societies to serve as Member-at-Large for the newly reconstituted WCCES Bureau which is now functioning for the first time since 2001. Another woman who has been actively involved in WCCES reforms over the past 2½ years is Lynette Shultz, who served last year as a member of an ad hoc Committee of Inquiry.

Lynette Shultz, in her 2015 CIESC (Comparative and International Education Society of Canada) Presidential Address, asks, “What does being a global organization mean in this time where we have never before been so interconnected throughout the world but with such terribly precarious relations?” (Shultz, 2015, p. 1). Reflecting upon her role on the Committee of Inquiry, she poses a number of salient questions:

What is important is to recognize the contributions of these and others to all of our academic societies.
must always be preceded by the affirmation of human diversity created by philosophical and cultural differences. Since there is no God’s eye view to be claimed by any society of people, the idea of the ethical space...entertains the notion of a meeting place, or initial thinking about a neutral zone between entities or cultures. The space offers a venue to step out of our allegiances, to detach from the cages of our mental worlds and assume a position where human-to-human dialogue can occur. The ethical space offers itself as the theatre for cross-cultural conversation in pursuit of ethically engaging diversity and disperses claims to the human order. (p. 202)

This idea of the ethical space corresponds with how Sharon Todd (2003) conceptualizes difference as being a space for ethical relationship formation. Understanding and reconciling worldviews other than our own is difficult work, but as Ermine (2007) concludes, “it can become a refuge of possibility in cross-cultural relations...for the effect of shifting the status quo of an asymmetrical social order to a partnership model between world communities” (p. 203). Following Ermine’s ideas, I would hope that all involved in the WCCES, both past and present, are provided with meaningful opportunities to enter the ethical space in order to foster, drawing from the WCCES’ own goals, ‘peace, intercultural co-operation, mutual respect’ within this global organization.

REFERENCES


Katerina Bodovski

*Across Three Continents: Reflections on Immigration, Education, and Personal Survival.*

New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing

This combination of autobiographical narrative and sociological analysis discusses the author’s firsthand experiences in Soviet Russia, Israel, and the United States. The book touches upon a wide variety of topics, including childhood and family relationships in the Soviet Union, education in three countries, parenting practices, immigration and women in academia.

Zehlia Babaci-Wilhite

*Language, Development Aid and Human Rights in Education: Curriculum Policies in Africa and Asia.*


The debate about languages of instruction (LoI) in Africa and Asia involves an analysis of both the historical thrust of national government and also development aid policies. Using case studies from Tanzania, Nigeria, South Africa, Rwanda, India, Bangladesh and Malaysia, Babaci-Wilhite argues that the use of local LoI not only offers an effective means to improve student comprehension, but also to achieve quality education and rights in education.

Jody L. McBrien & Julia G. Byers (Eds.)

*Cold Water: Women & Girls of Lira, Uganda.*

Kampala, Uganda: Fountain Publishers.

In *Cold Water*, women of Lira retell their stories of surviving Kony’s war and of thriving as they rebuild their community, creating schools, social services, co-ops, and more. All proceeds go to the women’s organizations and girls’ scholarships. Available on Amazon or contact JMcBrien@sf.usf.edu.
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Marianne A. Larsen (Ed.)
*International Service Learning: Engaging Host Communities.*

International service learning (ISL) programs are growing in popularity as students want to become better global citizens. While the benefits of these programs among students are well documented, little is known about the implications on host communities themselves. This volume explores the impact of ISL programs on members of host communities in East and West Africa, the Caribbean, and Central America.

Marcella Milana & Tom Nesbit (Eds.)
*Global Perspectives on Adult Education and Learning Policy.*

The worldwide appearance and expression of adult education and lifelong learning have changed significantly during the past 20 years. This book explores recent changes in their related national and international policies, how they intersect with developments in higher education and how they may contribute to debates on citizenship and democracy.

Maria Manzon (Ed.)
*Changing Times, Changing Territories: Reflections on CERC and the Field of Comparative Education.*
Comparative Education Research Centre (CERC), CERC Monograph Series.

Using case studies from Tanzania, Nigeria, South Africa, Rwanda, India, Bangladesh and Malaysia, Babaci-Wilhite argues that the use of local LoI not only offers an effective means to improve student comprehension, but also to achieve quality education and rights in education.

Jürgen Schriewer (Ed.)
*World Culture Re-Contextualised: Meaning Constellations and Path-Dependencies in Comparative and International Education Research.*

Impressive strands of research have shown the emergent reality of increasing world-level interconnection in almost every field of social action. As a consequence, theories and models have been developed which are aimed at conceptualising this new reality along the lines of an ‘institutionalised’ World Culture. This offers a new understanding of the worldwide diffusion of specifically modern – i.e. mainly Western – rules, ideologies and organisational patterns, and of attendant harmonisation and standardisation of fields of social action.
Emefa J. Takyi-Amoako (Ed.)


First of its kind, *Education in West Africa* is a comprehensive critical reference guide to education in the region. Written by regional experts, the book explores the education systems of all countries in West Africa in addition to Cameroon and Chad. It critically examines the development of education provision in each country, whilst exploring both local and global contexts. Including a comparative introduction to the issues facing education in the region as a whole, this handbook is an essential reference for researchers, scholars, international agencies and policy-makers at all levels.

Zsuzsa Millei & Robert Imre (Eds.)

*Childhood and Nation: Interdisciplinary Engagements.* (Critical Cultural Studies of Childhood series) New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan

This book opens a new vista for thinking about the world through categories of childhood and nation. It explores representations of childhood related to the nation; national agendas related to economic, social and political problems that exploit children and tighten their regulation; and childhoods that offer nations solutions for environmental and humanitarian issues.

Pavel Zgaga, Ulrich Teichler, Hans G. Schuetze, & Andrä Wolter (Eds.)


The central focus of this monograph is the concept of higher education reform in the light of an international and global comparative perspective. After decades of far-reaching reform, higher education around the world has profoundly changed and now has to face the challenges of the present. This volume takes a close look at these changes, the drivers of change, their effects and possible future scenarios. In their contributions the authors discuss a variety of basic concepts: learning and teaching in higher education; financing and quality assurance; governance change; massification vs. equity and equality; internationalization and mobility, the implementation of lifelong structures in higher education.

Gene Sperling, Rebecca Winthrop, & Christina Kwauk


Hard-headed evidence on why the returns from investing in girls are so high that no nation or family can afford not to educate their girls.

Zsuzsa Millei & Robert Imre (Eds.)

*Childhood and Nation: Interdisciplinary Engagements.* (Critical Cultural Studies of Childhood series) New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan

This book opens a new vista for thinking about the world through categories of childhood and nation. It explores representations of childhood related to the nation; national agendas related to economic, social and political problems that exploit children and tighten their regulation; and childhoods that offer nations solutions for environmental and humanitarian issues.

