

CIES Perspectives



April 2012 - Issue 158

Proposed
Constitutional
Amendment: For
and Against
Pages 1-9



Where to publish if
you will not perish?

Page 10

Universities and Cul-
tural Imperialism

Page 11

The Past, Present and Future of Puerto
Rican Education

Pages 12-13

Student Paper
Competition

Page 14

Globalization and
Education SIG

Page 15

CIES Board Recommends Constitutional Amendment to the Membership

CIES Board of Directors



The Board of Directors of CIES endorses a constitutional amendment to change the term of the Editor of the Society's journal *Comparative Education Review* to one 5-year term without renewal (11 for, 1 against, 1 abstention). Currently the editor's term is for 5 years with a possible 5-year renewal. The editor also

serves as a non-elected voting member of the Board, and several past editors have served a 10-year term.

The main reasons for the endorsement of the 5-year non-renewable term are to:

- Ensure a shorter duration of concentration of authority as both steward of the journal and non-elected voting member

of the CIES executive board in one person (5 years total instead of possible 10 years).

- Provide more frequent rotation of editorship ensuring greater opportunities for a greater number of CIES scholars to serve in leadership roles.
- Enable greater likelihood of intellectual diversity in the leadership of CER and in perspectives linked to the leadership.
- Make the term for a non-elected voting member of the CIES Board more in line with the 3-year term of elected Board members.

Because the CER editor's term is written into the Society's constitution, this endorsement will be announced at the State-of-Society meeting at CIES 2012, and will be put before the membership electronically for a vote soon after the conference. A majority of 2/3 of members is required for amending the constitution.

FROM THE EDITOR.... By Kevin Kinser

A scholarly association serves a few very important purposes. It provides occasions for interaction and exchange among those with common interests. It represents the history of the field and the standards it stands for. It discourages isolation by providing a community of scholars to welcome new members and new ideas. And it disseminates new knowledge through its sponsored publications.

This issue of the newsletter contains a debate that touches directly on these key functions of the Society. Specifically: How shall we choose the editor of our journal? I've invited several members of the Society to respond to the Board's proposal to amend the constitution to stipulate a single five year term for the editor. The membership is required to vote on amendments, so in part this is simply an information distribution exercise. Those in favor of the motion present their reasons; those against offer alternative perspectives.

But I'm sure you'll agree after reading the statements in these pages that much more is going on here. The authors give us a primer on how the Society views itself as seen by a group of people who have committed to serve it. They are passionate defenders of their scholarly organization. Faced with a choice, they disagree on which path to take. But I see their debate as representing the best of a scholarly association, one that has the strength to disagree in public about how best to preserve the mission of the organization and sustain it into the future.

Ultimately of course, one side will lose the vote. But without a doubt, CIES wins the debate.

CIES Publication Committee Report on CER Editor's Term

Carlos Ornelas, Chair (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana)

The members of the Standing Committee on Publications, after much debate, have agreed to give our opinions about three options for the Board of Directors to consider regarding the duration of the term(s) of appointment for the editor of the *CER*. We have collected information from various academic journals and societies. In most cases, the editors have a term of more than 3 years of duration [Editor's Note: The original Board proposal was for a 3 year term]. We did not find any journal with a mandatory open selection after the completion of the editor's first term. All allow for almost automatic reappointment after the first term, at least after an evaluation.

We attach a table [Editor's Note: Table was edited for space] that shows the initial term of appointment and process of reappointment of editorial teams of other academic journals. From this table, you can see that the amendment previously endorsed by the Board (3 years + additional 3 after open competition) would make the *CER* and the CIES an outlier. If the amendment became *CER* policy, for the first year of the next term the editor will be publishing articles accepted by the current team. In the second year he or she will be publishing articles processed by the current crew. Only in the third year would the new editorial team be likely to publish articles selected and submitted under their editorship. All but one member of the committee felt that this makes little sense. In view of our findings, most committee members (Ruth Hayhoe, Steven Klees, David Post and myself) do not advise an initial term of 3 years. These members favor the current arrangement, with an initial term of 5 years and a possibility of a second period of another 5 years. We recommend that two terms of 5 years is the maximum. This arrangement has served us very well for decades. There is no evidence of anything broken that has to be fixed.

Two members (Monisha Bajaj and Erwin Epstein) join the majority in favoring a five-year initial term and have no objection to a renewal term of five years. However, they also believe a three-year rather than a five-year renewal term would be equally acceptable. Additionally, we recommend that—like the *Review of Higher Education* (Journal of American Association for the Study of Higher Education)—the Board of Directors provide in the Bylaws that in the last year of the first term (i.e., the fourth year) a formal assessment of the editorial team be conducted. Subject to the outcome of this evaluation, the Board may decide to open a competition for a new editor. Finally, Alex Wiseman has provided a memo in defense of the amendment already passed by the board.

Journal name	Independent or association?	Publisher	Initial term of appointment?	Process for reappointment?	Who appoints or reappoints?	Mid-term evaluations?
<i>American Historical Review</i>	American Historical Association (1884)	University of Chicago Press	5 years	Eligible for multiple reappointments: no open bid	Elected council	Annual evaluations; editor may be replaced at any time for cause
<i>American Journal of Education</i>	Independent (owned by publisher)	University of Chicago Press	Open ended	No set process	Publisher	none
<i>American Psychologist</i>	American Psychological Association (1892; 150,000 members)	Self published by the A.P.A.	6 years	No set process. But reappointment is possible without an open bid for a maximum of 12 years.	Board of directors	none
<i>Anthropology & Education Quarterly</i>	Council on Anthropology of Education of the AAA	Wiley-Blackwell	3 years	Extended to 5 or 6	The Board of CAE	none
<i>Comparative Education</i>	Independent (owned by publisher)	Taylor & Francis	5 years	If the editor and board wish	Editorial Board	none
<i>Compare</i>	British Association of Int. and Comp. Ed.	Taylor & Francis	3 years	Can be renewed by one term	BAICE Board	none
<i>Educational Theory</i>	Phil. of Education Society and also John Dewey Soc.	University of Illinois Press	Open ended	No set process	Board of directors	none
<i>Journal of British Studies</i>	North American Conference on British Studies	University of Chicago Press	Open ended	No set process	Board of directors	none
<i>Latin American Research Review</i>	Latin American Studies Association	University of Pittsburgh	Open ended	No set process	Elected executive council	none
<i>Pacific Affairs</i>	Univ. British Columbia	Institute of Asian Research	3 years	Another three years	Editorial Board	none
<i>Teachers College Record</i>	Independent	Blackwell	Open ended	No set process	Publisher	none
<i>The American Naturalist</i>	American Society of Naturalists (1883)	University of Chicago Press	5 years	Eligible for multiple reappointments: no open bid	Executive committee	None apparent from by-laws
<i>The Review of Higher Education</i>	Association for the Study of Higher Education	Johns Hopkins University Press	5 years	One reappointment	Board of directors	Reviewed in last year of first term
<i>Journals of AERA</i>	AERA	Sage	3 years	Eligible for reappointments; no open bid	Not specified	none
<i>Journals of American Sociological Association</i>	ASA	Sage	3 years	Eligible for reappointments; no open bid	Committee on Publications	none

*Invited Commentary: Against the Amendment***Why Have Term Limits?**

Philip G. Altbach (Boston College)

I'm opposed to the proposed change in the CIES constitution that would impose a single five-year term on the CER editor. I have several reasons for this view.

