Awards Committee Handbook

Prepared by Maria Teresa Tatro, May 1995; Updated May 1996; Revised and Updated by Joel Samoff, 2000, Revised and Updated by Hilary Landorf, 2014; Revised and updated by Marianne Larsen, 2015
Comparative and International Education Society

Awards Committee Handbook

Contents
1. Purpose of the Awards Committee ........................................................................................................... 1
2. Description Of Awards Granted .................................................................................................................. 1
  2.1 Honorary Fellows Award ....................................................................................................................... 1
  2.2 George Bereday Award For The Best Article In the Comparative Education Review (Annual) ...................... 1
  2.3 Gail P. Kelly Award For The Best Dissertation (Annual/Biannual) .......................................................... 2
  2.4 Joyce Cain Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants .................................................. 2
  2.5 International Travel Award For Distinguished Service In Educational Reform ......................................... 2
  2.6 Jackie Kirk Award .................................................................................................................................. 2
3. Nominating The Chairs And Forming The Sub-Committees ....................................................................... 3
4. Guidelines & Mandates For The Subcommittees ....................................................................................... 3
  4.1 CIES Honorary Fellows .......................................................................................................................... 3
    4.1.1 Purpose: ........................................................................................................................................ 3
    4.1.2 Criteria: .......................................................................................................................................... 3
    4.1.3 Procedure: .................................................................................................................................... 4
  4.2 George Bereday Annual Award .............................................................................................................. 4
    4.2.1 Purpose: ........................................................................................................................................ 4
    4.2.2 Criteria: .......................................................................................................................................... 4
    4.2.3 Procedure: .................................................................................................................................... 5
  4.3 The Gail P. Kelly Award For Outstanding Dissertation ............................................................................ 6
    4.3.1 Purpose: ........................................................................................................................................ 6
    4.3.2 Criteria: .......................................................................................................................................... 6
    4.3.3 Procedure for Nominations ................................................................................................................ 6

2
4.3.4 Procedure for Selecting the Outstanding Dissertation ................................................................. 7

4.4 Joyce Cain Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants .............................................. 8

4.4.1 Purpose: ........................................................................................................................................ 8

4.4.2 Criteria: ........................................................................................................................................ 8

4.4.3 Procedure for Nominations ............................................................................................................ 8

4.4.4 Procedure for Selecting the Outstanding Article ............................................................................ 8

4.5 International Travel Award for Distinguished Service In Educational Reform ...................................... 9

4.5.1 Purpose: ........................................................................................................................................ 9

4.5.2 Criteria: ........................................................................................................................................ 9

4.5.3 Procedure: .................................................................................................................................... 10

4.6 Jackie Kirk Award .............................................................................................................................. 11

4.6.1 Description: .................................................................................................................................. 11

4.6.2 Criteria: ....................................................................................................................................... 11

4.6.3 Procedure for Nominations ........................................................................................................... 11

5. General Procedures ............................................................................................................................. 12

5.1 Organizing the Awards Committee’s and Subcommittees’ Work ......................................................... 12

5.2 Important deadlines/procedures for the Awards Committee Chair ..................................................... 12

5.3 Important Deadlines and Procedures for the George Bereday Award Sub-Committee Chair ................. 13

5.4 Important deadlines/procedures for the Gail.P.Kelly Award Sub-committee Chair ............................ 14

5.5 Important deadlines/procedures for the Jackie Kirk award Sub-committee ....................................... 15

5.6 Important deadlines/procedures for the International Travel Award sub-committee chair ................. 15

5.7 Important deadlines/procedures for the Joyce Cain Award sub-committee chair ............................... 15

5.8 Important deadlines/procedures for the Honorary Fellows Award sub-committee chair ........................ 16

6. Support Provided to the Awards Committee ....................................................................................... 16

7 Appendices ....................................................................................................................................... 17

7.1.2 Honorary Fellows Nomination Letters (Sample) ........................................................................... 17

7.2 George Bereday Award Additional Materials .................................................................................... 18
7.2.2 George Bereday Award Scoring Rubric ........................................................................................................18

7.3 Gail P Kelly Award Additional Materials. ........................................................................................................19

7.3.1 Gail P. Kelly Award Nomination Form (Sample) ........................................................................................19

7.3.2 Gail P. Kelly Award Letter to Institution Form (Sample) ..............................................................................20

7.3.3 Gail P. Kelly Notification Letters (Sample) ................................................................................................21

7.3.4 Gail P. Kelly Scoring Rubric ..........................................................................................................................22

7.3.5 Summary of Dissertations Submitted for the Gail P. Kelly Award ..................................................................31

7.4 Joyce Cain Award Additional Material ...........................................................................................................31

7.4.1 Joyce Cain Award Call for Nominations .........................................................................................................31

7.5 International Travel Award Additional Material ..............................................................................................32

7.5.1 International Travel Award Application Form ..................................................................................................33

7.5.2 International Travel Award Scoring Rubric .....................................................................................................35

7.5.3 International Travel Award Master List/Decision Matrix ..............................................................................36

7.5.4 International Travel Award Scoring Rubric .....................................................................................................37

7.5.5 International Travel Award Decision Letters ..................................................................................................38

7.6 Jackie Kirk Award Additional Material ...........................................................................................................40

7.6.1 Jackie Kirk Award Call for Nominations .........................................................................................................40

8. Awards Committee Records Section ..................................................................................................................42
The descriptions and procedures included in this Handbook are intended to assist and guide the Chair of the Awards Committee of the Comparative and International Education Society and other participants in the awards process. Specific circumstances may require supplementing the information contained in this Handbook, modifying the specified procedures, or adopting alternative approaches. Imagination, adaptation, and consultation are essential in the implementation of the responsibilities described here.

This Handbook was revised by Hilary Landorf (February 2014), reviewed by the CIES Board of Directors (2014), and updated by Hilary Landorf (2014).

This Handbook was revised and updated by Marianne Larsen (March 2015), reviewed by the CIES Board of Directors (2015), and updated by Marianne Larsen (2015)

This Handbook was prepared using Microsoft Word 2007 (Word .doc & .docx formats). When changes are made, the Handbook must be generated to update the Table of Contents, Cross References, and pagination.

For Awards Committee Chairs:

- This Handbook should be updated and passed on to each new Chair of the Awards Committee
1. Purpose of the Awards Committee

The purpose of the committee is to honor outstanding members of the international academic community who are active participants in the Comparative International Education Society. CIES honors its members by granting the Honorary Fellows Award, and by granting the George Bereday Award for the best article published by the Comparative Education Review. In addition, the CIES honors young scholars by annually granting the Gail P. Kelly Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants, Jackie Kirk Award for work related to empowerment of women and improvement of education in conflict and post conflict settings, International Travel Award For Distinguished Service In Educational Reform to increase the presence of education experts serving international projects.

2. Description Of Awards Granted

2.1 Honorary Fellows Award

The Honorary Fellows award was established by CIES in 1983 to honor senior members of the Society who through a period of life-long service and contribution to the field of comparative and international education as evidenced by scholarship, teaching, research and technical service have advanced the field qualitatively and significantly. The award has been established to recognize those scholars who have made the most marked contributions to growth in the field. The first Honorary Fellows were named in 1987: Claude Eggertsen and C. Arnold Anderson.

Recipients of the Honorary Fellows Award can be found the CIES website.

2.2 George Bereday Award For The Best Article In the Comparative Education Review (Annual)

In 1980 the first award committee was formed to review articles published in the *Comparative Education Review*. The mandate was to review all the articles published the preceding year for their importance in shaping the field, analytic merit, policy implications, and concern for theoretical constructs and implications for future research. In 1989 the CIES Awards Committee formally named the award as follows: The George Bereday Annual Best CER Article Award. The award was first granted in 1981 and has been granted every year since then. Recipients of the George Bereday Award can be found on the CIES website.
2.3 Gail P. Kelly Award For The Best Dissertation (Annual/Biannual)

In 1992 Carlos A. Torres, the chair of the CIES awards sub-committee, submitted a proposal to William Cummings, Chair of the Award Committee, to institute the Gail P. Kelly Award for the outstanding doctoral dissertation in the field of comparative education. Following Committee and Board approval the Award was instituted to honor the memory of the distinguished comparative educator for whom the award is named and her many contributions to the CIES. The award may be given annually or bi-annually to recognize an outstanding doctoral dissertation dealing with social justice and equity issues in an international and/or comparative context. The award was first granted in 1994. The second award was granted in 1995. Recipients of the Gail P. Kelly Award can be found on the CIES website.

2.4 Joyce Cain Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants

Proposed by the Under-represented Racial, Ethnic and Ability Groups Committee and approved by CIES’ Board of Directors in 2000, the Joyce Cain Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants is awarded by the Comparative and International Education Society to honor the memory of Joyce Lynn Cain, a colleague and committed scholar of comparative education whose scholarship on African descendants reflected her dedication to introducing individuals across ethnic boundaries to African culture, particularly in Southern Africa. The award recognizes and honors excellence in scholarly articles that explore themes related to people of African descent. The award is presented to an outstanding article that demonstrates academic rigor, originality, and excellence, and contributes to a better understanding of the experiences of African descendants. Recipients of the Joyce Cain Award can be found on the CIES website.

2.5 International Travel Award For Distinguished Service In Educational Reform

The International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform was established in 2008 through a gift from the Open Society Foundation and launched at the 2009 annual meeting. The award was established to encourage distinguished scholars, researchers and practitioners working in development contexts to present their work at the CIES annual meetings. The award seeks to increase the presence of educational experts who serve in countries where international projects are implemented.