Gene Sperling, Rebecca Winthrop, & Christina Kwauk


Hard-headed evidence on why the returns from investing in girls are so high that no nation or family can afford not to educate their girls.
2015 DISSENTATIONS
Completed by CIES Members

Olena (Helen) Aydarova
Teacher Education Reforms as Political Theater: Modernization Dramas in the Russian Federation.
Michigan State University

David Balwanz
Re-imagining secondary education: Voices from South African academic and vocational secondary education programs.
University of Maryland, College Park

John R. Bonnell
Changing Landscapes in Kenyan Higher Education: An Analysis of the Impact of Shifting Contexts on Religious-Oriented Universities
Michigan State University

Annette Bradford
Internationalization Policy at the Genba: Exploring the implementation of Social Science English-Taught Undergraduate Degree Programs in Three Japanese Universities
The George Washington University, Washington D.C.

Lucia Brajkovic
Higher Education in Post-transition Countries of Central and Eastern Europe: Rent-seeking States and Academic Marginalism
Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia

William C. Brehm
Enacting Educational Spaces: A Landscape Portrait of Privitization in Cambodia.
University of Hong Kong

Alisha M. B. Brown
Marginalization and Education: International Presence, Performance, and Policy
Michigan State University

Pragati Avinash Godbole
Girls’ education in India: A multilevel examination from a capability perspective.
University of Maryland, College Park

Jia Luo
University of Toronto (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Jenna Gwen Mitchler
Conceptions of Student Success within an Urban Alternative Learning Program
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Najwan Saada
Rethinking religious and civic education: Hybridity, othering, and the cultivation of Muslim-American students’ identities
Michigan State University

Sadaf Shallwani
Ready schools in Pakistan: School and classroom factors associated with children’s success in early primary
University of Toronto (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education)

Louise Michelle Vital
Tet chagne! An investigation of the Haitian education and leadership program in the higher education landscape in Haiti
Michigan State University

Tamara Ginger Weiss Rhodes
Local understandings of the entrepreneur and entrepreneurship: A phenomenological case study from the southern highlands of Tanzania
Michigan State University

Lisa Yiu
Integration in China’s Public Schools: Citizenship, Schooling, and Rural Migrant Youth in Urban China
Stanford University
Historian’s Corner

CHRISTOPHER J. FREY, CIES HISTORIAN (2015-2018)

As CIES prepares to celebrate its 60th Anniversary, it seems fitting to revisit our foundational year, and take a peek at our official archives at Kent State University. We owe much to the long-time historian of the Society, Erwin Epstein, for his efforts to expand and improve the Society’s archives, his work on the upcoming history of CIES, and Harold Bloom and four co-authors published what became known as Bloom’s Taxonomy.

The Comparative Education Society (CES) was established on April 27, 1956 at the third meeting of “a group of persons interested in the teaching of Comparative Education” at New York University. (Rocky Marciano retired undefeated from boxing the same day.) William W. Brickman (President), Robert B. Sutton (Vice-President), Gerald H. Read (Secretary/Treasurer) served as the first officers, along with an eight-member Board of Directors that included Harold Benjamin, George Bereday, and Bess Goodykoontz. The Society published the inaugural issue of Comparative Education Review in June 1957, where it was reported that “about 300 members” had already joined. In that first issue, all of 16 pages, were papers on CE textbooks, contemporary Italian universities, developments in Soviet education, a philosopher’s look at CE, and a discussion of methods in our young field. The first twelve months of CES was very active: five general meetings, several Board conferences, a 30-day tour of schools in Western Europe, while around them, the Suez Conflict raged, the Soviet invasion of Hungary sparked a refugee crisis, and Harold Bloom and four co-authors published what became known as Bloom’s Taxonomy.

The CIES archives were established in 1980 at Kent State University, home of the CES (and CIES, after 1969) business office led by Gerald Read until 1973. Today, KSU generously continues to house the Archives, under the able stewardship of Cara Gilgenbach. The bulk of the holdings have been organized into six series, including records for CER, Secretariat records, and Presidential files. Some of the more recent documents remain to be organized, as the shift to digital communications, programs, and records over the last two decades has presented unique challenges. We are aiming to continue the processing of these records, and increase digital access to those documents most in demand, starting with the Annual Conference programs, which should be available online by the Society’s 60th Anniversary.

I will be updating you regularly on these and other developments in the CIES Newsletter. In the meantime, the CIES Archives Finding Aid at Kent State, and the Historian’s Corner on the CIES website can give you immediate access to a wealth of information about our Society’s past.
A Dialogue about the Sustainable Developments Goals (SDGs), Education, and Comparative and International Education Research

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION
The United Nations General Assembly recently set out its Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which include a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). With their 17 goals and 169 associated targets, these successors to the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) include ambitious efforts to end hunger and poverty, reduce inequalities, achieve gender equality, combat climate change, promote sustainable development, and improve infrastructure, sanitation, health, and education. SDG 4 on education states: “Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.” This goal further broken down into 10 targets and at least 42 indicators. We asked a number of experts in our field to engage in a dialogue about the SDGs with a focus on the education goal. Specifically, we asked contributors to reflect on how the success of SDG will be measured/determined, whether the new SDGs are (un)realistic in terms of the numbers and how they will be carried out, whose voices are (not) heard in SDG discussions and who (does not) benefit(s). We also asked contributors to reflect on the implications of the SDGs for comparative and international education researchers.

Why Wait Till 2030?
A Political Economy View of the Education SDG

STEVEN J. KLEES, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND (SKLEES@UMD.EDU)

In a world where social and economic goals set by the international community have been ubiquitous, the SDGs stand out. I want to start by focusing on two important concerns related to the education goal.

Broken Promises
First, despite good intentions and much effort, can the SDG goals and targets be seen as serious efforts? In education, neither of the two education MDGs proposed in 2000 were achieved by their target date of 2015. One was to attain Universal Primary Education (UPE) and the other to achieve gender equality. But the history of broken promises goes back much further. Both of these goals were part of the 155-country Education for All (EFA) compact that was signed in 1990 with a target date of 2000. Midway through the decade, in a relatively secret process, UPE and other EFA goals were unceremoniously postponed until 2015 (this was before the establishment of the MDGs). And the history of broken promises goes back further still. UPE has been pledged by a number of international conferences since the 1960s. Yet there are still 58 million primary school-age children out of school (and many more at the secondary school level). Now, we are kicking the can down the road once more, postponing UPE and other goals to 2030.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
Meager Resources

Second, the most fundamental reason why UPE and other education goals have not been achieved is the unwillingness of the international community to supply the resources needed. Studies of resources from nations’ domestic financing and international aid contributions (Overseas Development Aid or ODA) project an annual global shortfall of $39 billion to attain just some of the 2030 education SDG targets (this is likely to be an underestimate). In the 2000 follow up meeting to EFA in Dakar, James Wolfensohn, then president of the World Bank, pledged that no country committed to attaining the EFA goals would be kept from meeting them by a lack of finance. After a few years, it set up the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) in an attempt to respond to the promise it made in Dakar, but FTI was plagued by problems and a lack of sufficient resources. FTI was revamped and transformed into the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), but, to date, they have only managed to put together donor financing totaling about $5 billion annually. We need at least 80 times more than this to make just some of the education SDG targets a reality! Given present efforts, projections show UPE will not be achieved until 2086, if then. While there is talk of developing innovative financing mechanisms, they are likely to yield few resources. Moreover, studies of private sector contributions have shown them to be small in scale, self-interested, uncoordinated, and misdirected, and the billionaire philanthropists have put relatively little money into education. It should be noted that no one has renewed Wolfensohn’s EFA pledge with respect to the SDGs.