- First and foremost, I don't like term limits. Not for politicians. Not for CER editors. Democracies, and the CIES Board of Directors, have an easy way to limit terms in office—vote for a new editor after one term.
- My second reason relates to editing a major journal—it may take time to learn the details of journal editing, and five years may be too short a time to exercise leadership. By the time an editor gets “into the groove”, the term may be over. Further, an editor may be really excellent at the job, and it would be unfortunate to automatically limit an outstanding editor to one term.

It is that simple. Perhaps a few words about academic journals in the 21st century are also in order. Journals are complex phenomena. They require a great deal of sophistication in terms of representing different perspectives and viewpoints. They require a great deal of diplomacy. They also require considerable knowledge of information technology since journals use these technologies. The CER is a particular challenge since the field of comparative education is multi- and interdisciplinary, and it reflects a variety of points of view. Further, it is international. It might well be that an editor skilled with the technologies of contemporary editing and with a good understanding of the field and its nuances would merit more than one five-year term. In my view, change for its own sake is not necessarily a positive thing. My argument is simply that the CIES constitution should allow for appropriate flexibility with regard to the editorship of the CER.

I write with some experience of journal editing. I served as editor of the CER from 1978 to 1988 (two terms), editor of *The Review of Higher Education* between 1996 and 2004, and North American Editor of *Higher Education* between 1974 and 1995. I was also founder and co-editor of *Educational Policy* between 1986 and 2004.

Why I Will Vote Against the Proposed Amendment

Ruth Hayhoe (University of Toronto)

Editor's note: The original published version of this essay left out the final paragraphs. I apologize for the oversight

It has been an interesting experience to serve on the new publications committee of the CIES over the past year, and discuss major issues relating to the Comparative Education Review. My own membership in the society goes back to 1986 and my sense of comparative education in North America before that largely came from reading the *CER*

When I finished my Ph.D. in the London Institute of Education and began searching for an academic position, it was clear that the field of comparative education had few established academic departments in North America but thrived in collaborative inter-disciplinary programs such as the one I joined at OISE in Toronto. Comparative education journals are thus extremely important as an academic centre point for a community of scholars that is scattered among departments in educational foundations, policy and leadership studies, curriculum studies or higher education. This may be the reason the CER is seen as a “crown jewel” of the CIES. It lies at the heart of a thriving intellectual community which has no other institution that reflects its core interests to the same degree. A second more pragmatic reason is that having one article accepted for publication in CER is a highly valuable asset at almost any stage in an academic career.

The proposed constitutional amendment, which will

permanently restrict the Board of Directors from ever re-appointing an editor who has served the CER for an initial term, is being justified in terms of a concern for greater diversity in the intellectual tenor of the journal and wider opportunities for CIES members from differing backgrounds to serve. There have, however, been many opportunities, for participatory leadership in the journal through the role of a changing group of co-editors over the years, also in the fact that not all recent editors have been willing to take on a second term. Decisions about the acceptance of articles reflect the judgments of hundreds of reviewers, both within and outside the CIES membership, and the moderated discussions initiated by the current editorial team have ensured the participation of a diverse and lively community of scholars.

The journal's intellectual authority and influence thus does not reside in the editor alone, but in the wider circle of co-editors, editorial board members and reviewers. The Journal and the Society have also received enormous support from the universities that have provided accommodation and student stipends for the editorial process over the years. The fact that the editor holds a membership on the CIES board and interacts on a regular basis with board members reflects the importance of the journal to the society and brings a longer time horizon to the board. It also allows the editor to function as a bridge between the CER community as a kind of “invisible college” and the membership of the CIES Board. In a certain sense, the journal has become an educational arm of the society and its wider community – given the practice of providing detailed rounds of referee critique and guidance to those who submit articles, whether they are accepted or not. I think CIES should be proud of the collection of review material on the website which has made this process so

transparent .

Given the complexity of the peer review editorial process, and the fact that articles are often two years or more in process before coming out, it would seem that limiting the appointment of the editor to a single five-year period deprives the society of the valuable experience built up over an editorial term. Why should board members be permanently disempowered from using this expertise? Why should the CER set a precedent that is not found in any of the 17 peer scholarly journals profiled in the table presented in this issue?

I worry that the proposed constitutional amendment will make it more difficult to attract a new editor of high caliber. One promising candidate has already indicated hesitation over bidding for the role without the possibility of a second term, given the large institutional start up efforts required. I am also distressed by the implied lack of appreciation and respect for two recent editors who have made huge contributions to the intellectual vitality of the journal at great personal and institutional cost. It is important for members to know, when they are asked to vote, that the publications committee did not initiate the proposed amendment, nor do they support it, with the exception of one member.

**Further Extending Term Limits:
A Poor Policy**

Steven J. Klees (University of Maryland)

I respect CIES' Board of Directors, but in this case they made a poor decision. I believe we should keep the Constitution unchanged and allow future Boards of Directors the *option* of extending the CER editors for a second five-year term. My reasons are as follows.

- A major rule, too often ignored these days, is if it's not broken don't fix it. **There is no evidence or argument that anything has been wrong with past practice.** To the contrary, we have had decades of stellar editors who have made CER the #1 journal in its field. Why mess with such success?
- There is a steep learning curve in editing a journal. It is not until the third or fourth year that the process becomes efficient and stable. The proposed term limits will result in more years of operating inefficiency.
- Having been involved in past

searches for CER editors, I can say that it is not easy to find a qualified team with the kind of university support we are asking for. In the face of such difficulties, for the Board to have the option of renewing a very successful team is eminently sensible.

- Yes, we have considerable diversity in our field but rotating the editorship more frequently is not the way to respond to diversity. We must have CER editors to be open to diverse viewpoints regardless of their personal positions. If they are not they shouldn't be hired and certainly not renewed. But, again, I go back to our history. Under the current rules, our CER editors have always been open to diverse views. They have not been criticized for this. Again, there is nothing broken to fix.
- Yes, there could be a handful of potential editors who would like the job but don't get it, but that's only a handful and not worth changing the Constitution and a successful system for.
- There is absolutely no reason to align the editor's term with the three-year Board member's term. In fact, the opposite is true. Having been on the Board and been President of the Society, with the composition of the Board changing significantly *every* year, it was extremely useful to have the CER editor and the historian on the Board to provide much needed institutional memory.
- What I find most troubling is that our current Board of Directors, with its own particular biases, is trying to change the Constitution in a way that will prevent every future Board of Directors from exercising an option, an option put there by the founders of our Society and an option that has resulted in CER being the #1 journal of its kind. **Why should this Board of Directors impose its will on every future Board?** And, remember, the current Constitution merely offers an option. If a Board decides a change in editorship is needed it simply does not have to exercise the option.

**Comment on Proposed Amendment
to CIES Constitution**

Noel McGinn (Harvard University)

Over the past 40 years the CER has been elevated from minor to major status in the hierarchy of social science journals. When I entered the Society the CER was

regarded by my non-education colleagues as the house organ for a small, not well-understood association. Its articles were infrequently cited even within education, and hardly ever by sociologists, psychologists, or economists. Today its publications are cited widely in the social science disciplines. Educationists and social scientists in general see it as an excellent platform for displaying their work to a wide audience. Hand in hand, the "fields" of comparative and international education have achieved some measure of respect, albeit they are still regarded with suspicion by discipline-based academics.