2.6 Jackie Kirk Award

The Jackie Kirk award, created in 2010, honors the professional life and deep dedication of Jackie Kirk to our field and to CIES. Jackie Kirk’s work was prolific and wide-ranging, and committed to the active engagement of theory and practice, in ways that further – in particular – the empowerment of women and girls and the improvement of education in conflict and post-conflict settings. Her activism with teachers and youth, creative use of participatory visual research methodologies, commitment to gender equality and inclusion, and on-the-ground work with schools in conflict areas shaped her scholarship on issues as varied as gender violence, armed conflict, home-based schools, refugee youth, women teachers, identity and visual representation of women and girls, peace education and fragile states. Her research and writing examined global contexts and also local realities, and she was professionally committed to encouraging dynamic and equitable collaboration between academics and practitioners, the global South and the global North, and comparative/international educators and teachers on the ground. The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) recognizes an outstanding book annually with the Jackie Kirk Award. This book award, supported by the Jackie Kirk Memorial Fund, acknowledges exceptional work in one or some of the varied areas of expertise represented in Jackie Kirk’s commitments. Recipients of the Jackie Kirk Award can be found on the CIES website.
3. Nominating The Chairs And Forming The Sub-Committees

The CIES President selects the Chair of the Awards Committee. Normally, the Chair of the Awards Committee, in consultation with the CIES President, selects CIES members to serve on the awards sub-committees. The membership of the awards subcommittees should reflect the membership of the CIES and its commitment to affirmative action and should insure diversity of institutions, geographic and substantive focus, theoretical views, and approaches to scholarship. In selecting subcommittee members, the Awards Committee Chair should consult with the Chairs of the New Scholars and the Underrepresented Race, Ethnic, and Ability Groups Committees. The following distribution is recommended for the awards subcommittees:

- Honorary Fellows Committee: the Awards Committee Chair in consultation with the CIES President and Board of Directors.
- George Bereday Award Sub-Committee: one chair and four members.
- Gail P. Kelly Award Sub-Committee: one chair and four members.
- Joyce Cain Award Sub-Committee: one chair and three members.
- Jackie Kirk Award Sub-Committee: one chair and four members.
- International Travel Award For Distinguished Service In Educational Reform: one chair and three members.

4. Guidelines & Mandates For The Subcommittees

4.1 CIES Honorary Fellows

4.1.1 Purpose:

The Honorary Fellows Award was established by CIES in 1983 to honor senior members of the Society, who through a period of life-long service and contribution to the field of comparative and international education -- as evidenced by scholarship, teaching, research and technical service -- have advanced the field qualitatively and significantly. The award was established to recognize those scholars who have made the most marked contributions to growth in the field.

The 2010-2011 CIES Board of Directors decided nominations for Honorary Fellows be changed from bi-annual to annual solicitations. The nominations for Honorary Fellow should be requested by the Awards Committee Chair from members of the Society via the CIES Newsletter in May/June and the CIES email listserv in May/June and in August. The Honorary Fellows Sub-Committee will first review the nominations, in absolute confidentiality. The nominations are then forwarded to the Awards Committee Chair and thence to the CIES President and the Board of Directors. The award of “Honorary Fellow” is at the discretion of the Board of Directors. When the award was established, it was suggested that the Honorary Fellows Subcommittee should consist of four members, all being Honorary Fellows. This precedent was followed up to 2008, after which the President sometimes appointed non-Fellows to chair and serve on the committee. From 2014, it has been agreed that the Sub-committee should consist of three Honorary Fellows, and a member of the CIES Board, who is a longstanding member of the society, all appointed by the President for a one year term.

4.1.2 Criteria:

The title of CIES Fellow is awarded to senior members of the Society, who have distinguished themselves by their scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and policy, administrative or technical activities in the field of comparative and international education and who have made a significant contribution to the development of the Society and the field by their active participation in its affairs. The criteria on which candidates are to be judged are as follows:
4.1.2.1. The candidate should have an outstanding record in two of the following areas of involvement in the field of comparative and international education, and an adequate involvement in the third area: 1) scholarly research and publication; 2) teaching and mentoring; 3) policy, planning, evaluation, technical assistance, and administrative activities.

4.1.2.2. The candidate should have made a significant contribution to the development and quality of the Society.

4.1.2.3. The candidate should have a long and distinguished career spanning more than 30 years and be recognized as a pre-eminent scholar. Normally, the candidate should be 60 years or older.

4.1.2.4. Usually, nominees will have been members of CIES for at least 20 years prior to the nomination, and have displayed outstanding service to the society.

4.1.3 Procedure:

The rationale and proposed set of procedures for the nomination and selection of Honorary Fellows of the CIES was last revised in July 2014.

4.1.3.1. Nomination of candidates must be supported by a summary letter by one or more nominating members of CIES and by at least five current members of the Society. The nomination should be accompanied by the candidate’s academic vita and submitted to the Chair of the Honorary Fellows Awards Sub-Committee by the 1st of November each year.

4.1.3.2. Normally, the board has elected no more than one fellow per year. Beginning from 2015, it has been agreed that 1-2 may be elected each year, reflecting the growth in the society’s membership. There is no ceiling on the total number of living Honorary Fellows at any one time.

4.1.3.3. Individuals nominated in previous years may be re-nominated. A maximum of five members shall be nominated in any one year; the first five complete nominations received by the Committee shall stand. Nominations received subsequently shall be re-submitted the following year.

4.1.3.4. The award of “Honorary Fellow” is at the discretion of the Board of Directors. A simple majority vote confirms the award. The tasks of the Honorary Fellows Award Sub-Committee are to ensure that the eligibility criteria have been met, and to prepare a rank order of merit and inform the President of the nominees by February 1 every year. However, the Board is not bound to accept the order as listed by the Committee. The Board’s decision on all matters is to be regarded as final and binding.

4.1.3.5. The privileges of Honorary Membership include membership in the Society at half the normal fee level, and free registration for CIES annual conferences.

4.1.3.6. Presentation of the Honorary Fellows Award shall be made at the Society’s Annual Meeting, in the year following the Board’s decision with presentation of a certificate by the President or designate and a few words of acceptance by the fellow. The announcement will be made at the Business Meeting of the year the decision is made. Designated Fellows will be informed to ensure their attendance the following year. The President also will notify in writing their Dean or Director.

4.1.3.7. A short biography of each designated Fellow will appear in the Comparative Education Review in the year of their successful nomination.

4.1.3.8. It is hoped that each Fellow will continue to contribute relevant papers to the Society’s archives at Kent State University, particularly as these relate to the historical development of the Society.

4.2 George Bereday Annual Award

4.2.1 Purpose:

To select the outstanding article published in the Comparative Education Review during the award year.

4.2.2 Criteria:

The article must significantly contribute to scholarship in the field of comparative and international education. Articles from any research paradigm are considered. These are evaluated on the basis: (a) the strength of their theoretical framework; (b) the sophistication and/or innovativeness of the methodology used; (c) the soundness of the data collection procedures and analysis;
(d) the social utility and implications for public policy; and (e) the extent to which the article makes a unique contribution to the development of the field. To distinguish among strong contenders, several additional criteria may be useful: (f) effective integration of attention to what-happens-within education and attention to education-in-societal-context, (g) effective use of relevant literature (as contrasted with voluminous references that ultimately contribute little to analysis or presentation; (h) evidence of a critical, and especially self-critical, approach to both theory and method; (i) likelihood that the article will advance an important debate within comparative education, through theoretical departures, new/revised/rejected findings, trenchant critique, or in some other way.

Editorials, addresses, book reviews, country and bibliographical reports are not eligible for the award. In extraordinary cases, essay reviews of exceptional merit may be considered.

4.2.3 Procedure:

4.2.1.1 The Awards Committee Chair establishes a sub-committee of five members to select an article for the George Bereday Award. Subcommittee reviews all CER issues for the award year.

4.2.1.2 After the members have read each of the articles published during the award year, each subcommittee member submits a rank ordered list of 3 nominations for the best article, with a brief justification for each nomination. Normally, at this point there is no direct joint deliberation among subcommittee members. The target date for these submissions is 15 December, with an absolute deadline of 15 January.

4.2.1.3 The subcommittee Chair then tallies the responses and lists the three to five articles that received the most nominations. The Chair sends to subcommittee members that short list of articles along with the justifications submitted.

4.2.1.4 The subcommittee members rank order the articles in the short list and provide additional commentary or justification as appropriate. If there is sharp disagreement, the subcommittee Chair may reduce the short list further by deleting the lowest ranked article(s) and then seek another round of consideration. The subcommittee Chair may as well invite direct debate among subcommittee members on the final selection by electronic mail or other means.

4.2.1.5 The goal is to achieve consensus on the final selection. Where consensus cannot be achieved, a majority among the subcommittee will select the article to be nominated.

4.2.1.6 The subcommittee Chair notifies the Chair of the Awards Committee of the recommendation for the George Bereday Award, no later than 31 January. The nomination should include a descriptive paragraph, highlighting the strengths and unique contribution of the article selected.

4.2.1.7 The subcommittee Chair sub-committee must insure that the process is completed before the end of January. The subcommittee Chair submits to the Awards Committee Chair a written report detailing the process followed and the decision reached. That report should describe the articles reviewed in terms of: geographical regions and institutions represented, topics covered, theoretical orientations of the articles reviewed, and authors’ gender. The report should also include the final tally and the comments supporting the decision reached.