An Education SDG Demonstration

I believe that, with the will and sufficient resources, at least some of the education SDG targets could be attainable in many countries in a relatively short time, perhaps as few as 3 to 5 years. I believe that one important reason — or at least excuse — is that the international community has not committed the resources necessary in education is because there is no convincing evidence that additional resources can accomplish our goals. The health sector gets much more money than education, in part, because they can demonstrate success. But improving health, while difficult, is a much easier task than improving education — simple interventions like bed nets and vaccinations can make a world of difference. Even more complex behavior change to reduce HIV incidence is much easier than the long-term task of providing a good education to our children.

However, education is not rocket science. We know how to give a child a good education. What I am proposing is that the international community, with the support of the Global Partnership for Education, perhaps as part of a partnership with a bilateral or multilateral agency, find a country that is willing to be a partner in an intensive demonstration effort to show that removing financial constraints can make a major difference in their education system in a short amount of time. This doesn’t mean you “throw” money at education. Of course, the money needs to be spent wisely, but resources would go to providing every child with a good education — trained teachers with adequate salaries, small classes, good facilities and learning materials (with some access to IT), scholarships and school meals when needed, and more.

Many donors talk about “capacity constraints” to using resources in developing countries but they can be overcome (and partly they are a paternalistic excuse). For example, a country could implement a crash, short-term, campaign-style training of teachers and principals with intensive follow-up in-service training for certification (in cooperation with teacher unions). Some crash school-building programs might be necessary. While the incredible barrier posed by poverty cannot be overcome in the short-run, scholarships, school meals, and health services for children in school can help a lot.

There are, of course, problems with supporting such a demonstration. One is that this could put off donors from providing resources until after they see if the demonstration works. This is possible, but I don’t think it will have a big effect. Donors are not lining up to provide anywhere near the amount of resources that are needed, some are even cutting back, and I believe a good demonstration could show encouraging effects in 2 to 3 years. Another problem is what happens to the
demonstration country after the demonstration. Somehow, the resources provided would have to continue. Partly, this can be done by the country agreeing to ramp up domestic financing over the course of the demonstration, but my guess is that the amount of resources needed to attain the SDGs will be far beyond the capacity of most countries to go it alone and that means ramping up the international finance effort as well.

Global Taxation

While domestic financing for education is essential, I believe the only hope for significant increase in funding for education – and the other SDGs – is some sort of global taxation to replace the ineffective exhortations for wealthier countries to “contribute” 0.7% of their GDP. This is not a farfetched idea. It has many supporters. At the Third Financing for Development meeting last July in Addis Ababa, there was a proposal to recommend the establishment of an intergovernmental tax body. Despite wide support, it was rejected by developed countries, resulting in the meeting’s fundamental “failure to finance development.” Many well-known economists have supported this call for a global tax. Nobel Laureate economist James Tobin long ago proposed a tax on international financial transactions. Thomas Piketty’s best-selling economic treatise offers only one remedy in 700 pages depicting the severe and increasing inequalities of capitalism – a global tax on wealth. Nobel Laureate economist Paul Krugman, along with other members of the recently concluded Independent Commission for the Reform of International Corporate Taxes, concluded that the “current system is broken, and minor tweaks will not fix it.” Their solution: significant international corporate taxation. As a modest first step in that direction, I propose that the very distinguished, newly initiated International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity study and promote global tax mechanisms. There is no way the usual financing alternative scenarios being discussed will get us significantly closer to bridging that shortfall – not increased domestic spending, ODA, private sector contributions, or innovative financing. We are only tinkering at the margins of the issue.

Conclusions

My colleagues in this issue of CIES Perspectives raise important related issues. Even if we can demonstrate some success in a demonstration, and even if we are willing to finance the SDGs, there is a lot of devil in the details. Lewin, Post, and Wulff are rightly concerned with what kind of education will be offered. The focus on a very narrow meaning of learning outcomes distorts education policy and may ignore basic indicators like having qualified teachers and a sound learning environment, as Wulff argues. It certainly ignores the need for a more critical pedagogy. Moreover, the SDGs emphasis on PPPs will further stratify education and increase inequalities, further privatizing what should be seen as a public good, again as Wulff argues. And Lewin and Post’s concerns with sustainable development are key. Post is not being extreme when he talks about the need to “save the planet.” We face multiple threats to the survival of large segments of our population and even the Earth itself.

The SDGs are laudable, they raise fundamental concerns. Unfortunately, there is no reason to believe that we will be any more successful this time around than we have been with setting goals in the past. From a political economy perspective, EFA, the MDGS, and the SDGs all represent contested terrain. On the progressive side, they result from widespread dissatisfaction and active challenges to world systems structures. However, on the regressive side, they reproduce and legitimate a fundamentally unfair system by promising education and social improvement while delivering little. I fear that the focus on the degree to which 169 target indicators are attained will turn the SDGs primarily into a social welfare program for researchers, with few resources left over to mount a serious effort for needed social change.

Achieving the SDGs while neoliberalism operates business as usual is not possible. We need a paradigm shift. It is time to end this experiment with neoliberal capitalism. Whether this means trying to move beyond capitalism entirely or whether it means the development of a new kind of welfare state is worth discussion. What it certainly means is to re-establish the legitimacy of government. What needs to be front and center is the call for a large, vibrant public sector that puts limits on
the market, that promotes and creates decent employment, that provides for the production of public goods, that develops an adequate and fair system of taxation, that redistributes wealth, not just income, and that is run as a very participatory democracy. Without such contextual changes, the SDGs will simply be more broken promises.

Sustainable Development and a New Agenda for Comparative Education

DAVID POST, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY (POST@PSU.EDU)

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for the year 2030. These include goals could revitalize an older research agenda on the benefits of education while at the same time offering critically-important and urgent new questions that should become a central focus in our field of study. The association between education and development probably goes back to the French enlightenment, but its formal launch was institutionalized through the UN Development Decade, which was established in 1961 by resolution #1710 of the General Assembly. To achieve development, the Secretary General was requested to take “measures to accelerate the elimination of illiteracy, hunger, and disease” in order to accelerate economic growth and other desirable outcomes. Expanded schooling was an integral component.