Our field has advanced enormously from the time, 40 years ago, when most of our published work was descriptive rather than analytical and almost all our concepts were borrowed from the disciplines. The CER has played a major role in that process of self-improvement, not only because of the quality of articles selected and published, but also by means of patient yet penetrating criticism of the work of colleagues, most of which was not published (at least not in the CER). Here I speak from personal experience, conscious of how much my own limited understanding was advanced by the observations and suggestions of unknown colleagues, and the editors of the CER. Journals achieve authority necessary to shape the work of colleagues by constructing and applying a clear perspective on the field they represent. The editor is the primary representative of that perspective, his or her writing and decisions build a definition of the field that attracts high quality work, both that which complements or expands the editor's perspective, or which provides evidence and arguments to support an alternative view. This dialectic process, when well managed, advances the field as well as all its participants. Intellectual diversity is energy source for progress, but without good management it can result in chaos.

There is little in our academic training to equip us to be good managers; the social and intellectual skills required are best learned experientially. That takes time. Over time, editors of the CER learn how to not just accommodate the rich intellectual diversity of our membership, but to harness distinct viewpoints to provoke new understandings of the problems in our field. Time on the job is necessary for all editors to move beyond the social networks they bring to the position to a more comprehensive

understanding of the wealth of ideas and writing skills among our membership. Phil Altbach, the editor I knew best, sharpened our understanding of the field, and of the importance of the CIES, by broadening the range of topics and ideas appearing in the journal while simultaneously improving the quality of articles. He was able to do this, I would argue, precisely because he had enough time as editor to learn how to do it and to establish his authority (and hence that of the CER).

Opportunities for leadership in CIES already exist but most are not exercised. Past Presidents have noted that it is difficult to find persons to head up both temporary committees and more stable groups such as the SIGs. The term of the presidency is too short to fully understand the various constituencies of the Society, to recruit persons for the various groups, and to represent the Society outside our field. We should follow the example of other professional societies and allow presidents to serve at least two years. The editorship of the CER has worked precisely because it has not suffered the constant rotation of “leaders” that constrains the ability of real leaders to get something done.

Invited Commentary: For the Amendment

A Recommendation in Favor of Increasing Opportunities to Serve in the Most Prominent Leadership Position in CIES

Gilbert A. Valverde
(University at Albany, SUNY)

Francisco O. Ramirez
(Stanford University)

David Baker
(Pennsylvania State University)

Nancy Kendall
(University of Wisconsin - Madison)

The position of Editor of the CER is the most significant position of leadership in the CIES and in our field. The Editor is not only the arbiter of the content of the oldest and most prominent journal of Comparative and International Education, s/he is also a full non-elected voting member of the CIES Executive Committee and Board of Directors. The Editor has a voting term that exceeds that of all elected officers. Presidents, from their year as President Elect to Past President serve 4 years. Members of the Board of Directors serve 3, as do two other non-elected voting members: the Secretary and Treasurer. Commonly, Editors have served 7 to 10 years. No other leadership position in the Society is equivalent in its influence on the scholarship in our field.

The Board of Directors voted overwhelmingly (11 in favor, 1 against and 1 abstention) to recommend a constitutional amendment to limit the term for those who serve in this leadership position to 5 years. Currently, the Editor’s term is five years, but it can be renewed for a total of 10 years. It has been renewed a number of times in the past, making decade long terms commonplace. The proposed amendment would maintain the 5 year term for an Editor, but would simply eliminate the possibility of term renewal. Since the Editor of CER enjoys the editorial

position, the voting position on the CIES board, and serves *ex officio* on the Publications Committee, we feel that no one should be able to retain that extraordinary gate keeping role in our field for potentially a decade.

The CIES constitution requires us to consider this position in its entirety. The Editor’s position simultaneously entails the scholarly task of editing the journal and a period of prolonged tenure as an unelected voting member on the Executive Committee. The information the Board considered in making its judgment indicated that a 5 year term is an excellent accommodation between the time required to grow into the position and then make an imprint on the journal, and the need to open up opportunities for more members of the Society to take on this role. The most important leadership position in the Society needn’t be held by the same person for a decade, and the Board’s vote is a recommendation to revise the Constitution to avoid this eventuality in the future.

When the CIES was a younger society, with fewer members, perhaps there was good reason to allow for decade-long terms. We have benefitted by the hard work and excellence of past editors. This recommendation is not born of a particular problem noted in past editors. To the contrary, manifestly there have been a number of excellent editors in the past. The recommendation is based instead on an assessment of the current status of the Society, and its future needs. Simply put, in our opinion the Society is now large enough, diverse enough, and mature enough to ensure a rotation of strong editors representing the full diversity of the Society, every 5 years. We recommend making a purposeful decision to open up this opportunity as part of the Society’s agenda for the future.

Limiting the term of the Editor to 5 years in no way diminishes the stature nor the

integrity of the position. It still would be the signal leadership position in the Society – combining an extended period of direction of the premier journal in our field with what would still be the longest governance term of any voting member in CIES leadership. There is no question that many scholars in the CIES are capable of performing the duties and providing the leadership that the editor’s position on CER represents. We advocate opening this opportunity to more of the exceptional members of the Society than would be possible if Editors continue to each be able to serve 10 years. No decision regarding the length of the term of an Editor can guarantee that some individuals on occasion will not disappoint in this role. This is possible equally over the course of 10 years or over the course of 5. The change that the Board of Directors voted to recommend however, guarantees that this truly unique position of leadership in the field will be open to more Society members than it is currently.

A CIES Member’s Perspective on the CER Editor’s Term

Alexander W. Wiseman
(Lehigh University)

Growing pains are a part of the lifecycle of every community, and CIES is no different. Throughout the Society’s history, growing pains have led to debates over issues like the establishment of the CER itself, the Society’s financial and taxation responsibilities, an identity crisis when the Society’s name was changed, contested Society elections and voting procedures, and the list goes on (Swing, 2007, <http://cies.us/CIESWCCES.pdf>). In each instance, the crisis has been indicative of the Society’s growth and development, and the solutions have consistently been to address the needs of

the membership rather than protect the status quo. CIES is thankfully in another cycle of growth and development, but it also means we are having growing pains again. As a member-based organization, the Comparative and International Education Society relies on its members to weigh the issues and let their voices be heard. The CIES Board's endorsement of a 5-year term limit for CER editor presents us – the Society's members – with a chance to support the Society's growth and development or to defend the status quo while still expecting different results.

As a career-long member of the Society and more recently of the CIES Publications Standing Committee, I have only the highest respect for former and current CER editors. Each of them have served the Society and associated professional community well, in a job that is extremely demanding and largely thankless. We would all be remiss if we did not publicly thank each of the CER's former and current editors for their service to CIES and the broader comparative and international education community.

Let me clearly state that a constitutional change limits for CER editors in no way diminishes the fact that these editors have done a phenomenal job building the rigor and quality of the CER over the years. But, let it also be clear that CIES exists to serve its members (not the other way around) and we have reached a point where the current CER editor term limits and practices do not adequately serve the membership's needs, represent who the CIES membership is, nor allow members as much of a voice or as much of a diverse base in intellectual and ideological perspectives as we should expect and deserve.