4.2.1.8 The Chair of the Awards Committee is then responsible for informing the recipient of the award, and for inviting him/her to the Annual CIES Conference. The Awards Committee Chair also notifies the CIES President and Board preferably by 1 February but at least three weeks prior to the Annual Meeting to permit preparation of the Award Certificate. If the recipient attends the Annual Meeting, s/he is expected to present briefly (10-15 minutes) the award winning article.

4.2.1.9 After the CIES President has confirmed the award, the Awards Committee Chair or subcommittee Chair may, with the consent of the award recipient, inform the recipient’s departmental chair or dean of the award and
4.3 The Gail P. Kelly Award For Outstanding Dissertation

4.3.1 Purpose:
The Gail P. Kelly Award for Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation dealing with social justice and equality issues in an international context has been instituted to honor the memory of the distinguished comparative educator Gail P. Kelly, and her many contributions to the Comparative and International Education Society.

4.3.2 Criteria:
The Award is bestowed upon an outstanding Ph.D. or Ed.D. dissertation which, in the opinion of the Awards Committee, fulfills the requirements of academic excellence, originality, methodological, theoretical and empirical rigor, and deals with issues of social justice and equity in an international context. These issues may include gender, race, class, ethnicity, and nationality among others. The dissertation should reflect the scholarly purpose of the Society: comparative, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary and international studies contributing to the interpretation of developments in education in their broad and interrelated political, economic, and social contexts. Any Ph.D. or Ed.D. dissertation written in English and defended in an accredited institution of higher education from July of the preceding year through August of the award year is eligible for consideration.

Any CIES member in good standing, including its author, may nominate a dissertation.

4.3.3 Procedure for Nominations

4.3.3.1 The Awards Committee Chair establishes a sub-committee of five members to select the best dissertation and designates one member as a Chair for the sub-committee. This subcommittee may include representatives from other committees such as the Underrepresented Race, Ethnic, and Ability Groups and New Scholars Committee.

4.3.3.2 In May of each year the Awards Committee Chair or the subcommittee Chair writes to all departments and programs with doctoral programs whose graduates’ dissertations may meet the award criteria soliciting nominations.

4.3.3.3 The Awards Committee Chair or the subcommittee Chair must insure that the CIES Newsletter announces the award in the June and September editions each year, specifying the award criteria and encouraging nominations. As well, relevant electronic bulletin boards and lists, including those of the AERA, should also be used to publicize the award and nominations procedures.

4.3.3.4 In addition, the subcommittee Chair should make announcements and distribute flyers at regional and annual CIES and AERA meetings, especially at the international SIGs.

4.3.3.5 The deadline for submission of nominations is October 15.

4.3.3.6 Nominations should be directed to the Chair of the Gail P. Kelly Award Subcommittee and should include (a) a cover letter requesting that the dissertation be considered for the Gail P. Kelly Award, (b) a supporting statement on the merits or unique qualities of the dissertation, (c) one unbound copy of the dissertation, and (d) a copy of the Departmental and University approval of the dissertation.

4.3.3.7 The subcommittee Chair should acknowledge all dissertations received.
4.3.4 Procedure for Selecting the Outstanding Dissertation

4.3.4.1 The solicitation for nominations should have yielded at least six dissertations to assure a fair selection process. When less than six dissertations are received, the Awards Committee Chair and Gail P. Kelly Award subcommittee Chair, in consultation with the CIES President, may decide to extend the selection process for a year to include dissertations that have been completed during the preceding two year period. Individuals who submitted dissertations should be informed that their dissertation will be considered the following year. Nominated theses will automatically be entered into the pool the following year unless their nominees or authors indicate otherwise.

4.3.4.2 Each member of the subcommittee reads the nominated dissertations, ranks orders them according to the award criteria, and prepares a brief comment on the special strengths of the top two selections.

4.3.4.3 When more than six dissertations have been nominated, the subcommittee Chair may subdivide initial reading responsibilities among subcommittee members, insuring that each dissertation is read by at least two reviewers. The subcommittee Chair then uses the subcommittee members’ preliminary rank orders to assemble a pool of six dissertations to be considered for the award. Those dissertations are then read and ranked by all subcommittee members.

4.3.4.4 The subcommittee Chair then tallies the results and circulates the rankings and accompanying comments to all members of the subcommittee. After all members have seen these rankings and comments, they should seek to achieve consensus on a single dissertation for the award. Electronic discussions and/or a conference call may be used to develop that consensus.

4.3.4.5 Where consensus cannot be achieved, a majority among the subcommittee will select the dissertation to be recommended for the Gail P. Kelly Award.

4.3.4.6 For this process to be manageable, consideration of the nomination dissertations must begin promptly after the submission deadline. The subcommittee chair should establish and monitor a clear schedule for reviewing dissertations and sending them on to the next subcommittee member. Every subcommittee member must assume responsibility for adhering to the schedule and particularly for sending dissertations on to the next reader.

4.3.4.7 The subcommittee Chair reports the results of the subcommittee’s review to the Awards Committee Chair no later than 20 January. The subcommittee Chair submits a written report to the Awards Committee Chair detailing the process followed and the decision reached. That report should describe the nominated dissertations in terms of geographical regions represented, theoretical approaches used, topics covered, author’s gender, and nominating institutions. The report should also include the final tally and the comments supporting the decision reached. See Section 7.3.5 below for a sample table to include in the report.

4.3.4.8 The subcommittee Chair or the Awards Committee Chair is then responsible for informing the recipient of the award, and for inviting him/her to the Annual CIES Conference. As well, the subcommittee chair notifies the unsuccessful nominators. The Awards Committee Chair also notifies the CIES President and Board preferably by 1 February but at least three weeks prior to the Annual Meeting to permit preparation of the Award Certificate. In addition to the Award Certificate, the recipient will receive $500 to defray the cost of attending the Annual Meeting. If the recipient attends the Annual Meeting, s/he is expected to present briefly (10-15 minutes) the award winning dissertation.

4.3.4.9 After the CIES President has confirmed the award, the Awards Committee Chair or subcommittee Chair may, with the consent of the award recipient, inform the recipient’s departmental chair or dean of the award and the Awards Committee’s commendation.
4.4 Joyce Cain Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants

4.4.1 Purpose:
The Joyce Cain Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants is awarded by the Comparative and International Education Society to honor the memory of Joyce Lynn Cain, a colleague and committed scholar of comparative education whose scholarship on African descendants reflected her dedication to introducing individuals across ethnic boundaries to African culture, particularly in Southern Africa. The award recognizes and honors excellence in scholarly articles that explore themes related to people of African descent.

4.4.2 Criteria:
The award is presented to an outstanding article that demonstrates academic rigor, originality, and excellence, and contributes to a better understanding of the experiences of African descendants.

Any CIES member in good standing, including its author, may nominate an article for the Joyce Cain Award.

4.4.3 Procedure for Nominations

4.4.3.1 The Awards Committee Chair establishes a sub-committee of three members to select the best article that meets the criteria for the Joyce Cain Award and designates one member as Chair for the sub-committee. This subcommittee may include representatives from other committees such as the Underrepresented Race, Ethnic, and Ability Groups and New Scholars Committees.

4.4.3.2 In May of each year the Awards Committee Chair or the subcommittee Chair publicizes the award and solicits nominations.

(Note that since this award has been created very recently, the appropriate publicity strategy remains to be developed and refined. A subsequent revision of this Handbook should include additional detail on the procedures adopted.)

4.4.3.3 The Awards Committee Chair or the subcommittee Chair must insure that the CIES Newsletter announces the award in the June and September editions each year, specifying the award criteria and encouraging nominations. As well, relevant electronic bulletin boards and lists, including those of the AERA, should also be used to publicize the award and nominations procedures.

4.4.3.4 In addition, the subcommittee Chair should make announcements and distribute flyers at regional and annual CIES and AERA meetings, especially at the international SIGs.

4.4.3.5 The deadline for submission of nominations is October 15.

4.4.3.6 Nominations should be directed to the Chair of the Joyce Cain Award Subcommittee and should include (a) a cover letter nominating the article for the Joyce Cain Award, (b) a supporting statement on the merits or unique qualities of the article, and (c) three copies of the nominated article.

4.4.3.7 The Subcommittee Chair should acknowledge all nominations received.

4.4.4 Procedure for Selecting the Outstanding Article

4.4.4.1 The solicitation for nominations should have yielded at least ten articles to assure a fair selection process. When fewer than ten nominations are received, the Awards Committee Chair and Joyce Cain Award Subcommittee Chair, in consultation with the CIES President, may decide to extend the selection process for a year to include articles that have been completed during the preceding two year period. Nominated articles will automatically be entered into the pool the following year unless their nominees or authors explicitly withdraw them.
4.4.4.2 After the members have read all of the articles proposed for consideration, each subcommittee member submits a rank ordered list of 3 nominations for the best article, with a brief justification for each nomination. Normally, at this point there is no direct joint deliberation among subcommittee members. The target date for these submissions is 15 December, with an absolute deadline of 15 January.

4.4.4.3 The subcommittee Chair then tallies the responses and lists the three to five articles that received the most nominations. The Chair sends to subcommittee members that short list of articles along with the justifications submitted.

4.4.4.4 The subcommittee members rank order the articles in the short list and provide additional commentary or justification as appropriate. If there is sharp disagreement, the Subcommittee Chair may reduce the short list further by deleting the lowest ranked article(s) and then seek another round of consideration. The Subcommittee Chair may as well invite direct debate among subcommittee members on the final selection by electronic mail or other means.