For various reasons, the consequences of education for development began to seem less central in our field beginning about 25 years ago. One reason was that a rights focus emerged that partly pre-empted questions about the outcomes of education. The success of Helsinki Watch and its offspring at the end of the Cold War inspired Education For All (EFA) proponents to adopt a human rights approach while downplaying the expectations and research agenda of the 1960s. Also, the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) became the world’s most successful international treaty. Investigations of the benefits of education seemed less urgent than during the Development Decade.

After the EFA’s launch in 1990, and after the 1989 introduction of the CRC, researchers acknowledged education as an end-in-itself and focused more on the reforms necessary to protect and promote the right to equal education, regardless of the consequences. Although the benefits of education were never ignored — especially not by economists (see the accumulated literature from the World Development Reports, or see the 2006 Global Monitoring Report on adult literacy) – many in the field of comparative education moved away from consequencialism when they adopted a rights-perspective.

Today, by contrast to the past 25 years, a consensus about sustainable development should re-energize investigation of the social and economic consequences of different forms of education for youth and adults. What the SDG focus adds to the past is the urgent demand to understand how education does and does not contribute to environmental stewardship by individuals and communities. Action is needed from everyone, including from those whose vocations involve research on schools and societies. One education goal included in the new framework is to universalize secondary education for all. The corollary research project, perhaps to be taken up by those reading this CIES newsletter, is to question the assumption that more schooling in itself will necessarily produce students who care and act to save the world’s environment and slow global climate change.

This is not the place for a comprehensive review of new evidence, but as examples I could point to two sources of information that have been missing in recent dissertations I have heard about through, e.g. the Gail Kelly Awards by CIES. To summarize one US source of information over a twenty year period, the Pew Research Center’s American Values Survey, we know what US respondents think about the need for stricter protection of the environment. Consistently over time, there has been very little difference in responses depending on the education level of the respondent. However, there has been a large and growing divide between those who identify themselves as Democrats and Republicans (see Figure 1). It seems possible that beliefs about the environment are no longer caused by information alone, but have some element in group
identity and faith, similar to religious belief. Answers to the questions: “Do you believe in The Bible,” or “Do you believe in the Holy Koran” tell us about the identity of the respondent more than they tell us whether respondents have received specific information to inform their beliefs. Apparently, in the US at least, the same is true about environmental beliefs.

The disconnect between education and thought about environmental protection also can be seen cross-nationally. If we analyze the most recent World Values Surveys (conducted between 2012 and 2014), we see great inconsistencies in the association between schooling and attitudes. For example, in Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, and Romania, adults who at least completed secondary education (as opposed to adults who did not finish secondary) were more likely to agree that “Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs.” And this positive relation was found even after controlling for age, gender, and economic security. However, before educators celebrate the positive good for the environment that might come from achieving the SDG goal of universal secondary school, we have to consider that there are other countries (e.g. Thailand, Russia, Morocco, Qatar, Pakistan) where there is no positive effect at all. And the data from the WVS for the United States – one of the world largest contributors to climate change – is consistent with the Pew Research Survey: in this country, too, those with secondary schooling are no more concerned about the environment than those without secondary (and the overall level of concern is quite low, as seen in Figure 2).

The Sustainable Development Goals have handed our field an urgent set of questions about whether more and better education can save the planet. New information sources, such as those mentioned here, must be expanded so as to understand not only the levels of schooling responsible for environmental concern, but also the context and content of schooling that makes a difference. Perhaps our future scholarship should be guided by a mission even more urgent even than the human rights focus behind Education for All: the responsibility of educators to save the environment using all possible tools, including research tools.

Finally, after reading the contributions by Steve, Keith, and Antonia, I wish to conclude with two points of engagement. It is true that focusing on environmental consequences of education (and type/level/quality of education) is only one of the many possible agendas developing from the SDGs. However, this possible connection is the most innovative and audacious of the new goals, which go beyond an aspiration for “more” and move to an aspiration to connect education with one of the planet’s most urgent challenges. I have reason to know that CIES members have focused their attentions elsewhere for several decades. When my CER co-editor Heidi Ross called for submissions to a special issue of the journal on “Educators and the Environment” in 2008, we were surprised that – even after extending the deadline – we received only 3 submissions (for other special issues there are about 30 – 50 submissions). When we tried to persuade scholars to develop articles for the issue, we learned and most were busy working on projects that were either types of rights-based research (how to get more children into equal quality schools), or else were drawing on standardized testing data authors had downloaded. My CER co-editors and I very reluctantly abandoned the idea of promoting a special issue. I hope that in the future, education research will not abandon this field to social scientists operating from other perspectives. We have much to add. As for Antonia’s point that accountability has not been specified in the SDGs, of course she is right. There

**FIGURE 1**
Percentages of US Adults Who Believe that “There need to be stricter laws and regulations to protect the environment,” by education level and party affiliation.

Source: Pew Research Center American Values Surveys
is much that could be debated about how monitoring "works" and whether it helps effect the change it monitors. I have written at some length on this elsewhere based on my experience helping with the Global Monitoring Report, and can simply refer readers to the English http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002431/243127e.pdf or the Spanish http://www.saece.org.ar/relec/revistas/8/mon1.pdf version of "Does Watching Help."

Good things sometimes benefit from considered reflection, slow maturation and repeated road testing. Time will tell if the SDGs are as durable as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and whether the evident limitations of the MDGs have been addressed by the SDGs. There are now 17 SDGs and 169 Associated Targets, which can be compared with the 8 goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators of the MDGs one of which was specifically educational (universalizing access to basic education), and another (gender equity) was cast partly in educational terms. Education now has 10 targets and at least 42 indicators, with more likely to be invented. Both the Jomtien and Dakar global education conferences that defined 'Education for All' had a single goal and six educational targets. A rule of thumb in cognitive psychology is that most people can only remember seven things at a time plus or minus two, so Jomtien and Dakar met this criteria. The SDGs stretch the memory envelope. This may have occurred to the drafters of the SDGs who, when they reached SDG target number 164, decided there was a need to "Enhance Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development". 164 targets is a lot to interrelate and cohere.

The targets for educational development fall under the overarching super goal 4 which is to ‘ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’. The commitment to this goal is familiar not only because of its recent global promotion, but also because it encapsulates the welcome commitment that "Every person - child, youth and adult - shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs....Basic education is more than an end in itself. It is the foundation for lifelong learning and human development on which countries may build further levels and types of education and training". But this last commitment is not new. It was made in 1990 at Jomtien and reaffirmed at Dakar in 2000!