As an example of the lack of diversity and voice in the current system, let's consider the fact that no woman has ever served as senior editor. Is this because there are no qualified or willing women to serve as CER senior editor? Of course not. Should we consider the fact that only white males have served as CER editor to mean that underrepresented people are neither welcome nor qualified? Of course not. We could also consider the fact that two of the last three editors were trained at the same university and in the same department. Is this because the last 20 years has seen a dearth of qualified or willing individuals trained at other institutions who could serve as senior editor? Again, of course not. In short, the existing CER editor term limits allow (and perhaps encourage) decade-long terms. This limits opportunities for new editors to rise into the position, and limits the willingness of individuals who may not want to commit a decade of their professional career to the significant challenges and responsibilities of CER editor. Instead, CIES members from all backgrounds and intellectual traditions should be provided the maximum opportunity to have a voice in shaping scholarship and intellectual directions in our field as well as encouraging new generations of leaders in our field to emerge.

In the discussions leading up to this debate, some who oppose the change have already made practical arguments claiming that five years is barely enough time for new editors to finish the previous editor's backlog of articles and establish "his" own agenda for CER. (I emphasize "his" since CER senior editors have only been men so far.) This practical argument is worth addressing, but is hardly an insurmountable obstacle. Consider some examples. Although there is a range of practices among professional societies, two of the largest related societies with highly rigorous and productive journal publications are the

American Educational Research Association and the American Sociological Association. Both the AERA and ASA produce multiple scholarly and research-oriented publications to serve both their membership and the global professional community. Both associations also have 3-year editor terms, which are renewable for 1-3 additional years with the approval of the association.

The evidence from the AERA and ASA suggests that from a practical perspective the CIES Board's endorsement of a 5-year term limit for the CER editor is acceptable practice and does not limit the ability of future CER editors and editorial teams to produce high-quality, rigorous content. In short, there is no question that maximum editor term limits of 5 years or less are practiced by large and respected professional societies in related fields, so the Board's endorsement of a 5-year term limit for the CER editor aligns with what other comparable societies are doing. But, more importantly, revising the maximum CER editor's term supports the healthy, rigorous, and productive development of professional scholarship and community. In other words, it's more about what's good for the Society's members and the community served by the *CER* than it is about the position of editor itself.

The CIES and its primary voice (the CER) have a responsibility to remain member-oriented. CER enjoys the widest circulation and serves the largest membership of any other society in the field of comparative and international education. Given this fact, it is akin to ideological, research, and publication hegemony for any editor of a member-oriented society's only scholarly journal to serve as long as a decade, especially a society that has as many diverse theoretical and methodological approaches as CIES. As another example, consider the fact that the CIES has a strong and significantly large young professional membership. These members deserve the same chance to contribute to the editorship of their Society's journal and to have their voice heard as those who have been in the field for decades already.

Longer term limits, like we currently have, build complacency among the membership towards research leadership in our field. A decade with the same editor sends the message that a particular editor or editorial team's approach to scholarship in the field is the best or right way. While rigor coupled with theoretical and methodological openness to different approaches is certainly possible during a decade long term, we will be better served with shorter terms and more cooperation and overlap among editors. Shorter term limits, like the ones endorsed by the CIES Board, help reduce any deleterious influence of seniority among Society members. This provides the opportunity for an increase in the frequency of merit-based selection of CER editors, which in the future will hopefully include women, minorities, and those from diverse intellectual bases. And, if CIES members had more active (and frequent) opportunities to edit the journal, the Society might find that the membership becomes even more active than it already is.

In short, approving the CIES Board's endorsement of a 5-year term limit for CER editors is a way to celebrate the generation of new ideas and infuse the field with fresh approaches to scholarship and publishing. Change is always accompanied by resistance, but as members of CIES we should expect more of a voice and more opportunities for involvement in and diversity among the Society's scholarly and intellectual leadership than maintaining the status quo provides.

CER Editor's Term

Ratna Ghosh (McGill University)

We are privileged that our Society's Newsletter offers us a forum in which we may engage in a dialogue about matters of significance to the broad membership of CIES. The Board of Directors has endorsed a motion **that would change the term of the Editor of the CER, our Society's journal, from a renewable 5-year term to a non-renewable 5-year term.** This would require an amendment to the Constitution. While only a few of CER's past editors have served 10-year terms (three out of seven total), it is important to note that the ex-officio position entitles one to concurrently serve as a voting member of the Board of Directors and on the Executive Committee; the Editor is not elected to the Board by the membership of CIES. The duration of the CER Editor's term is demarcated in the Constitution and its amendment would require the support of a 2/3 majority of the Society's members who vote. I voted in favor of this constitutional amendment, and I will elaborate on my rationale below.

While there have been cases made for rejecting the proposed constitutional amendment and continuing the status quo, I maintain that, on the whole, **arguments for a non-renewable 5-year term outweigh those against it.** Although each new CER Editor needs con-

siderable time to become acclimated to the position, s/he takes over a backlog of journal issues before publishing articles submitted and selected under his or her editorship; this allows for the initial part of the Editor's term to be focused on assembling an editorial staff and gaining a sense of what the job entails. In investigating the practices of other scholarly journals, the members of the CIES Publications Committee reported both shorter and longer editors' terms and for this reason recommended a 5-year term, though one that could be renewable after a formal evaluation in the Editor's fourth year of service. However, in consideration of whether a renewable or non-renewable term would satisfy the needs of the Society and its diverse membership, I believe that more frequent rotation of the CER editorship would create additional opportunities for CIES members without endangering the quality of the journal.

Given that the membership of CIES has grown so rapidly—with over half of our members joining in the past five years, many of them students, from increasingly varied places around the world—the CER Editor has a responsibility to represent our member-oriented Society and a range of theoretical and methodological worldviews. This task becomes unquestionably more challenging if the Editor's term is permitted to span an entire decade (as is currently possible under the

Constitution). Thus, the argument to restrict the Editor's term to five years without the option for renewal is convincing for a number of reasons: (1) it would promote greater intellectual diversity in the leadership of CER by limiting the length of time in which any one person's authority would influence the activities of the journal; (2) it would promote greater intellectual diversity among the CER editorial team, which is appointed by the Editor and should demonstrate diversity in perspective amongst its members; (3) it would shorten the length of time that the Editor could serve on the CIES Board as a non-elected voting member, whose elected members serve only 3-year terms; (4) it would open up leadership roles to a greater variety of qualified scholars, of whom there are and will continue to be many in the Society's expanding membership; (5) it would reduce the length of the commitment made by the Editor's host institution in helping to facilitate the work of the editorial staff; and finally, (6) this option would remain in line with the current advertisement for a new CER Editor, while simply clarifying the 5-year appointment as non-renewable.

For all of the above reasons, I advocate the 5-year non-renewable term. This proposed Constitutional amendment is also timely because it comes at a period when the Society is undertaking an overall revision of its Charter.

Invited Responses**Term Limits: What is the Debate?**

Steven J. Klees
(University of Maryland)

I must admit, I didn't really think there was much of an argument for further term limits (I say further because we already have term limits - two). However, reading Ratna Ghosh, Gilbert Valverde and Alexander Wiseman, there were points I had not considered -but, I think if you sift through the arguments, the reasons to reject term limits far outweigh the very few small benefits that may be possible. Let me begin by looking at Ghosh's conclusion. I choose that because I thought it offered some of the strongest arguments, some of which were echoed in other contributions. Below I just wish to show how, for each of those positive points Ghosh makes for term limits (in *italics* below), there is an alternative view.