4.4.4.5 The goal is to achieve consensus on the final selection. Where consensus cannot be achieved, a majority among the subcommittee will select the article to be nominated.

4.4.4.6 The Subcommittee Chair notifies the Awards Committee Chair of the recommendation for the Joyce Cain Award, no later than 31 January. The nomination should include a descriptive paragraph, highlighting the strengths and unique contribution of the article selected.

4.4.4.7 The Subcommittee Chair must insure that this process is completed before the end of January. The Subcommittee Chair submits to the Awards Committee Chair a written report detailing the process followed and the decision reached. That report should describe the articles reviewed in terms of: journals from which articles were proposed for the Joyce Cain Award, geographical regions and institutions represented, topics covered, theoretical orientations of the articles reviewed, and authors’ gender. The report should also include the final tally and the comments supporting the decision reached.

4.4.4.8 The Chair of the Awards Committee is then responsible for informing the recipient of the award, and for inviting him/her to the Annual CIES Conference. The Awards Committee Chair also notifies the CIES President and Board preferably by 1 February but at least three weeks prior to the Annual Meeting to permit preparation of the Award Certificate. If the recipient attends the Annual Meeting, s/he is expected to present briefly (10-15 minutes) the award winning article.

4.4.4.9 After the CIES President has confirmed the award, the Awards Committee Chair or subcommittee Chair may, with the consent of the award recipient, inform the recipient’s departmental chair or dean of the award and the Awards Committee’s commendation.

4.5 International Travel Award for Distinguished Service In Educational Reform

4.5.1 Purpose:
The award seeks to increase the presence of educational experts who serve in developing countries where international projects are implemented by providing support to attend the CIES annual meeting. The ITA has awarded monetary awards of $1,000 to each recipient.

4.5.2: Criteria:
Candidates will be considered based on the following criteria:

a) A minimum of five years of professional experience in education in developing country/countries
b) Submission of application for funding, which consists of:

i. Accepted CIES abstract

ii. Completion of ITA application form

iii. A 500-word personal statement demonstrating long-term commitment to policy, practice, and/or research of education development and/or related field; vision for policy, practice, and/or research of education development and/or related field; clear and compelling case for funding; high quality record of scholarship

iv. Resume or CV

4.5.3 Procedure:

4.5.3.1: The subcommittee consists of a chair and a minimum of three other members.

4.5.3.2: The subcommittee members familiarize themselves with the E-mail client responsible for handling applications. If the committee intends to use an account that was set previously (i.e. by a previous committee) then the necessary credentials are obtained.

4.5.3.3: The deadline for the submission of applications is set by the subcommittee. It is strongly recommended that applications submitted past the deadline should not be considered.

4.5.3.4: The call for nominations should be reviewed and revised by the subcommittee and distributed through the CIES list-serv and newsletter if possible.

4.5.3.4: The subcommittee should consider only complete applications and evaluate these following the 8-category, 32 point rubric (see Section 8) in order to assess the experience, professional service and scholarship of the applicants in the areas of education practice research and reform.

4.5.3.5: The applications are ranked according to their respective scores.

4.5.3.6: Decisions regarding outstanding applications worthy of the award are reviewed by the subcommittee chair.

4.5.3.7: Subcommittee chair makes the final decisions concerning the applications.

4.5.3.9: Award letters are sent to the winners by the subcommittee chair, to include a request for confirmation of acceptance of award and attendance at that year’s conference (see Section 8 for sample letter).

4.5.3.10: Letters are sent to candidates on the “waiting list,” by the subcommittee chair, notifying them of the quality of their applications and the possibility of receiving the award in the event that others do not accept the award (see Section 8 for sample letter).

4.5.3.11: Letters are sent by the subcommittee chair to those who were not select for the award (see Section 8 for sample letter).

4.5.3.8: The awardees are required to register for the annual CIES meeting during the year of the conferring of their award. The deadline for registration should be set by the subcommittee.
4.6 Jackie Kirk Award

4.6.1 Description:
The award created in 2010, honors the professional life and deep dedication of Jackie Kirk to our field and to CIES. Jackie Kirk’s work was prolific and wide-ranging, and committed to the active engagement of theory and practice, in ways that further – in particular – the empowerment of women and girls and the improvement of education in conflict and post-conflict settings. Her activism with teachers and youth, creative use of participatory visual research methodologies, commitment to gender equality and inclusion, and on-the-ground work with schools in conflict areas shaped her scholarship on issues as varied as gender violence, armed conflict, home-based schools, refugee youth, women teachers, identity and visual representation of women and girls, peace education and fragile states. Her research and writing examined global contexts and also local realities, and she was professionally committed to encouraging dynamic and equitable collaboration between academics and practitioners, the global South and the global North, and comparative/international educators and teachers on the ground. She encouraged integrated, holistic, systemic change in order to increase access and equality in education for everyone. The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) recognizes an outstanding book annually with the Jackie Kirk Award. This book award, supported from the Memorial Fund, acknowledges exceptional work in one or some of the varied areas of expertise represented in Jackie Kirk’s commitments.

4.6.2 Criteria:
The award honors a published book that reflects the spirit of Jackie Kirk’s legacy by addressing one or some of the varied areas of expertise represented in her commitments as described above. Additional criteria as published in the scoring rubric are listed below (see section 8 for the scoring rubric). The Book should achieve the goals of ‘Teaching Contested Narratives’, ‘Opening Minds, Improving Lives’ and ‘Gender, Religion and Education’ by addressing the following:

1) Gender and Education: How does this book deepen the field’s understanding of gender dynamics/relations in education in more nuanced ways, to help educators acknowledge the full humanity of all students and teachers and to work toward social justice?

2) Education in Conflict, Post-Conflict, Fragile States, and/or Peace Education: How does this book reveal the realities of the challenges of education in demanding contexts, and/or the work that people are doing despite the challenges?

3) Activism/ inclusion/ empowerment/ participatory methods/ holistic, systemic change (secondary Criterion): Is the book committed to the active engagement of theory and practice, in ways that further the empowerment of women and girls, and the improvement of education in conflict and post-conflict settings?

4) Identity/ globalization (Secondary Criterion): Does the book address identity (particularly of girls and teachers), globalization as a context for local practice and/or visual participatory research methodologies?

5) Collaboration (Secondary Criterion): Is the book reflective of collaboration between academics and practitioners, the global South and the global North, and comparative/international educators and teachers on the ground?

4.6.3 Procedure:
4.6.3.1: The Subcommittee will consist of a chair and a minimum of two other members. It is recommended that subcommittee members are sufficiently grounded in (and balanced between) the two primary areas reflected in this award—gender, and conflict/post-conflict—so that one area is not privileged over the other.
4.6.3.2: The duties of the subcommittee are to review, revise and distribute the call for nominations via the list-serv (Executive Director) and other means, receive nominations, determine a short list of nominees, request copies of books for that short list, read those books and individually rank them using the common criteria established in the rubric, and collectively determine which book will receive the award.

4.6.3.3: All nominations should be received by the deadline (September 1st). The subcommittee chair should acknowledge all nominations received. All the nominations should be evaluated by the subcommittee based on the criterions mentioned in the rubric and the top three should be shortlisted for full review. In case a consensus on the top three nominations cannot be reached, the chair will evaluate the prioritized rankings from the subcommittee report and decide the top three books.

4.6.3.5: The type of authorship of the book should be considered (i.e. authored or edited). This fact should only be taken into consideration in the case of a tie for winner, and that each committee will need to develop its own rationale for including this factor as a criterion.

4.6.3.4: ‘Honorable Mention’ should be used appropriately. If merited, the runners up should receive honorable mention.

4.6.3.6. Once the winner has been elected, the subcommittee chair should inform the Awards Committee chair and the awardee(s), who should also be invited to attend the Awards Ceremony during the Annual Meeting to receive the award. In case the awardee(s) cannot attend the award should be mailed.

5. General Procedures

5.1 Organizing the Awards Committee’s and Subcommittees’ Work

Every year during or immediately following the Annual Meeting the CIES president nominates the CIES Awards Committee Chair and suggests members for the Awards subcommittees. Once the Awards Committee and various Subcommittee membership is set, the Awards Committee Chair communicates to the Awards Committee members and the Subcommittee Chairs the Awards Committee and Subcommittees’ mandates and procedures.

After this first communication, Subcommittee Chairs are responsible for communicating responsibilities, procedures, schedule, and deadlines with their respective members. Normally, subcommittee Chairs will draft those communications in consultation with the Awards Committee Chair. The President and Secretariat should be copied on all correspondence.

5.2 Important deadlines/procedures for the Awards Committee Chair:

May/June:
- Communicates with CIES president and reaches agreements on composition of the Awards Committee and Subcommittees and tasks to be performed.

June/July:
- Contacts committee and subcommittee members and confirmations participation.
- Writes to all committee members and subcommittee chairs, explaining guidelines, procedures and delineating important deadlines for the tasks ahead. Included in this communication are the names and contact information of all Awards Committee and Subcommittee members for that year.

August
- Sends (or confirms the inclusion of) a call for nominations for all awards to appear in the September and October newsletters.

November:
• Checks with the Chairs of the subcommittees to assure that reviews are in process and proceeding according to schedule.

December:
• Again checks with the Subcommittee Chairs to assure that reviews are in process and proceeding according to schedule.

January:
• Reminds Subcommittee Chairs of the impending deadlines and works with them to resolve problems that may have arisen.