### FIGURE 2

Adults who agree with the statement that “Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs.”

Note: countries are ordered by the size of the gap between adults with and without a completed secondary school education. Source: Analysis of 2012-2014 World Values Survey (WVS).

---

**Education for Sustainable Development or Sustainable Educational Development?**

KEITH M. LEWIN, EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX (K.M.LEWIN@SUSSEX.AC.UK)

Good things sometimes benefit from considered reflection, slow maturation and repeated road testing. Time will tell if the SDGs are as durable as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and whether the evident limitations of the MDGs have been addressed by the SDGs. There are now 17 SDGs and 169 Associated Targets, which can be compared with the 8 goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators of the MDGs one of which was specifically educational (universalizing access to basic education), and another (gender equity) was cast partly in educational terms. Education now has 10 targets and at least 42 indicators, with more likely to be invented. Both the Jomtien and Dakar global education conferences that defined ‘Education for All’ had a single goal and six educational targets. A rule of thumb in cognitive psychology is that most people can only remember seven things at a time plus or minus two, so Jomtien and Dakar met this criteria. The SDGs stretch the memory envelope. This may have occurred to the drafters of the SDGs who, when they reached SDG target number 164, decided there was a need to “Enhance Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development”. 164 targets is a lot to interrelate and cohere.

The targets for educational development fall under the overarching super goal 4 which is to ‘ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’. The commitment to this goal is familiar not only because of its recent global promotion, but also because it encapsulates the welcome commitment that "Every person - child, youth and adult - shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs....Basic education is more than an end in itself. It is the foundation for lifelong learning and human development on which countries may build further levels and types of education and training". But this last commitment is not new. It was made in 1990 at Jomtien and reaffirmed at Dakar in 2000!
The worrying thought is that the super-goal and the 10 new targets for education neither break new ground by being specific about what makes them likely to contribute to sustained development, nor do they provide criteria for indicators that would create a step change that goes beyond the aspirations of the past. The question remains ‘what is it about the SDGs that could lead to a more sustainable form of development?’ If the specification of Goal 4 is read on its own it appears substantially similar to the Jomtien and Dakar goals and targets. There is nothing in the text that really explains how the new education goal and ten targets are any more or less likely to lead to sustainable development than the previous sets of goals and targets targets (Open Society Foundations 2015). Or how the new goals and targets for education will relate to all the other SDGs most of which have educational dimensions. Or why “reaching the furthest behind first” makes sense where failure to deliver services may be systemic, rather than on the margin of fundamentally sound education systems.

The text claims to offer a ‘new agenda’ for sustainable development but finding what is new remains elusive. Education is mentioned 24 times in the draft. On all but two occasions the reference is to greater access to education as a necessary component of development which is of course the agenda of EFA. There is little guidance as to what might matter for sustainability. In the ten targets for education in Goal 4, sustainability is only mentioned in one. Target 4.7 seeks to “ensure all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.” This catch all target statement embraces at least ten sub targets, suggesting a lack of focus. It also evades many awkward questions. For example, without a global State with agreed governance and appropriate powers, can there be global citizens with global rights and responsibilities? Full citizenship of a country, which is denied to so many internally displaced and cross border migrants, is surely a greater priority and is a necessary precursor to global citizenship. Can we name a global citizen (who is not a celebrity), and can we agree their attributes? It is a matter of taste as to whether target 4.7 improves on an earlier target for sustainable development in 1990 which was “Increased acquisition by individuals and families of the knowledge, skills and values required for better living and sound and sustainable development, made available through all education channels including the mass media, other forms of modern and traditional communication, and social action, with effectiveness assessed in terms of behavioural change” (Framework for Action, Meeting Basic Learning Needs, 1990).

In his contribution, David Post argues that the SDGs focus on “urgent demands to understand how education does and does not contribute to environmental stewardship”. The second reference to education and sustainable development in the ESD targets appears not in Goal 4 at all but in Goal 13 on the need to combat climate change. Target 13.3 of the SDGs is to “Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning” But why is this not an education target and why does sustainability collapse largely into concerns for climate change? If rogue States really do posses themonuclear devices and use them irresponsibly the effect on sustained development will be catastrophic. So also will civil conflicts that undermine social cohesion.

The proposed indicator of “the percentage of 15 year olds who have proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience” is a great idea, especially given that currently only a small minority of the world’s children study environmental and geo science in any depth at the age of 15. But it is wholly disappointing as an adequate interpretation of the kind of broad spectrum concerns that ESD should have beyond climate change, with an eye on valuing the future rather than merely satisfying the desires of the present. Asking adults if they want to prioritise protecting...
the environment “even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs” across 22 countries in the World Values Survey, begs more questions than it asks. For the informed respondent it is likely to be impossible to answer – protecting which environment from what? Slower growth of what kind? How slow? And is the loss of jobs mine or yours? ESD is worth more robust exploration and a much more expansive set of concerns.

The basic problem is that the SDG text and its elaborations leave open whether it is promoting sustainable educational development (SED) or education for sustainable development (ESD). It lingers longer on the SED than ESD yet the latter is the core issue. Is it unreasonable to expect more clues as to what should go into the 15,000 hours of school that the SDGs anticipate for all children? What would constitute an education fit for purpose in the 21st century that is different to that which proved so successful in many countries in the 20th century? What would close the cognitive chasm that exists between the achievement of 15 year olds in different countries that is equivalent to six years of schooling? What would reduce the current differences between the richest and the poorest students within low income countries which mean that the highest scoring students perform at rich country levels, and the lowest simply fail to score? How can all 15 year olds understand enough science and technology, and logical reasoning, to have an informed view on climate change, pollution, urbanization, and epidemic and endemic diseases? What kind of citizenship education might contribute positively to reductions in conflict and levels of distressed migration and would global citizenship add any value? What competencies related to health and wellbeing, and environmental economics, should every 15 year old have? We should all encourage the ESD dialogue to be more explicit about what it values and why in terms of cognition and affect.

Steve Klees is right to draw attention to the broken promises of Dakar, but who broke which promise and why? Making rights realities requires sustained political will over and above signing declarations. At Jomtien and Dakar it was bilateral and multilateral agencies who promised sufficient financing to achieve Education for All. They needed a persistence of purpose not evident in the first decade after the declaration. Their developing country partners needed the complementary ambition and political will as well as the resources to make EFA materialize. Those that had this made good progress. Those that did not stagnated and fell far short of the EFA targets (IIEP 2015).