Thus, the argument to restrict the Editor's term to five years without the option for renewal is convincing for a number of reasons:

- (1) it would promote greater intellectual diversity in the leadership of CER by limiting the length of time in which any one person's authority would influence the activities of the journal;*
- (2) it would promote greater intellectual diversity among the CER editorial team, which is appointed by the Editor and should demonstrate diversity in perspective amongst its members;*

(continued on page 8)

The journal always does, has, and must reflect the intellectual diversity of the field. If it does not, the editors will not be renewed. It is a mistake to think that there is an issue of intellectual diversity in this debate over term limits. The spectacular success of the journal also denies that diversity has been a problem.

(3) it would shorten the length of time that the Editor could serve on the CIES Board as a non-elected voting member, whose elected members serve only 3-year terms;

To the contrary, having someone on the Board with a 5-10 year presence is a huge benefit to Board functioning. And even a 10-year presence on the Board does not give the Editor any power.

(4) it would open up leadership roles to a greater variety of qualified scholars, of whom there are and will continue to be many in the Society's expanding membership;

Very few positions will be opened up. If we had had term limits over the past 50 years, we would have had only 3 additional Editors -- over 50 years! This is not worth changing the Constitution for and it may even be a negative, not a positive, as it adds years of inefficient start-up to CER operations.

(5) it would reduce the length of the commitment made by the Editor's host institution in helping to facilitate the work of the editorial staff.

Hayhoe reports the opposite—we may get fewer bids by prohibiting renewal. And remember, no Editor or university ever makes a 10-year commitment anyway.

Wiseman characterizes this debate as a "chance to support the Society's Growth and Development or to defend the status quo." Those against term limits are "resisters." Those for, are "serving membership needs." I see the debate quite differently. The critics of the amendment aren't a group of change-resistant defenders of the status quo uninterested in the membership. Everyone is interested in the future of the Society and very attentive to our membership, but with very different views of what is best to do.

To conclude, as Hayhoe reported, **of the 17 other journals the CIES Publications Committee gathered data on, none have mandatory one term limits. All other Boards retain flexibility. Why not CIES?**

Vote to reject the term limits amendment. If not, you will be strangely voting to trust this Board in its decision not to trust every Board that succeeds it.



Response to CER editor essays

Alexander W. Wiseman
(Lehigh University)

Times of transition are always difficult, and the frustrations and opinions expressed by those of us who were invited to comment reflect this. But, rather than being an "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" community, let's strive to be a forward-thinking and solutions-oriented community. Rather than la

ment the loss of the "good old days", let's plan for the future of our Society and our profession. As part of our Society's development, it is time for a change in the CER editor's term limits. The shift to a 5-year maximum term is a way to improve what already exists, by supporting intellectual diversity and new opportunities for those who have not had as much of a voice in our Society's scholarly publication.

There is no question that the CER has in many ways served as a de facto educational and mentoring arm of the Society, but let's not build up the CER editor's position to assume more functions than it can handle or effectively implement. If we want an educational and mentoring arm of the Society, then let's create one rather than rely on the editor to do it. It is from a position of dominance and power that a CER editor uses his position to "teach" authors who have submitted manuscripts for review. As those who study and are intimately concerned with education, we should all know that part of the educational process is encouraging and empowering students to teach themselves so that learning becomes not just a school process, but also a lifelong process. How is that supposed to happen when the alternative to following the editor's suggestions is to have your manuscript rejected?

We should indeed be reminded and respectful of the service and leadership that CER editors (past and present) have brought to the Society. Their contributions to the development of the field are tremendous, and we all agree that they should be lauded for their efforts. But, we should not equate length of service with expertise or representativeness. Nor should we accept that the only good editors are those who are willing to commit a decade of their career to the position. I find it remarkably condescending to suggest that the CIES membership doesn't understand the responsibilities and challenges of the CER editor position because only someone who has served for 10 years in that position can appreciate what it takes to edit the CER. Instead, let's recognize that the energy behind the proposed change to a 5-year term limit comes from a desire for the CER to fully represent the Society's membership and the many voices in our professional and scholarly field. And, let's believe in our membership enough to make a change that will do this.

I'll say it again: change is never easy, but it is sometimes necessary. The CIES is not the same society it was in the 1970s, 1980s, or even the 1990s. Our Society is bigger and more diverse than ever before. As members of this great Society, we *all* deserve a voice and an opportunity to lead. Let's give ourselves the chance.

Editor's Note: This response from Ruth Hayhoe was inadvertently left out of the original issue. I apologize for the oversight.

Women Editors of Comparative Education Review & Related issues:

A Response to the CER Editor Term Debate

Ruth Hayhoe

(University of Toronto)

It seems important to set the record straight and note how many women scholars have been involved in editing Comparative Education Review over the years, also the degree to which the work of the editorial team has been a collective endeavour. I was involved in the appointment of the team at UCLA some years ago, and remember how, in evaluating their bid, we looked at the whole team, not only at the lead editor, who had a key role in securing institutional resources for the editorial office.

So let's celebrate some of the outstanding women scholars who have taken up editorial leadership in various teams over the years. Gail Kelly, Nelly Stromquist, Heidi Ross, Amy Stambach, Emily Hannum and N'Dri Therese Assie-Lumumba (as book review editor) all come to mind for me – perhaps there are others I have missed.

As we consider the important vote around this proposed amendment, I hope we will reflect on the nature of the editorial role, as a highly professional role, also a very collaborative one in the CER's history, with diversity found in the editorial team and also in the inclusion of multiple voices through the editing of special issues and participation in moderated discussions. Since we have an elected president to lead the society, with the assistance of elected board members, why should we not leave full discretion to them over issues around the possible re-appointment of the editorial team for CER? Why should we treat the editor's membership on the Board as a political matter, rather than a matter of coordinating a collective characterized by a high level of professional expertise and experience as well as a spirit of service that has been a huge asset to the society and functioned as a kind of educational arm for the society over many years?

It is notable that many of the most well established and respected academic societies on the list provided by the publications committee for the newsletter allow for initial terms of five or more years for their journal editors, with at least one five-year extension possible. This is the case for the American Historical Association (*American Historical Review*), The American Psychological Association (*American Psychologist*), The American Society of Naturalists (*The American Naturalist*), and The Association for the Study of Higher Education (*The Review of Higher Education*). Why should we remove the CIES from such distinguished company and permanently tie the hands of the Board rather than trusting them to further the best interests of the CER in changing circumstances?



Where to Publish If You Will not Perish?

Helen Abadzi
(World Bank)

About a year ago a colleague was leafing through a recent international education journal and pointed to various articles. "I will send them an article that can be just like that," he said. A year and two rejections later, he declared that it's not worth it. What happened in between?

Publishing is an indispensable prerequisite for academic status, so a host of academic journals exist to fulfill this survival need. The journals essentially mirror the rhythms of the academic lifestyle. Students and professors have the time and funding to collect data just for the sake of research, consequently methodological and statistical sophistication matter a lot. Since publishing is more important than publishing about something worthwhile, however, topics may be rather unimportant. Reviewers may leave manuscripts waiting for months and then write pithy commentaries about issues that have no utility outside academia. With back and forth comments, the publication process takes years. But that's ok because submitted but unpublished articles are included in hiring and tenure decisions. And electronic journals with potentially quicker turn-around rates are somehow perceived to be second rate.

So there is an implicit competition for publication of 25 or so articles per year in a respectable journal, and many published articles use superb methodology to analyze relatively unimportant or outdated topics. It's a strange system, given the demand of just-in-time research news, but academics' needs for promotion are adequately fulfilled.

On the other hand, most staff in donor agencies and international organizations don't perish if they don't publish in journals. They write reports, evaluations, and some popularized publications. Still some of us get ideas about publishing in actual journals. Articles in their final state seem deceptively easy to attain, so we submit our research for review.