February:
• Communicates to the President, President-elect, Secretariat, and Executive Director the names of awardees in early February and requests that certificates be printed for the Honorary Fellows Award, George Bereday Award, Gail P. Kelly Award, and Joyce Cain Award. These Certificates are presented to the awardees during the CIES Awards ceremony by the Awards Committee Chair or by the Chairs of the Subcommittees.
• Communicates to the Secretariat and the Executive Director that the following monetary awards should be allocated to their respective awardees:
  • Gail. Kelly Award: $500
  • Jackie Kirk Award: $2000
  • International Travel Award: $1000 to each awardee. Monetary awards are presented to the awardees during the CIES Awards ceremony by the Awards Committee Chair or by the Chairs of the Subcommittees.

April:
• By 15 April, sends announcement of the awards granted to the Comparative Education Review editor for publication.
• By 15 April, sends announcement of the awards granted to the CIES Secretariat for publication in the May issue of the CIES Newsletter.
• Updates Awards Handbook,

5.3 Important Deadlines and Procedures for the George Bereday Award Sub-Committee Chair

September:
• Makes initial contact with members of the subcommittee.
• Communicates to subcommittee members the procedures, schedule, and deadlines for reviewing articles published in the Comparative Education Review.

November:
• In mid-November (after the final CER issue for that year has been published), the George Bereday Subcommittee Chair contacts subcommittee members and reminds them that the last issue is out and that they are expected to have finished reviewing and ranking the articles by mid-December (or at the latest, early January).

December:
• Subcommittee Chair reminds members of deadlines and encourages completion of initial article review and rankings prior to the year-end holidays.

January:
• January 1: subcommittee members should have read all the four CER issues January 15: the subcommittee members should have received compiled list of CER articles and ranking criteria
• January 20: review and rank ordering is completed and sent to the subcommittee Chair.
• January 30: the Chair compiles the final nominations and tallies the results. If substantial disagreement persists,
the Chair may organize a conference call with subcommittee members to try to achieve consensus. Where that seems unachievable, the subcommittee decides by majority vote.

February:
- The final result should be communicated to the Awards Committee Chair no later than February 1st.
- The Awards Committee Chair or subcommittee Chair contacts the award winner and invites her/him to attend the Annual Conference. The awardee is expected to present briefly the award winning article during the Awards Ceremony.

5.4 Important deadlines/procedures for the Gail P. Kelly Award Sub-committee Chair

April:
- Sends call for nominations to the Secretariat to be published in the May CIES Newsletter.

May:
- Sends letter in April/May with request for nominations to target institutions (CIES Secretariat should have appropriate list, original extracted from P. Altbach's directory published in 1994/95 at SUNY Buffalo).
- Sends calls for nominations through internet in April and again in September. The AERA Bulletin Board is a useful starting point. Other lists, discussion groups, and forums should be used as well.

August/September:
- Sends a second letter in late August early September with request for nominations to target institutions.

October:
- Circulates the dissertations received. By the second half of October the first set of theses is being read simultaneously by subcommittee members. Depending on the number of theses there are several rounds where the readers rotate dissertations from one to another. This rotation should be carefully orchestrated by the Chair of the sub-committee so that all members get to read all theses in a timely manner, preferably by mid-December but at the latest by 1 January.
- As necessary, the subcommittee Chair may need to make additional copies of the dissertations to facilitate review by subcommittee members.

January:
- January 10: the subcommittee Chair compiles thesis nominations and rank orders with written justifications by the subcommittee committee members, tallies and ranks the results, and sends those results and justifications to all subcommittee members. The subcommittee members do a second ranking based on the results sent by the Chair.
- January 20: the subcommittee Chair tallies the revised rankings. If substantial disagreement persists, the Chair may organize a conference call to try to achieve consensus. Where that seems unachievable, the subcommittee decides by majority vote.
- Preferably by mid-January, but no later than 31 January, the subcommittee Chair communicates to the Awards Committee Chair the recommendation for the Gail P. Kelly Award.

February:
- February 1: the Awards Committee Chair communicates the results to the CIES President, who confirms the award.
- February 5: the sub-committee Chair or Awards Committee Chair contacts the award winner and invites her/him to attend the Annual Meeting and offers an honorary award to defray costs of attending the meeting.
The awardee is expected to present briefly the award winning dissertation during the Annual Meeting.

5.5 Important deadlines/procedures for the Jackie Kirk award Sub-committee

June-July:
- Review, revise and distribute the call for nominations (several times via the CIES list-serv with the assistance of the Executive Director).

September:
- September 1: The book author(s) or editor(s) should provide an executive summary of the book

October:
- October 15: The subcommittee will determine a short list and request books from the authors/editors for a full review.

December:
- December 1: Books must be provided to the subcommittee by the authors/editors

February:
- February 1: Decisions will be made by the subcommittee by February 1, or at least four weeks prior to the next CIES meeting, whichever is sooner.
- The Awards Committee chair and the awardee(s) should be informed. Awardees are encouraged to attend the CIES meeting in the year they receive the award.

A report of activities should be submitted by the subcommittee upon request of the ED and presented to the Board of Directors.

5.6 Important deadlines/procedures for the International Travel Award sub-committee chair

October:
- Late October: CIES conference presentation abstract due through the conference online submission system.

November-December:
- The call for applications for the ITA should be sent out via the CIES list-serve.

January:
- January 1: Travel award application due.
- January 12: The awardees will be notified. Only dues-paying members of CIES are eligible for this award. Awardees will be announced on the conference website as well as in the CIES Newsletter. Applicants who are selected for the travel award will receive $1,000 provided that their proposal has been accepted for presentation at the conference.

5.7 Important deadlines/procedures for the Joyce Cain Award sub-committee chair

May:
- The Awards Committee Chair or the subcommittee Chair publicizes the award and solicits nominations.

June - September:
• Announcement of the Award to appear in the June & September editions of the CIES Newsletter, as well as relevant electronic bulletin boards and lists, including those of the AERA. The subcommittee Chair should also make announcements and distribute flyers at regional and annual CIES and AERA meetings.

October:
• October 15: All nominations to be submitted to the Chair of the Joyce Cain Award Subcommittee. The Subcommittee Chair should acknowledge all nominations received.

December:
• 15 December: Each subcommittee member submits a rank ordered list of 3 nominations for the best article, with a brief justification for each nomination.

January:
• By 31 January - The subcommittee Chair then tallies the responses and lists the three to five articles that received the most nominations. The Subcommittee Chair notifies the Awards Committee Chair of the recommendation for the Joyce Cain Award. The Subcommittee Chair submits the final written report to the Awards Committee Chair.

February
• 1 February: The Chair of the Awards Committee informs the recipient of the award, and invites him/her to the Annual CIES Conference. The Awards Committee Chair also notifies the CIES President and Board.

5.8 Important deadlines/procedures for the Honorary Fellows Award sub-committee chair

November:
• 1 November: Nominations need to be submitted to the Chair of the Honorary Fellows Awards Sub-Committee

November-January:
• The sub-committee reviews the first five complete nominations received to ensure that eligibility criteria have been met. Nominations received subsequently shall be re-submitted the following year.

February
• 1 February: The Honorary Fellows Award Sub-Committee prepares a rank order of merit and informs the President of the nominees by February 1 every year. The Board is not bound to accept the order as listed by the Committee. The Board’s decision on all matters is to be regarded as final and binding.

6. Support Provided to the Awards Committee

The CIES Board of Directors has allocated $1,000 for expenses associated with the work of the committee. This decision was made in April 1994 at the Annual Meeting of the Board.
7 Appendices

7.1.2 Honorary Fellows Nomination Letters (Sample)

<<<<<<<<<<<SAMPLE>>>>>>>>>

4 November 2012

Professor Emeritus Norma Tarrow
Chair of CIES Honorary Fellows Sub-Committee
835 N. Humboldt Street, #302
San Mateo, California
94401

RE: Professor Robert F. Lawson’s nomination

Dear Professor Tarrow,

It is with great pleasure that I write in support of Emeritus Professor Robert F. Lawson, who has dedicated a very active career in the field of comparative and international education over the last 50 years.

I have known Bob Lawson since the time of my first ANZCIES meeting as President in 2006. He travelled to Canberra, Australia to become our first keynote speaker and gave the talk, “Comparing the Comparative: How ANZCIES has shaped and been shaped by the surrounding debates and institutional contexts of the field”. He shared his insights and ruminations of the field with past presidents of ANZCIES (specifically Roger Woock, Phillip Jones, Anthony Welch, Christine Fox, and Anne Hickling-Hudson), and provided a robust discussion. This discussion centered around the differences in how the field is approached and studied in Australia/New Zealand, North America, and Europe and where it is going for future students of comparative education. Bob’s contribution was notable due to his vast wealth of experience as CIES President 73-74, his extensive scholarship in comparative education policy studies at the Universities of Indiana, Calgary, UCLA, Hamburg, and Ohio State University, and his cooperative nature of being a wonderful mentor/advisor.

As one who has only known Bob for a little over six years, I find that my chance encounters with Bob at CIES have become commonplace, suggesting that this world is indeed small. We initially met in CIES Hawaii 2006 at a Michigan alumni function with Victor Kobayashi introducing me to Bob for the first time. We shared common interests in Germany, having both lived and studied there but at different times. We also shared our strong support of our times at Michigan, even though our Michigan alumni meetings at CIES have waned since then. I have since met Bob at least three other times (CIES- Columbia, Charlotte, and Montreal), and each time we meet, we seem to embrace each other like longstanding friends and “catch-up” on each other’s doings and whereabouts.