The bilateral development partners certainly fell short of providing the resources needed for EFA. We estimated the gap in financing at Jomtien in 1990 to be about 2.5 billion USD a year to support the additional recurrent costs of EFA assuming plausible reforms to increase efficiency. By Dakar in 2000 the estimate had risen to 5.5 billion USD per year (Global Monitoring Report 2002), and by 2008 to over 8 billion USD per year (World Bank 2008). By 2015 the GMR was estimating the financing gap at over 40 billion USD a year. At best the resources provided by all aid to basic education in 2015 appear to have been averaging only 5 billion USD a year and may now be falling. This impressive inflation of the financing gap may reflect mission creep, greater needs, habituation to over promising, or some mixture of all three. Bridging the new gap with aid may no longer be a feasible promise, given the apparent unwillingness of development partners to commit to specific and predictable flows of assistance to education country by country, or even in the aggregate.

Multi national corporates should pay taxes in the countries which generate their revenues. This is self evident. Low income countries might then be able to afford public services of enhanced quality and reach. The problem with global taxation systems, and for that matter Tobin taxes, is not so much how to collect revenues, but how to determine who should decide how they are to be used in the absence of an accountable system of global governance.

At the 2015 World Education Forum in Incheon there was a clear intention to shift the locus of responsibility for educational development back to the countries with less than universal enrolments, and extend the obligations of EFA and the SDGs to countries with low levels of measured learning outcomes. Symbolically the original Fast Track Initiative (FTI), which was set up to accelerate progress on EFA, linked activity on EFA to its own budget which was typically less than a billion USD a year, and sometimes a lot less. After the FTI morphed into the Global Partnership for Education it claimed in 2014 to have mobilized pledges for 28 billion USD worth of resources for EFA. But 26 billion USD of this was from national budgets not from the development partners, and it was not clear how the pledges were to be tracked into disbursements, and what the consequences would be of falling short on realising the pledges.
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This shift in attribution of responsibilities for education and development – from the idea that educational development requires external assistance in poorer countries to the idea that poorer countries have to do it largely for themselves - seems to have passed unnoticed. But perhaps this is a good thing for sustainability. External assistance invokes dependence unless it is constructed with a viable exit route that no longer requires concessional aid at some point in the future. The time scale may be long or short, but if aid has no end then the development it supports is not systemically sustainable. This in no way absolves rich countries from their promises to support universal access education. Or from their reciprocal interests in sponsoring strategic investments in education that lead to development that delivers the rights that fire the imagination and underpin all modern societies. But what is the kind of aid that leads to sustainable educational development (SED). No new definition is on offer but one is needed that is focused on diminishing and eliminating funding gaps over time.

Many more questions nag away. The SDGs are a list not a recipe, as was also true of the MDGs. Achieving all the SDGs may make the world a better place. There is a broad consensus that most of the outcomes they flag are desirable. However, all the Goals taken together are no guarantee that development will take place, and are not in themselves the basis for a development strategy. They are context blind, and insensitive to the priorities that all governments have to identify.

The Goals are not distributional in character – a major omission if poverty is partly the product of the distribution of wealth as well as its generation, and inequality is an endemic source of conflict. Moreover, the SDGs are presented statically, with no obvious mechanisms to evolve dynamically. The MDGs remained enshrined in stone (or cast in concrete) for 15 years. This is longer than any corporate development strategy is likely to be relevant, and longer than most national governments last in democratic states. Those who snooze may well lose, and hang on to priorities overtaken by events linked to climate processes, social movements and economic realities that have a global momentum. The SDGs should be conceived of as dynamic, responsive and iterated with changing circumstance if they are to be durable and resilient over 15 years. That would be an advance over the MDGs.

Education is at the heart of development and learning creates and transfers capabilities. It may not guarantee enlightenment and freedom from superstition but it makes it more likely. The SDGs locate education more as part of the definition of development than as a means to achieve it and fail to advance discussion of what kind of education is to be valued for what purpose. An opportunity has been missed to dwell more on the curriculum and pedagogic reforms that could transforms minds, hands and hearts and offer insight into what education designed to promote development that is climate friendly, human rights respectful, and economically advantageous might look like. SED is the agenda of EFA. ESD needs to be much more than SED if it is to support reforms that are both disruptive and constructive.

We have yet to map ‘the road to sustainable development” as the SDG document claims in a triumph of aspiration over cartography. The Brundtland Commission of 1987 introduced the idea of sustainable development into mainstream development theory. Brundtland’s criterion was that ‘the needs of the present are met without compromising the needs of the future’. This is the key challenge to those who want to go beyond Jomtien and Dakar and develop ESD post Incheon. What would be different under a ESD frame of reference rather than a revitalized EFA business as usual framework? Who would go to what kind of educational institutions and how would they be selected? How and why would they choose which educational programme? Who would certify the programmes and who would recognize the qualifications? How
would the interests of individuals be balanced with the needs of communities and nation states? How would access and outcome become more equitable across generations? What would teachers do that was different? How would public education be financed for whose benefit? How would the private providers be regulated and how should the adverse effects of marketisation on equity, access and exclusion be mediated? How would the curriculum and pedagogy change? What trade offs would be needed between benefits in the future and benefits in the present? What kind of discount rate should be applied? Should development assistance be contracted against performance targets linked to sustained development? How should the UN architecture around ESD be refashioned to fit its new purposes?

These are the debates that must be addressed if the story of the SDGs in 2030 is to be different to the MDGs and EFA. Those of us who are optimists think there is time to act and address the hard questions that should define ESD. The window of opportunity short. The world is a very different place than it was in 1990 and 2000 when Education for All was born and evolved. The case for collective action to understand and limit the destructive physical burdens of humanity on the planet is supported by a mountain of scientific evidence on environmental changes. Social cohesion is widely thought to be becoming more fragile. It is more important than ever that this generation promotes education that promotes understanding and reshapes the preferences of the next generation to eschew conflict, provide for universal basic needs, and respect the planet. ESD needs to be informed by hypotheses rather than hyperbole, analysis rather than supposition, and equity rather than inequality.

© Keith M Lewin 2016

The SDGs: A renewed impetus for quality education for all

ANTONIA WULFF, EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL, COORDINATOR, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT UNIT, (ANTONIA.WULFF@EI-IE.ORG)

After years of advocacy, consultations and negotiations, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were finally adopted in September 2015. Irrespective of whether one views the final set of goals and targets with satisfaction, the agenda is ambitious in scope and reach, while agreements on financing and accountability fall woefully short of mirroring this level of ambition. Education got its stand-alone goal – SDG 4. But will the targets thereunder get us any closer to achieving the goal? Are the correct measures in place to determine this? And what challenges will the poor agreements on financing and accountability pose to genuine success with SDG 4?

Education 2030: progress, backlash or status quo?

The cynical view is that the SDGs represent a mere reorganisation of the global must-do-list, a copy-paste-exercise with existing commitments and existing promises that will remain unfunded despite the new packaging. Keith Lewin, for example, critiques the education targets for failing to “break new ground”. Yet I would disagree: the ten targets under SDG 4 go far beyond what anyone expected would be adopted as the new blueprint for education, and there are three specific components that I want to highlight as clear steps forward.