Just one effort is enough to convince aspiring authors that the journal rhythms and priorities are really not meant for our work style. To begin with, for us the topic is what matters the most. We must make real-time decisions based on the available causal chains, so our manuscripts may deal with pretty significant development topics that affect millions of people. But our datasets often lack the elegance of those whose job is to research nearly full time. We cannot afford the time or money to collect many data, and certainly not just for the sake of good research. So when submitted to journals the manuscripts risk getting rejected on methodological grounds. If we survive the many delayed bouts of commentaries and have an article accepted, the issue may become outdated by the time the ideas finally get to print.

An example has been teachers' tendency in low-income countries to focus on the few best students and ignore the rest; this situation drives many students to dropout. The situation has been observed often, and the causal chain is fairly clear. A colleague and I prepared an article for publication in August 2010 in hopes that the issue would get attention and that more studies would be done. But that was naïve thinking. An informal consultation with a CER editor made it clear that the article would go nowhere with just spotty data from one country. So I sent it to a journal whose editor is interested in counterintuitive ideas. Re-

viewers did not get around to it for about 4 months. At least one was unimpressed by the consequences of this issue and recommended rejection due to data quality. Fortunately the editor disagreed, and it was published in December 2011. Many edits were made, but 16 months was a triumph of speed and good judgment.

The very poor in low-income countries are dropping out illiterate every day, and science-based solutions ought to be of some interest. But hypotheses based on learning research fare quite poorly. Many education professors have limited familiarity, so they misunderstand and argue on irrelevant points. Around September 2010 I co-authored an article on the research rationale for a cognitively efficient literacy program we are involved with in a poor country. But the article got roundly rejected. "Why publish now?" one editor asked us. Wait for 3 years until you collect your data and then resubmit. (Presumably your graduate students are preparing other publications that include your name so that you can show academic productivity in the meantime.) Another journal had ideological problems with information processing research, so they just avoided it and sent us to a third. That one waited for 6 months and then rejected the article without any explanation. After wandering around like an orphan, the article is now going to a small east Asian journal where the second author is personally known.

This is not, of course, to say that everything deserves publication. I am a reviewer of two journals, and I recommend rejection for over half the articles I receive, mainly due to poor causal chains (and do so within a week of reception). But I have been surprised over the years with the apparently lack of concern for the real-world significance of topics that get rejected by respectable journals.

And for the same mismatch reasons, the CER rarely has anything I can use to improve the outcomes of my work. It publishes nice data about interesting countries, but variables tend to peripheral. Rarely are instructional issues researched, and the causal chain is often unclear. These conditions give very little insight on how to fix things in those countries.

So why should a practitioner publish? Journals sometimes are the last to print news; blogs are read fast and perhaps by a larger audience. But blogs are impermanent and not yet citable. Those of us who want others to read our proposed solutions and research them must still look for journals. For that reason, a peer-reviewed online journal was established for practitioners, the "Journal of Education for International Development (JEID). It was financed by USAID, and when the relevant project ended, the journal issued its last articles in December 2010. (<http://www.equip123.net/JEID/>)

In conclusion, the journal system works very well for the promotion of full time academics, but works terribly for practitioners. For my part, I have learned over the years to approach mainly the editors who know me or my co-authors personally. I have also learned that journal quality does not matter. What matters is whether a journal is searchable by library services. Now I am toying with online journals that are little more than publishing mills. For \$300 I can get my message out and in the hands of inquisitive graduate students in 4 months or so. This way users of journals will get more of the real-world knowledge that never makes it into peer-reviewed journals.

Universities and Cultural Imperialism

An Inspiring Exception

Ruth Hayhoe
(University of Toronto)

Shanxi University, which will have its 110th anniversary in the spring of this year, offers a fascinating exception to the general picture of universities serving as the knowledge arm of imperial power in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Founded at a time when China was suffering extreme humiliation from the punishing conditions imposed by the Western powers after the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, in a province most severely affected by the Boxer Movement, it might have been expected to serve the interests of British imperial power and function as an institution that embodied clear aspects of the British model of the university. Tsinghua University, which was funded through American Boxer Indemnity money, was certainly characterized by features of the American university model. Likewise, L'Université Aurore, founded by French Jesuits, exemplified a French emphasis on excellence in medicine and law.

However, Shanxi University never stood out as a British model of the university in China. In fact, there is no British model, with the exception of the University of Hong Kong. This was in spite of the dominance of Britain's economic power during the 19th and early 20th centuries. The reason for this anomaly has recently become clear in two doctoral theses that focused on the founding of Shanxi University in 1902. The first, done by Eunice Johnson at the University of Florida in Gainesville, focused on Timothy Richard, a Baptist missionary from Wales who spent 45 years in China from 1871 to 1916. Richard began as an evangelist but gradually came to see higher education as a crucial issue for China's development. He put forward a proposal in the 1890s for a modern university in each province that could lead in China's development efforts. After the Boxer tragedy in 1900, Richard seized the opportunity of negotiating for Shanxi province's compensation payments to Britain to be used for a local university. He put enormous effort into gathering together a group of scholars who could take up the tasks of teaching and scholarly leadership. In his negotiations with provincial officials, he agreed that the new university would be handed over to Chinese control within ten years, and in the end signed it over to provincial authorities just nine years after its founding. It thus functioned throughout the 20th century as a public university that served the interests of both the province and the country through difficult times.

Johnson's thesis explored the factors in Richard's life that resulted in this kind of altruistic leadership – the independent spirit nurtured in his Welsh childhood, the fact that he himself was a graduate of a normal school not a university (so had little interest in implanting a British university model), and the deep love he developed for China through his years of service. A devoted Christian, he felt his calling was to interact with “those who are worthy” and this feeling led to close and respectful dialogue with Confucian officials, as well as leaders of Buddhism and Islam in China. Richard was also deeply committed to peace and intercultural understanding, putting forward a proposal early in the 20th century which foreshadowed aspects of the work

of the League of Nations and could even be seen as an early vision for the work of UNESCO.

Some years after Johnson's thesis was completed and presented to Shanxi University at the celebration of its 100th anniversary in Taiyuan in 2002, a Chinese student at Oxford, Aisi Li, became inspired to explore the founding of Shanxi University. Her focus was on the Chinese angle of this story and she accessed Chinese archival sources in the UK, the USA and China that had not been available to Johnson. Besides considering the important role of Timothy Richard, Li looked carefully at the contribution of Cen Chunxuan, the remarkable governor of Shanxi Province at the time of the Boxer Indemnity negotiations. He was determined to ensure that the modern university established in his province should be fully under Chinese control, while adapting the new curricular knowledge introduced by the missionaries to China's development needs. Thus even while Richard was negotiating the missionary indemnity issues for Shanxi and seeking to ensure that the Boxer indemnity funds be directed to establishing a Sino-Western university there, Governor Cen was busy setting up a new provincial university under firm local control.

Cen then negotiated for Richard's Sino-Western University to be merged with his provincial university as the Western Department, while his university became the Chinese Department. All student dormitories were placed under the supervision of the Chinese Department, which exposed students to a curricular foundation in China's own knowledge patterns. Meanwhile the Western Department was headed and staffed by missionary scholars for a ten year period, by which time the teachers of Western learning had been trained, useful translations of important texts had been completed and a modern curriculum developed that could serve the needs of the province. An interesting finding of Li's thesis was that provincial level leaders such as Cen were open to the Western learning, yet far more radical in insisting on independence from foreign control than national level leaders, who felt there was no alternative to accepting terms imposed by the victorious Western powers. At the same time these provincial leaders displayed considerable flexibility in importing and modifying Western models.