Although I cannot speak much about Bob’s significant contributions to the field and to CIES, I can attest that the compliments he has received from notable scholars from around the world lay testament to Bob being recognized as an exceptional scholar. From my standpoint, Bob is exceptional as a person, colleague, and friend. Bob is a thoughtful person, quiet in personal style and demeanor, but strong in conviction. Always quick to acknowledge other points of view, Bob tends to work from a well-informed standpoint. There are precious few people in this world who have such wonderful qualities. He gets my highest praise for the range of personal strengths he brings to the field and to CIES.

In Bob Lawson, a person will be found who can bring a rare combination of skills and outlook in comparative and international education, I humbly recommend him with great enthusiasm and support for CIES Honorary Fellow.

Sincerely,

Past President, ANZCIES (2006-2009)
7.2 George Bereday Award Additional Materials

7.2.2 George Bereday Award Scoring Rubric

The pattern of assigning weights to the articles based on the reviewer recommendations was developed by the chair of 2014 George Bereday Award subcommittee. This was necessary since a clear winner was not evident from the recommendations of the judges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev 1</th>
<th>Rev 2</th>
<th>Rev 3</th>
<th>Rev 4</th>
<th>Rev 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shields (Nov)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altschuler (feb)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu and Zhou (Feb)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goos, et al (Feb)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Jr. (Feb)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bol and Van de Werhorst (May)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepka (Aug)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews (May)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro (feb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinbaum et al (Aug)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev 1</th>
<th>Rev 2</th>
<th>Rev 3</th>
<th>Rev 4</th>
<th>Rev 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shields (Nov)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Altschuler (feb)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lu and Zhou (Feb)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Edwards Jr. (Feb)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goos, et al (Feb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pepka (Aug)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Andrews (May)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metro (feb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bol and Van de Werhorst (May)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brinbaum et al (Aug)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Gail P. Kelly Award Additional Materials.

7.3.1 Gail P. Kelly Award Nomination Form (Sample)

Gail P. Kelly Award for Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation

Each year the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) recognizes an outstanding doctoral dissertation with its Gail P. Kelly Award. Created to honor the distinguished comparative educator Gail P. Kelly and her many contributions to the CIES, the Gail P. Kelly Award honors a doctoral dissertation that addresses social justice and equity issues in an international context.

The Award is conferred on an outstanding Ph.D. or Ed.D. dissertation that manifests academic excellence, originality, methodological, theoretical, and empirical rigor, and that deals with issues of social justice and equity in international settings. Those issues may include gender, race, class, ethnicity, and nationality among others.

The dissertation should reflect the scholarly purpose of the Society: comparative, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary and international studies contributing to the interpretation of developments in education in their broad and interrelated political, economic, and social contexts. Any Ph.D. or Ed.D. dissertation written in English and defended in an accredited institution of higher education from July 1998 through August 1999 is eligible for consideration.

Any CIES member in good standing, including its author, may nominate a dissertation. Award recipients are required to become CIES members in order to receive their award.

Nominations should include one unbound copy of the dissertation, a copy of the Departmental and University approval of the dissertation, and a cover letter requesting that the dissertation be considered for the Gail P. Kelly Award. The deadline for nominations is October 15, 1999.

The recipient of the Gail P. Kelly Award will be honored at the 2000 CIES Annual Meeting and will receive a travel voucher to defray the cost of attending the meeting. The award recipient will present briefly the outstanding dissertation.

Nominations, applications, and queries should be sent to:
Professor Joseph P. Farrell CIDEC, O.I.S.E. 252 Bloor Street West Toronto M5S 1V6 CANADA
Dear Colleague,

I write to seek your personal assistance in nominating candidates for the Gail P. Kelly Award for Outstanding Doctoral Dissertations.

Each year the Comparative and International Education Society recognizes an outstanding doctoral dissertation with its Gail P. Kelly Award. Created to honor the distinguished comparative educator Gail P. Kelly and her many contributions to the CIES, the Gail P. Kelly Award honors a doctoral dissertation that manifests academic excellence, originality, methodological, theoretical, and empirical rigor, and that addresses issues of social justice and equity in international settings. The Gail P. Kelly Award will be presented at the 2000 CIES Annual Meeting; the recipient will receive a travel voucher to defray the cost of attending the meeting.

This award provides an excellent opportunity to highlight innovative work and a promising young scholar in international and comparative education.

The nomination procedure is straightforward. Any Ph.D. or Ed.D. dissertation written in English and defended in an accredited institution of higher education from July 1998 through August 1999 is eligible for consideration. Any CIES member in good standing, including its author, may nominate a dissertation. Several of the recent nominees, including the 1997 winner, Dr. Anne Hickling-Hudson, have come from other countries or studied at universities outside the U.S. Nominations should include one unbound copy of the dissertation, a copy of the Departmental and University approval of the dissertation, and a cover letter requesting that the dissertation be considered for the Gail P. Kelly Award. The deadline for nominations is October 15, 1999.

Nominations, applications, and queries should be sent directly to the Chair of the Gail P. Kelly Award Sub-Committee: Professor Joseph P. Farrell CIDEC, O.I.S.E. 252 Bloor Street West Toronto M5S 1V6 CANADA tel: 416.923-6641 x2361 • fax: 416.926-9754• email: jfarrell@oise.utoronto.ca

I have enclosed for your use a copy of the award announcement. Do let me know if I can be of any help in this process (you can reach me most directly at: 3527 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306-4221; telephone and fax 650.856-2326; email joel.samoff@stanford.edu).

Sincerely,

Joel Samoff Chair, CIES Awards Committee, 1999/2000
To whom it may concern:

The Comparative International Educational Society Sub-committee for the Gail P. Kelly Award for the best dissertation in the field of comparative education has granted the award to:

Catherine M. Raissiguier, for the thesis, “Racial and gender identity formation in the schools: The case of working class girls from Algerian and French descent in a French vocational high school”

The members of the committee found this to be a superior thesis in terms of academic excellence and methodological and theoretical rigor as represented by its careful literature review, thorough field work, originality, and its consistent use of the feminist methodology. In addition to dealing with issues of class, ethnicity, and gender within an international context, the thesis benefits from a clear focus and good narrative strategy, provide important insights into the lives of girls in French vocational schools. Moreover, through its use of the feminist methodology it contributes to novel interpretations of educational phenomena in their broad and interrelated political, economic, and social contexts.

Dr. Raissiguier is expected to deliver a short presentation regarding her dissertation during the Annual Meeting of the Comparative International Education Society to be held this year in San Diego from March 21 to the 24. All recipients of the Gail P. Kelly Award must be members in good standing of the CIES prior to receiving their award.

Sincerely,

Maria Teresa Tatro, Chair CIES Awards Committee
### 7.3.4 Gail P. Kelly Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Addresses social justice and equality issues in an international &amp; comparative context</th>
<th>Demonstrates originality of research design and methods (5 points)</th>
<th>Reflects the scholarly purpose of the society* (5 points)</th>
<th>Total Points (20 points)</th>
<th>Special strengths of the paper (may be quoted in award speech or materials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>5 4 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>This is a really interesting piece of qualitative research that makes a number of contributions. The methods largely consist of document analysis, participant observations, and interviews. He collected and analyzed a significant amount of data and I suspect that the fieldwork was challenging at times. While the research is concerned with the school cultivation programmers of two schools in rural Tanzania, it is clear that the researcher learned a great deal about these two communities beyond the initial scope of the study. I think this is a well-designed and rigorous piece of research that reflects the focus of CIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>4 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>This study employs a very sound methodology and approach to examine school cultivation programs in Tanzania. The data collection and analysis are well done and the author makes an excellent use of his participants' voices. Two areas of improvement would be for the author to strengthen his understanding of the literature, which was misinterpreted on occasion. In addition, the use of the &quot;Chain of Influence&quot; model was a bit confusing at times as the &quot;Organizations&quot; category often contained activities. As such, the author may have been better served through the use of a more simple logic model. Despite these issues, this study makes a solid contribution to school-based research in Tanzania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This dissertation is a study of donor-driven school gardening models as a window to examine the challenges and dilemmas of rural primary schools in two Tanzania communities. The work explores how the school cultivation programs respond to local needs and how local actors perceive such models in relation to student learning and community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>4 4 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>The topic of this research is very interesting: focusing on cultivation strategies to improve teaching, learning, and community health is a very important research endeavor. This research has important implications for educational policy and practice and was nicely framed taking into account the historical, socio-cultural, and development contexts from Tanzania. The author presented a clear and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study employs a very sound methodology and approach to examine school cultivation programs in Tanzania. The data collection and analysis are well done and the author makes an excellent use of his participants' voices. Two areas of improvement would be for the author to strengthen his understanding of the literature, which was misinterpreted on occasion. In addition, the use of the "Chain of Influence" model was a bit confusing at times as the "Organizations" category often contained activities. As such, the author may have been better served through the use of a more simple logic model. Despite these issues, this study makes a solid contribution to school-based research in Tanzania.
well-defined argument to explain the relevance of this study and utilized a rigorous methodological approach. Utilizing different methods of data collection and data sources, the author does a nice job in triangulating the main findings and in providing a deep understanding of key mechanisms and issues. Although this is a very strong dissertation, the stronger integration between theory, findings, and research positionality would have significantly enriched the overall quality of this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donald Brent Edwards</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an interesting case study of the Educational with Community Participation policy/programmer. The research examines the development of the programmer and its subsequent promotion. In many ways, this is a difficult piece of work to undertake and the researcher should be congratulated on analyzing policy formation processes with such programmer as EDUCO. Having said this, I did find it hard work to read and while the methodological approach seemed sound and with aspects of innovation, I am not sure this dissertation is worthy of the award. I suspect there are other dissertations that are a better fit with the criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donna C. Tonini</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jinting Wu</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This dissertation uses a longitudinal case study to examine the development of a program (EDUCO) by focusing on the critical events and dynamic changes of the policy formation. For the most part, the dissertation reads like a literature review of many things, with very dry policy talks lacking theoretical depth or ethnographic richness. Many important concepts are treated rather commonsensically, rather than critically, such as decentralization, community, etc. The dissertation does not address how EDUCO operated at the local level, which, in my opinion, is a significant weakness of the work, especially given that the archival data only covers until 1995.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maria Khan</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This case study of El-Salvador's EDUCO program is very interesting; at times it was difficult to follow the researcher especially in the literature review section. The methodology is clear. Despite three major limitations in the study that the researcher himself admits, the dissertation is an important contribution to developing an understanding of the program and its implications at the national and global level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Claudia Galindo | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyung Ryeol Kim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This dissertation employs a rigorous quantitative methodology and approach to measure the disparities in civic participation across a multitude of countries which participate in the ICCS dataset. The design of the study is theoretically strong and the author does tie in substantive literature to foreground her claims. However, despite its quantitative strengths, it is missing the rich perspectives and voices of qualitative data. With approximately 30 countries sampled for each research question, such qualitative data collection presents understandable difficulties; yet qualitative insight from perhaps 1-2 countries in case-study format would have helped fill in some of the gaps, enriched the study, and set the stage for future study replicability with the other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The dissertation uses a large-scale, quantitative database of over 30 countries to examine the discrepancy in civic outcomes among adolescents from a wide range of political and social contexts. Two dimensions of family backgrounds—SES and immigration background—are identified and focused on in the analysis. It contributes to the literature on the sociology of political inequality. The weakness is that without taking into full account the lived experiences of students, the internal mechanisms of the correlation and the ways in which country-level factors mediate variation in political inequality are left unexplained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research is concerned with the experiences of students studying on an EASL program in a university in Pakistan. While the research is interesting, I found it to be somewhat pedestrian. The research design lacks ambition and relies on essentially data from 17 students and 7 teachers. The research conducted some document analysis as well as observations and semi-structured interviews. Given the number in the sample, I think it is fair to say that the findings are somewhat overstated. I am confident that there are better dissertations that are more deserving of the award.