These are things that Education International, the international federation of teacher unions, fought hard for and that we consider successes at this stage of the process. Because the first measure of success is the extent to which the agenda corresponds to the demands and needs of the peoples, and those at the centre of implementation, i.e. teachers and education workers, students and other stakeholders.

Firstly, the commitment to universal completion of free quality primary and secondary education; the promise of free secondary education in fact goes well beyond the traditional interpretation of the right to education and its aim of progressively making post-primary education free.
Secondly, the targets span from early childhood to higher education, and include targets on equity, safe learning environments and qualified teachers. The latter two are so-called means of implementation targets (SDG targets 4.a-c) and an important recognition of what has to be in place for the overarching goal to be reached at all.

Finally, the agenda obliges countries to look at the content of the education they provide and integrate elements of human rights, sustainable development, global citizenship, and gender equality, inter alia. It is this third component that David Post highlights as the new ground that the education community will have to break, but interestingly, he zooms in on education for sustainable development only, despite the target itself containing a long list of knowledge areas. So does Lewin when asking whether the new agenda is about sustainable educational development or about education for sustainable development.

This distinction is obviously a key question as the world prepares for implementation, but I frankly fail to see the problem because both are and should be an integral part of the new agenda. Sustainable development is as much about the environment as it is about sustainable social and economic development, which means that it is impossible to claim sustainable development without ensuring and respecting the right to education. At the same time, it is impossible to claim quality and relevance in a system that fails to capture sustainable development in policy, curricula, teacher training, and teaching and learning materials.

Key is also the question of what a global agenda can and should do. Lewin critiques the education targets for being context blind, but also for failing to specify ‘what education designed to promote development that is climate friendly, human rights respectful, and economically advantageous might look like’. This seems to be a contradiction, and possibly an unfair expectation. To me, the point of the global agenda is to set a direction and agree on a common minimum standard in the field of education. The agenda obliges member states to carefully consider the targets and discuss what concepts such as equitable, free and quality mean in their context, and find ways of operationalizing them at national level. What does free education mean in today’s world, and what are indicators of quality, or relevant and effective learning outcomes? These are things that shouldn’t be set in stone at global level, but discussed in dialogue with all stakeholders at national level. That in itself is sustainable educational development.

The indicators as conditionality 2.0

The challenge with a global agenda is that it has to be monitored at global level too. It is impossible to develop satisfactory indicators for fluffy targets without adding some specificity, or by focusing on a particular aspect of the target, and it is difficult to do that without also changing the meaning of the target. Yet, each target will have one indicator that is tracked at the global level, accompanied by national, regional and thematic indicators.

There is generally speaking a clear preference for outcomes indicators and in the case of education, for learning outcomes. The target on free primary and secondary education (SDG 4.1) will be tracked by an indicator on learning outcomes in reading and mathematics at end of primary and secondary. In this case, learning outcomes become a proxy as well as a composite for completion, for free, equitable, quality education and for relevant and effective learning outcomes, which effectively means that the focus of analysis shifts from the performance of the state to that of the individual students. This is symptomatic of the tendency to perceive problems through the narrow lens of the individual, ignoring structural concerns and the responsibilities of duty-bearers. Importantly, it is therefore difficult to know what any change in results is due to, as inputs to the system are not given adequate attention. Has the goal of equitable and inclusive quality education been reached once all children are in school, or once all children enjoy the same level and extent of quality education? Neither would – or should – result in exactly the same learning outcomes. What you need to measure is both the enjoyment of the right by rights-holders, and the degree of compliance with human rights obligations of states.
I am yet to meet a teacher or a student activist that sees the lack of a global metric for learning as the biggest problem in education. Learning outcomes are not synonymous with quality education, nor is measurement in itself a solution to the lack of learning that has been reported over the past years (one recalls here the widely-reported figure of the 250 million primary school age children that are unable to read or write). The indicator is not a technical necessity but a political choice, and the UIS is already calling for ‘a single measure of reading and mathematics that is carried out in all countries’. What does such a single measure mean for individual countries’ ability to design relevant and sustainable national education systems? And what does it mean for countries that traditionally have been dependent on aid?

The focus on outcomes is pertinent also in relation to the target on education for sustainable development, global citizenship and human rights. Post – and the state of the world today – challenges the assumption that education makes us better human-beings. Information and awareness do not necessarily lead to action, but, more importantly, the assumed link carries problematic expectations in terms of values and behaviours, i.e. voting as a display of knowledge in civics.

**Beggars can’t be choosers**

Steve Klees identifies correctly the sad tradition of financing gaps and broken promises on education in the development agenda; similarly, Lewin is correct on the ‘shift in attribution of responsibilities’ where poorer countries are expected to sort out their own financing. What has changed is the role that the private sector has come to play – or, rather, has been given in the intergovernmental negotiations on the new agenda. Member states that are keen to cut costs turn to the private sector as the saviour of not only education but of development as a whole.

The rush over recent years to get as many children in school as soon as possible led to a diversification of provision, and, in many cases to systems that couldn’t keep up with the expansion, and, thus, education of a lower quality. Quality and equity being at the centre of the new agenda can, at least in part, be seen as a consequence of this. Unfortunately, member states refused to learn the part of the lesson that pointed to public provision of education as key to both equity and quality.

Despite a broad civil society alliance, our efforts to secure an explicit commitment to public education failed, and so did efforts to protect public services from privatisation and public-private partnerships. Indirectly, the new agenda encourages private-sector participation in education: for instance, the investment by the UK Department for International Development in private, fee-paying profit-making education will be understood and treated as UK contribution to the SDG implementation. Apart from the obvious equity concerns, this also discourages national investment in public education and, thus, the building of strong national systems.

While research clearly has shown the positive effects of abolishing tuition fees on primary school enrolment, and this was something that supported our advocacy on free primary and secondary education throughout the post-2015 process, there seems to be a lack of research on the impact of private sector participation in education. We desperately need more research on the impact of private provision on equity and quality, on the working conditions of teachers, on communities, and on the policy-making itself.

**The missing A-word**

The breadth and ambition of the SDGs is compromised by the lack of accountability mechanisms; neither states nor the private sector are held to account within the SDGs framework. In the negotiations, member states refused to use the term accountability and eventually ended up referring to follow-up and review. Eager not to repeat the failures of MDG 8, member states talked about a renewed global partnership to ensure the success of the SDGs. But what looked to be heading towards a partnership between governments quickly turned into partnerships in plural, mainly referring to different forms of
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partnerships with the private sector.

The indicators are supposed to help us in this regard, and the first battle will be the formulation of national-level indicators. These are a great opportunity to expand on – and challenge – the global indicator framework, and identify context-relevant indicators that support the development of national education systems. This process must be inclusive, as must the monitoring mechanisms.