The two sides of this story came together when the Oxford student, Aisi Li, attended the New Scholars workshop of the Comparative International Education Society's Annual meeting in Chicago in March of 2010, and learned about Johnson's thesis from Ruth Hayhoe. She subsequently visited Johnson and was able to access the extensive English language archives Johnson had collected. She also visited the Library of the Yale Divinity School, and opened the way for the Eunice Johnson Collection to be placed in a formal archive there. When Li's thesis was ready for defence at Oxford in December of 2011, Hayhoe was invited to serve as external examiner and Johnson travelled with her to Oxford for the occasion.

This cross cultural journey of these two scholars from China and the United States culminated in a memorial service at the last resting place of Timothy Richard, close to the London home of his final years, in the Golders Green Crematorium, on December 22 of 2011. It was a remarkably balmy winter day, with sun streaming down, as we gathered with a great grandson in the Columbarium that held Richard's ashes. Before us was a simple plaque, “In Most Happy Memory of Timothy Richard, Li Ti Mo T'ai... Blessed are the Peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.”

Richard's in-depth understanding of Chinese society, passionate conviction about the importance of engaging with top scholars and leaders in China in a mutually respectful way, and his detachment from British governmental interests, had enabled him to play this remarkable role in the development of Shanxi university. At the same time, Governor Cen's strong belief in the importance of education, open attitudes towards Western learning and determination to maintain China's educational sovereignty was an equally important part of the equation. This enabled him to ensure that the modern university he established served China rather than fitting into the contours of emerging Western ideas of cultural diplomacy.

Eunice Johnson's thesis is entitled "Educational Reform in China, 1880-1910: Timothy Richard and His Vision for Higher Education" (University of Florida, Gainesville, 2001).

Aisi Li's thesis is entitled "Competition and Compromise between British Missionaries and Chinese Officials: The Founding of Shanxi University in 1902." (University of Oxford, 2011).



Jones Act, but did not have the right to vote for the U.S.

President in federal elections. Moreover, the Jones Act adopted resolutions to improve Puerto Rican public education and created a new legislative body in Puerto Rico, but also maintained the right of veto power by the U.S. government on any laws passed on the island.

In 1948, Puerto Rico elected its first popularly elected governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín, a native of Puerto Rico, and in 1952 Puerto Rico established internal self-government with the ratification of its constitution and status of *Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico*, "Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." Governor Muñoz-Marín passed a series of education reforms to restructure Puerto Rico's educational system, including establishing mandatory attendance, building new schools, and increased hiring of teachers, all in an effort to transform Puerto Rico from an agricultural-based economy to an industrial-based one. In the following decades, Puerto Rican educators, lawmakers, and administrators would continue their efforts in reforming the administrative structure, school curricula, teacher training, and language policy of Puerto Rican schools.

Current challenges and promises for the future of Puerto Rican education

Currently, the Puerto Rican Department of Education is dealing with the aftermath of long-standing administrative issues, including severe bureaucratic and funding problems. Poised to improve the future of Puerto Rican education at all levels, the Department of Puerto Rican Education held a summit in San Juan on October 17, 2011. The 2011 Puerto Rican Education Summit: Investing in Our Future, brought together teachers, principles, community leaders, and government officials to discuss how to prepare Puerto Rico's children for the knowledge-based global economy of the 21st century.

Although test scores do not reflect what students learn in school, policymakers and stakeholders use test scores to define students. The most recent test scores available provide some perspective of student achievement. Results from the 2009-2010 Consolidated State Performance Report for Puerto Rico indicate the following for the more than 270, 000 students tested in Mathematics and Reading/Language, and more than 110, 000 tested in Science:



The Past, Present and Future of Puerto Rican Education

Bethsaida Nieves (University of Wisconsin)

Historically, the *Taino*, an Arawakan-speaking people, inhabited the island of *Borikén*, "Land of the Valiant Lord." In 1493 when Christopher Columbus arrived in *Borikén*, he claimed the island for the Spanish crown, and it was then renamed Puerto Rico, "Rich Port."

Approximately twenty years later, The Cathedral School was built in San Juan where only children of the privileged classes would be educated. Children of non-privileged classes would be educated through various charitable missions. When Puerto Rico was conceded to the United States under the Treaty of Paris in 1898, it found itself under a new colonial power. The Organic Act of 1900 established San Juan as the administrative center of Puerto Rican education, and granted the U.S. President the right to appoint the Commissioner of Education of Puerto Rico every four years.

In 1917, Puerto Ricans would gain U.S. citizenship under the

(continued from page 11)

Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient

Grade#	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
3	65.3%	52.2%	Non-testing grade
4	48.3%	39.5%	66.1%
5	37.2%	40.4%	Non-testing grade
6	9.0%	46.5%	Non-testing grade
7	5.8%	32.8%	Non-testing grade
8	7.4%	39.1%	22.6%
High School	3.8%	34.9%	39.1%

source: <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/sy09-10part1/pr.pdf>

The 2009-2010 Consolidated State Performance Report for Puerto Rico also indicates that qualified teachers do not always teach Core classes, defined as English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography. For example, the report indicates that the percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified in all elementary classes is 79.7 %, and 85.3 % in all secondary classes. Conversely, the percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are *not* highly qualified in all elementary classes is 20.3%, and 14.7 % in all secondary classes.

According to Arne Duncan who spoke at the Puerto Rico Education Summit on October 17, 2011, there are 63 low achieving schools in Puerto Rico. But, he warns, heeding to a No Child Left Behind law that unfairly labels schools as failing is not helpful. What is needed, he proposes, is a law that “supports teachers, students, and parents at the local level, not one that is so punitive and prescriptive.” As the Departments of Education in both Puerto Rico and the United States move their efforts forward to modernize schools, increase student achievement in math, science, and reading in both Spanish and English, as well as teacher training and accountability, the home-school-community partnership is indispensable. What remains to be seen however, is how the upcoming 2012 Puerto Rican plebiscite for U.S. statehood will affect current and future efforts to reform Puerto Rican education. What will happen to Puerto Rican education if the plebiscite for U.S statehood passes, or if Puerto Rico remains a commonwealth?



The 2012 Student Paper Competition Jointly Sponsored by the Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) SIG and the Indigenous Knowledge and the Academy (IKA) SIG



Indigenous knowledge systems are the complex arrays of knowledge, know-how, practices and representations that guide human societies in their innumerable interactions with the natural milieu. It is through this fine-grained interplay between society and environment that indigenous knowledge systems have developed diverse structures and content; complexity, versatility and pragmatism; and distinctive patterns of interpretation anchored in specific worldviews. Whereas knowledge is conceived in Western culture as an abstract entity independent from practice (e.g., science as opposed to technology), such a compartmentalized view is alien to indigenous societies

Nakashima and Roué (2002, p. 2)

The intersection between the indigenous knowledge and Western knowledge regarding sustainability is the topic for this student paper completion. The winner will receive a certificate in recognition of the award and a reimbursement of up to \$100 for travel expenses incurred for traveling to the CIES annual meeting (Co-authored or multiple authored winners will share the specified monetary award). The winner may receive the award during the joint business meeting of Indigenous Knowledge and the Academy (IKA) and the Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) SIGs, Wednesday, April 25, 3:30-5:00p in Puerto Rico, or at a later date.