The research design and application of theory is weak. The researcher asks interesting questions but with a sample this small and lack of innovation, nothing great gets accomplished in the end.

The scope and aims of this dissertation do not provide many innovative contributions to the field of English learning in an international context. To better understand the educational experiences of Pakistani students a stronger truly multi-source study is needed. The author mentioned integrating several solid theoretical frameworks (symbolic interactionism, Bourdieu’s capital theory, and Wenger’s communities of practice); however the analysis and application of these theories need a deeper analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td>This dissertation on binational encounter programs in Israel is extremely well-researched and written. The literature review, theoretical grounding and methodology are very strong and appropriate for the study. The author effectively uses her participants' voices to bring life to these two educational peace programs in the midst of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. What also distinguishes this dissertation is that the author builds on existing theories of identity construction, and makes a clear contribution to the literature through her exploration of the politics of identity. This dissertation was an enjoyable read and a fascinating learning experience, and represents all of the qualities and merits of the Gail P. Kelly award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>5  4</td>
<td>This dissertation examines Peace Child Israel and Sadaka Reut, two binational encounter programs bringing together Palestinian and Jewish citizens in Israel, regarding their impacts and potentials for fostering social change, changing alumni perspectives, and challenging structural inequalities in Israeli society. Although analytical chapters five and six read a bit repetitive, overall, this is a well-researched and well written dissertation that, in my opinion, deserves the honor of this year’s Gail Kelly award. The lives, narratives, and identity claims of alumni of both organizations as well as the programmatic approaches enrich scholarship on peace education, conflict resolution, and organizational evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td>5  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td>5  4</td>
<td>I found this research fascinating. It is well done and the researcher must be congratulated on having completed the study with such vigor and bringing attention to the two programs. I do hope that this dissertation is seriously considered for the Gail P. Kelly award. It is easy to follow, walks the reader through the Israeli and Palestinian conflicts and stresses on the significance of the issues in the current educational system of the Palestinian and Israeli society. The concepts from scholarship on civic education and socio-cultural studies are well applied, and methodology section is sound. There may be some limitations to the study, but strong conclusions make it a very interesting piece of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>5  4</td>
<td>The topic of this dissertation is extremely important. The project is interdisciplinary in nature not only because of its theoretical approach but also because of its methodological endeavors. Overall, this is a very thorough, methodological rigorous and theoretically grounded research piece. The intersection of social change and individual agency was very enriching and informative. The methodological approach (a comparative case study of two organizations) was conducted rigorously and integrated multiple sources and voices. The author did a very nice job sharing her participants' voices and perspectives. I support the opinions of my colleagues; this high quality dissertation fulfills the requirements of the Gail P. Kelly award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Moss Gamblin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This dissertation is concerned with Education for Sustainable Development. Claudia can you check that I have that right because my comment differs from Jinting's below. The study involved data collection in three different countries (Canada, Lithuania, ad Sweden. While there is a section in the methods section that discusses the choice of countries, it is not entirely clear or well justified. Despite the data collection from three countries, I consider this research fairly small scale. The sampling is largely unclear and only 30 individuals (teachers, administrators, care takers, and coordinators) were interviewed in total. I think there are better dissertations so I do not consider this research to be in contention for the award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The research design and methodology of this dissertation is not especially rigorous nor original in its approach. The research question focuses on the &quot;sustainability perspectives&quot; of adults in school sustainability programs but then proceeds to sample only 30 adult representatives of those schools - excepting students. As such, these “perspectives” are limited largely to administrators and a few teachers. As eco-schools are a relatively new phenomenon, a case-study approach with rich ethnographic data detailing student experiences would have made for a stronger study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This is a very ambitious project given that the author collected data in three different countries. While this could have influenced the international relevance of this work, there is no clear rationale to do so. Perhaps, collecting data in fewer countries, and expanding the data collection within each country, could have made a stronger project. A clear rationale of the participants of the study was not present. The implications for research, theory, and practice were not clear. The literature review was very descriptive and the theoretical and analytical frameworks were underdeveloped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Vayaliparampil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>This is an interesting piece of research that essentially assessed the effectiveness of Sarva Shikshu Abhiyan. SSA consists of eight inventions (i.e., meals, accommodation, stipend etc.) that are intended to increase school enrolment in India. It is a multi-case design with some interesting data collection approaches (i.e., photo voice). It is a well conducted study that focuses on an important topic (i.e., EFA). There are places where the researcher could have provided more text and depth. Overall, very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This dissertation aims to understand stakeholder perceptions of the effectiveness of SSA, India's flagship program for achieving universal school enrolment, by using participatory action (photo voice) and qualitative case study methods. The research findings are cogently argued and clearly presented. Even though it claims to be phenomenological, the study is still somewhat lacking in ethnographic richness and the close linking of the problems with Indian’s social, historical, and cultural context. The lit review might have mentioned some of the contextual issues, but it feels separate from the main body of analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A good effort to understand the effectiveness of SSA in India's multi-faceted society. The researcher admits three limitations to the study, despite which the attention to detail of the research design is very well done. The methodology is clear; literature review section goes astray in few instances, but overall not difficult to follow. The study brings to light very important issue regarding the marginalized minorities not only in India, but what may be true for many other developing countries in the region. It definitely meets the criteria for Gail P. Kelly award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saran Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Hampden-Thompson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna C. Tonini</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinting Wu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Khan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Galindo</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the outset of this dissertation, the author identifies the problem of "unattached youths in Jamaica" and how colonial education fosters a sense of cultural worthlessness on the youths. The author employs a postcolonial lens to explore the influences of colonialism on the education system in Jamaica, but focuses more on its historical development, rather than drawing out a strong connection between colonialism, the trend of extra lessons, and the un-attachment of youth. As such, I agree with my colleagues who sense that the author's use of the postcolonial lens is not as strong as it could have been. In addition, the dissertation could have been strengthened by including a more rigorous literary study of the inequities posed by extra lessons. Other than these detractions, this dissertation was quite an enjoyable read, with the qualitative data especially rich and enlightening.

This dissertation uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine whether extra lessons can improve educational outcomes for students at the secondary level in Jamaica. It aims to offer a postcolonial lens on the study of extra lessons, yet the postcolonial lens got buried and lost, to some extent, in the actual analysis. The reader is left feeling that the study is situated in a postcolonial context but that context was not effectively built in the analysis as the author hoped. The role of the state and a neoliberal lens could also have been incorporated to strengthen the argument.

This dissertation is the result of an impressive data collection process. A clear justification of why it was important to use mixed-methods was included. But, the topic has important limitations in its implications and the theoretical approach could have been better analyzed. The idea of bringing a postcolonial perspective to the topic of extra lessons had a lot of potential, but it was not well executed. A deeper analysis of the different theoretical stands would have strengthened the quality of this piece.
7.3.5 Summary of Dissertations Submitted for the Gail P. Kelly Award
(This table is to be submitted with the Gail P. Kelly Subcommittee Chair’s Final Report)
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• reflects the scholarly purpose of the Society—comparative, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary, and international/global studies contributing to the interpretation of developments in education in broad and interrelated economic, political, and social contexts.