What the SDGs need are human rights-based indicators that strengthen accountability by tying the targets to a binding rights framework. These indicators measure the extent to which states fulfil their human rights obligations, which reveal weaknesses and failures of the system and, thus, support the improvement of public policy. Again, this is about the sustainability of education systems.

At the same time, the question is not only how but by whom the success of the agenda is measured. Another positive aspect of the inclusive and participatory process to formulate the new agenda is the ownership by civil society, and their expectations to remain involved, take stock of progress and to hold governments to account.

Conclusions

Again, the cynic would say that nothing has changed with the adoption of the new agenda; we will keep fighting for the right to education to be realised, for decent work and labour rights of teachers and education workers. At the same time, in a meeting room in Dakar a couple of weeks ago, the Directors of Planning of the Ministries of Education in West and Central Africa discussed the new education targets and ways of integrating them into their respective education plans. Their exchange on concepts, levels of ambition, and strategies for implementation made clear that Education 2030 is giving a renewed impetus to member states – and to all those of us fighting for quality education for all. It obliges us to revise and update strategies and plans, to engage in a dialogue on policy priorities, to formulate indicators, and to agree on monitoring mechanisms.

What has not changed, however, is the sad state of education financing, and here analysis and advocacy is sorely needed. The consequences of private sector participation in the education sector, as well as the different forms of public-private partnerships will have to be carefully examined. This is closely linked to questions of quality but also of ever-increasing inequality in the world and the need to make sure that we have the data and the tools we need to understand equity and equality in education.

Unfortunately, the new agenda also brings a new emphasis on learning outcomes and a curious shift towards learning outcomes as the indicator of equity. Learning outcomes alone must not dictate the policy discussion about inequity in education; equity is also about all students enjoying the same levels of safety in learning environments, quality of education and qualifications of teachers, and quality and relevance in teaching and learning materials, just to mention but a few of the factors that have to be examined.

These are issues that we must not leave at the wayside if we are to ensure that SDG 4 marks a step forward not only in its ambition and relevance but also in the realisation of genuinely sustainable development and in meaningful accountability of states for delivering the agenda. Unless we are careful, the opportunity will be missed, and we will all find ourselves simply in the learning outcomes business.

...we will keep fighting for the right to education to be realised, for decent work and labour rights of teachers and education workers.
### Teachers and Research

Dr. Erik Byker from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte conducting field research with ASER India. Dr. Byker is interviewing teacher candidates in rural Haryana about their experiences volunteering with ASER.

#### The Countries Where Teachers Get Paid The Most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>$99,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$65,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$63,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>$56,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$55,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$53,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>$53,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>$51,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>$45,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$44,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>$44,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>$44,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OECD countries

Source: OECD

---

Which country has the best-paid teachers? A recent report revealed that among OECD countries, teachers in Luxembourg earn the highest wages. A lower secondary school teacher with 10 years experience can expect to bring home close to $100,000 USD every year, a considerable distance ahead of second placed Germany’s $65,843 USD. Out of the top the top-12 countries listed here, eight are in Europe. The highest-placed non European nation is Canada where the average annual salary comes to $63,557 USD.

This chart shows the annual average salary of lower secondary school teachers with 10 years experience in 2013.
The return of this newsletter presents a critical opportunity for the CIES to go beyond its core meeting function to reach a new beginning. During its original, humble, New York City origin, led by William Brickman, the Comparative Education Society merely produced periodic hard-copies of academic-type “research” papers, edited by Teachers College Professor George Bereday, plus a newsletter of relevant topics, snail-mailed to teachers and government officials and edited by Professor Gerald Read from far-off Kent State University. Out of a tiny American club of subscribers, we have grown into a complex, multi-purpose, international conference that has come to a point where - if we can clearly recognize our diverse purposes, constituencies and functions - we can now multiply our organization.

It’s time. Unlike the cozy yearly gatherings of the past, we now host the world’s premier English-language Annual Meeting (AM) and networking venue for students and professionals. Today, from all parts of the world come people who are eager to join our AM program. And they register! Of course we are grateful for their financial support, and we respect that our clientele no longer seeks merely to infuse comparative perspectives into the American teacher-training curriculum, or necessarily to share “research.” Also, especially since ten years ago, when the organization started requiring conference goers to purchase a journal subscription, our members are no longer just Americans. Our premiere venues have become so successful that even our neighbors with their own annual conferences often prefer CIES...

Because of below-market, even cut-rate registration fees, the organization was forced to depend on journal subscriptions and membership dues to balance its budget. However, today we boast an Annual Meeting (AM) that returns the $$$ needed to staff an array of services for attendees and to build our investment portfolio. And we can expect AM registration fees of at least market rates – and even exceed them, LOL! In this way we can maintain an administrative infrastructure for attendees far beyond what would have been possible with our meagre subscription and membership income.

After successful fiscal growth thanks to the patronage of students and others from the Global South, our premiere venues have become so successful that even our neighbors with their own annual conferences often prefer CIES...
we have reached a point where income from the journals sold by the University of Chicago Press has become superfluous. This is precisely the point where we can multiply the organization. Think about it: today’s AM-goers can always find the conference’s journal on line. Nearly all CER downloads are already made through institutional gateways, and there is little need for attendees to receive weighty paper copies of the publication since they can – if need be – tag citations through electronic access. Of course there is a clientele who – for whatever reason – may wish to get and perhaps read the conference journal. We should honor their preferences and recognize that change is unsettling for older participants. The proposal here is simply to make the journal and the newsletter self-supporting, just as our AM has become (more than!) self-supporting.

Instead of merely one CIES, let us multiply. We do not deny there may be a place for a newsletter like this one, just as there may be a continuing demand for the CER in the immediate future. However, even if these older media are still referenced in the CIES constitution, it is anachronistic to force attendees to subscribe to (or fund) such written communications unwillingly.

Our modest proposal here is to allow us once again to vote using our credit cards. Those who wish to subscribe, or to have their institutions subscribe, to the CER and this newsletter should be free to do so and thus to support Knowledge Mobilization (KM). But, is it right that this organization should subsidize the institutions hosting the CER through AM profits? What would happen if, in the future, the production of newsletters also required a similar diversion of proceeds from the Annual Meeting? Should not profits from the main event go into expanding our social networking and receptions? Why was it necessary to limit the budget for recent AM receptions merely to 100K?

A win-win solution will be for separate memberships and separate financing for our AM and KM. The first, and larger, organization will promote vital networking and leadership opportunities though AM. The second organization can maintain the traditional written forms of KM and academic “research.” Currently, the CIES board tries to be all things to all members, but the Board and its management company have enough on their plates, and enough financial needs, without attempting to fulfill both functions. Everyone wins by doubling CIES and creating two organizations.