Competition Rules

- The maximum length of a paper is 3500 words (approximately 12-15 pages including bibliography). An abstract of no more than 150 words must also be included.
- The title page must include the author's name, institutional affiliation, email address, and the name, address, and telephone number of the student's advisor/mentor.
- Papers with multiple authors will be considered provided that all authors are graduate students.
- Contestants must submit papers electronically via email: esd.editors@gmail.com. We do not accept hard copies.
- Please send any inquires regarding the competition to esd.editors@gmail.com, subject line: 2012 Student Paper Competition.
- For information on Education for Sustainable Development SIG, please visit the following web site: <http://educationsustainable.weebly.com>
- For information about the Indigenous Knowledge and the Academia SIG visit the following web site: http://www.cies.us/SIGS/Indigenous_Knowledge_SIG/index.htm
- To be eligible to enter the competition, one needs to be a CIES member, and if selected, to become a SIG member (if one is not already a member).

Judging

A panel of judges from both SIGs will blind review papers. The judges will employ conventional scholarly criteria -- including thesis development, theoretical application, methodological application, discussion/findings, and mechanics -- in their deliberations. The papers will also be reviewed for their potential for publication. Please submit papers by **Saturday, April 15, 2012** to esd.editors@gmail.com

Douglas Nakashima and Marie Roué M. (2002). Indigenous Knowledge, Peoples and Sustainable Practice, Vol.5, *Social and economic dimensions of global environmental change*, pp. 314-324. *Encyclopedia of global environmental change* (ed) Ted Munn. John Wiley @ Sons, Ltd., Chichester.



Globalization and Education SIG

Holds Webinar on Ethnography and Studying Globalization

Sophia Rodriguez and Noah W. Sobe
(Loyola University Chicago)

On January 31, 2012, the CIES Globalization and Education Special Interest Group (SIG) hosted a webinar on the topic of "Ethnography and the Research Agenda for Studying Globalization and Education." This 90-minute event featured short presentations by Kathryn Anderson-Levitt (UCLA, United States), Stephen Carney (Roskilde University, Denmark), and Susan Robertson (University of Bristol, UK), followed by a stimulating discussion with more than 50 researchers, students and practitioners who attended the online event. The webinar was co-hosted by the Center for Comparative Education (CCE) at Loyola University Chicago and moderated by Noah W. Sobe, CCE Director. Participants came from over a dozen countries representing every continent. In addition, students from six different universities participated in the webinar as part of a class.

Kathryn Anderson-Levitt began by posing two questions: who makes world culture and how? And, what counts as global culture? Drawing on scholars such as Lechner and Boli, Anderson-Levitt noted that "global culture" tends to be defined as "whatever manages to be presented to the world as universally applicable and meaningful." As examples, she listed school choice, mixed method for reading instruction, and student-centered instruction. Anderson-Levitt noted that transmission of these ideas is subject to debate. Some argue that ideas are deliberately imitated while others emphasize how they are often directly imposed.

For Anderson-Levitt, it is important that we look at the social and cultural construction of ideas. Ideas can and do get re-made at the local level with local resources. It is necessary, therefore, to consider who controls resources at the local level. Adding the assumption that cultural meaning is always constructed through interaction, we can then assume that all cultural production is local. This means that even the production of a so-called world culture is happening in particular places and being done by particular people. Comparative education researchers

tend to obscure this point, Anderson-Levitt argued, because they do not always "name the actors" (as John Bodley insists that we do in his book the *Power of Scale*). She argued that ethnography has an important role to play in the study of globalization and education if we actually want to think about who is out there in the world making meaning.

Stephen Carney next began his presentation with three broad questions: (1) Where do we do ethnography? (2) What do we look for during ethnography? and (3) What is our aim for ethnography? Drawing on his previous work on policy-scapes, and the scholarship of Arjun Appadurai, Carney explained how he approached globalization through concepts such as global cultural economy, and "flows, ruptures, and disjunctures." Work on "-scapes" demands that we rethink "space and locality," and even though critiques have been offered of Appadurai's work, Carney found it useful for thinking about power and the state, though such theorizing did not allow for much innovative work with concepts at the empirical level. However, by considering Appadurai's work alongside Hardt and Negri's *Empire*, Carney began to understand that "globalization could be a force that brings together historically displaced people." He has taken up the suggestion found in Anna Tsing's book *Friction* that globalization ought to be looked upon as sets of actually-occurring events. Within this definition Carney argued that there is ample room for empirical work that investigates what Tsing calls the "the friction of worldly-encounters."

Carney then took up the question of what this means for ethnography. From his own work on the study of youth, Carney argued that complicated phenomenon are difficult to examine ethnographically. He finds James Ferguson's work useful because it invites us to consider how we read the global in a particular location. Ferguson views ethnography as a process of eliminating that which is viewed as a distraction to understanding social phenomena. For Ferguson, though, the globalization of social life makes such neat distinctions problematic. Because of this, Carney argues, ethnography can no longer be viewed as the process by which a researcher locates truth or meaning in one place. Instead, he proposed that globalization itself is a useful analytic that requires us to rethink the purpose and meaning of ethnographic methodologies.

Finally, Susan Robertson opened her presentation by noting that ethnography works at the local level, while globalization has often been viewed as something that is both dominant and distant. Robertson's approach, however, breaks down globalization into various dimensions. We might understand globalization as: a condition of the world; a discourse mobilized by politicians; a project (such as neoliberalism); or as a scalar subject (such as the vertical as well as horizontal elements that allow us to see globalization stretching out into spaces). This breakdown invites study through a variety of research methodologies. She argued that among these, ethnography is fundamentally important if we are to sidestep the trap of only seeing the global as macro-political processes, that articulate the global as inevitably "in here" and "with us". Robertson proposed that we examine the "reach" of the global, and thus always consider the global as territorial and local and occurring in motion. In view of this, Robertson encouraged researchers to think about what ethnographic context actually means and which context actually matters. She cautioned that researchers must be attentive to the idea of movement and reach in spaces; only when we have accounts of multiple contexts and/or multiple accounts in spaces, can we analyze which of the multiple matters most and when.

For Robertson this highlights the importance of ethnographic research in addressing the "context of contexts"—or the wider social relations and structures that might reveal the "invisibility" of normalized power. In the conclusion of her presentation she argued that global ethnographies should be attentive to five things: (1) social forces, (2) dwelling and movement, (3) imagining and materializing, (4) vertical and horizontal spaces, and (5) multiple shifting relational contexts.

A rich discussion followed the presentations, all of which was recorded and — together with the opening presentations — are publicly viewable at <http://blogs.luc.edu/cce/webinar/>. We hope that this webinar will be the first of many such events organized by the G&E SIG and by other groups in the Society.

CIES Newsletter Call for Contributions

The CIES newsletter editorial staff seeks contributions from the membership. The following topics are especially welcome:

Notes from the field
Reports of Special Interest
Group activities
Highlights of new publications and blogs
New dissertation abstracts
Dialogues and debates on current topics
Essays and opinion pieces
Graphics and charts that present data relevant to the membership
Photos (with captions) of members

Free-standing articles should be between 750 and 1500 words. Shorter contributions can direct the reader to a web site or other publication for more information. All submissions will be edited for style and space considerations. Please send all contributions to the attention of the newsletter editor at secretariat@cies.us.