To be eligible for the Award, articles must be written by a member of the Comparative and International Education Society. Articles must be published in a refereed journal during the calendar year January 1, 2012 – December 31, 2012; articles slated for publication in the final months of 2012 may be submitted in manuscript form with a letter from the journal editor stating the intended publication schedule.

Nominations and self-nominations for the Joyce Cain Award are welcome. The deadline for submissions is December 1, 2012. Send articles with a cover letter or nomination requesting consideration for the Joyce Cain Award to clancie.wilson@uafs.edu

7.5 International Travel Award Additional Material
7.5.1. International Travel Award Announcement sample

Comparative and International Education Society

International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform

http://www.cies.us/home.htm

We are pleased to announce the 2013 CIES International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform. The travel award was established through an endowment from George Soros and the Open Society Institute (OSI) and expanded under CIES president Ratna Ghosh to encourage distinguished researchers and practitioners from developing countries to participate in CIES conferences. Launched at the 2009 CIES conference, the endowment attempts to facilitate the participation of international education experts who serve in countries where international projects are implemented.

Several awards of $1,000 each will be awarded for the 2013 conference in New Orleans. Last year, fifteen grants were awarded, and we anticipate this year to be the same. Conference participants from developing countries with at least five (5) years of professional experience in educational development are eligible to apply. Some applicants may also wish to apply for the Under-Represented Ethnic and Ability Groups (UREAG) travel award, but are reminded that they cannot receive both awards.

Applicants must have submitted their CIES conference presentation abstract by October 26th, 2012 through the conference online submission system and a travel award application by December 7, 2012. Applicants who are selected for the travel award will receive $1,000 provided that their proposal has been accepted for presentation at the conference. The awardees will be notified by January 12, 2012. Awardees will be announced on the conference website as well as in the CIES Newsletter.

For information on how to apply for an International Travel Award and to access the application form please visit: http://www.cies.us/home.htm. Questions about the 2013 International Travel Award can be directed to cies.travel.award@gmail.com.
7.5.1 International Travel Award Application Form

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<SAMPLE>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Comparative and International Education Society
International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform

2014 Application Form

The International Travel Award (ITA) for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform was established in 2009 through funds provided by the Open Society Institute (OSI). The objective of the Award is to facilitate participation of international educational experts at the CIES annual conference. CIES conference participants with more than five (5) years of professional experience in educational development are eligible to apply for a $1000USD award to support travel-related costs. Applicants are reminded that they may only receive one CIES award for travel. Only dues-paying members of CIES are eligible for this award. The deadline for submitting the application is December 29, 2013. Awardees will be notified by January 12, 2014.

First Name: Last Name:
Email Address:
What is your gender?
Organization/Institution:
Job Title:
No. of years in current job:
No. of years in Educational Development:
Current Country of Residence:
What is your country of origin/citizenship?
What is your highest level of education attained?
Are you currently enrolled in a higher education degree program: If so, what level and where?
Have you previously applied for the ITA? If so, please specify year.
Have you ever been awarded any other CIES travel award(s)? If so, which and specify year?
Are you currently a member of CIES in good standing?
Have you submitted an abstract proposal for the CIES 2014 Conference?
Submitted proposal abstract to CIES 2014 (including title): TITLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABSTRACT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Have you applied for other funding for this conference? If so, from where?

Please write a personal statement (maximum of 500 words) about your service in educational development. In your statement describe your area of expertise in international educational development, current projects/research in which you are involved, and why you wish to attend the CIES conference. Note that if you are awarded a grant, this information will be published in the CIES newsletter and on the CIES website.

A complete application includes:
1) The application form
2) A copy of your CIES 2014 abstract submission
3) Your resume or CV
4) A 500 word personal statement (save as: LastName_FirstName_CIESTravelAward_PS.docx)

Please send all components of your completed application in one email to cies.InternationalTravelAward@gmail.com and write ‘CIES 2014 INT’L TRAVEL GRANT’ in the subject line. Thank you for your interest!
7.5.2 International Travel Award Scoring Rubric

Applicant # _____ Name: _____________________

Scorer’s Name: ________________________________

☒ Application From ☒ Abstract ☒ Resume/CV ☒ Personal statement

<p>| CIES Travel Award: Basic Applicant Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Country of Residence</th>
<th>Education Level Attained</th>
<th>Previous Winner? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Member of CIES? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>CIES Proposal accepted? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Five years of Experience in educational development? (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CV</th>
<th>CV &amp; Past Experience</th>
<th>Overall Statement</th>
<th>Commitment to the Field</th>
<th>Vision and Leadership</th>
<th>Need for Funding</th>
<th>Record of Scholarship</th>
<th>Conference Abstract</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the reviewer: Award points for each category using the following rubric:

4= Provides strong evidence, 3=Provides adequate evidence, 2=Provides some evidence, 1=Provides little or no evidence
### 7.5.3 International Travel Award Master List/Decision Matrix

| #  | First and Last Name | Reviewers | Scores | Composite Score | Gender | Country of Origin | Country of Residence | Decision/Notes | Award Granted? | Letter sent? | ACCEPTED? |
|----|---------------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
|    |                     |           |        |                 |        |                   |                      |               |               |             |           |          |
### 2014 International Travel Award Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIES International Travel Award: Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least FIVE years of experience in a developing country/countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the reviewer: Award points for each category using the following rubric:

4= Provides strong evidence, 3=Provides adequate evidence, 2=Provides some evidence, 1=Provides little or no evidence
Dear [AWARD RECIPIENT]

Thank you for your application for the Comparative and International Education Society's 2014 International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform. The Committee reviewed a large number of applications from colleagues with impressive qualifications. It is our distinct pleasure to inform you that you were selected from among these to receive a travel award for the 2014 Annual Meeting in Toronto.

Please note that in order to receive the 1,000 USD funds, your CIES membership and conference registration must be current. You will receive the Award in person, since you are expected to deliver your presentation at the conference as scheduled. Furthermore, we would like to publish the names of the awardees and their affiliations in the February issue of the CIES Newsletter.

To this end, we ask that you please:

(1) Write to accept/decline this award no later than Friday January 24 by stating your intention to attend the conference. Please include the correct spelling of your name and professional/institutional affiliation.

(2) Update your CIES 2014 membership and register for the CIES 2014 conference. For your convenience, links for this purpose are provided under the Registration tabs of the conference website at http://www.cies.us/2014/registration.shtml

(3) If your plans to attend the conference should change at any point, please inform us at your earliest convenience by contacting Fernanda Pineda at fernanda_pinedac@yahoo.com. Other highly qualified colleagues would appreciate the opportunity to be considered should you not be able to attend the conference.

Further information on how to receive the CIES 2014 International Travel Award at the conference venue will be made available closer to the conference date.

On behalf of the 2014 International Travel Awards Committee, the CIES Secretariat, and the Conference Organizers, we congratulate you on this important recognition of your distinguished record of service and scholarship in the field of education. We look forward to seeing you in Toronto!

Sincerely,

Gilbert Valverde, PhD
CIES President

Fernanda Pineda, EdD
2014 ITA Committee Chair
Dear [WAITING LIST]

Thank you for your application for the Comparative and International Education Society's 2014 International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform. The Awards Committee, with a process that entailed inter-rater scoring, reviewed a large number of applications from colleagues with impressive qualifications such as yours. We regret that you were not among those top ten colleagues selected to receive a travel award this year; however, because of your high score, you were placed on a waiting list. The first ten finalists were asked to notify CIES by January 24 if they accept or decline their travel award. You will receive a notification as soon as we know if there is a finalist who cannot participate in the CIES conference in Toronto.

On behalf of the 2014 International Travel Awards Committee, the CIES Secretariat, and the Conference Organizers, we thank you for your expression of interest and for the opportunity to read your application and learn about your important contributions to our field through your service and scholarship. Should all finalists accept their award and we cannot award you these funds, we hope that you will consider applying again to the International Travel Award in the future.

We wish you a successful year, and look forward to seeing you in Toronto.

Sincerely,

Fernanda Pineda, EdD
2014 International Travel Award Committee Chair

Dear [NOT A FINALIST]

Thank you for your application for the Comparative and International Education Society's 2014 International Travel Award for Distinguished Service in Educational Reform. The Awards Committee, with a process that entailed inter-rater scoring, reviewed a large number of applications from colleagues with impressive qualifications such as yours. We regret that you were not among those selected to receive a travel award this year.

On behalf of the 2014 International Travel Awards Committee, the CIES Secretariat, and the Conference Organizers, we thank you for your expression of interest and for the opportunity to read your application and learn about your important contributions to our field through your service and scholarship. We hope that you will consider applying again to the International Travel Award and other sources of support or recognition in future.

We wish you a successful year, and look forward to seeing you in Toronto.

Sincerely,

Fernanda Pineda, EdD
2014 International Travel Award Committee Chair
7.6 Jackie Kirk Award Additional Material

7.6.1 Jackie Kirk Award Call for Nominations

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
JACKIE KIRK AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING BOOK
CIES’s Jackie Kirk Memorial Fund & Outstanding Book Award

The Jackie Kirk Memorial Fund is designed to memorialize the legacy that Jackie Kirk has left on the field of comparative and international education. Jackie Kirk’s work was prolific and varied, and committed to the active engagement of theory and practice, in ways that further the empowerment of women and girls, and the improvement of education in conflict and post-conflict settings. Her activism with teachers and youth, creative use of participatory visual research methodologies, commitment to gender equality and inclusion, and on-the-ground work with schools in conflict areas shaped her scholarship on issues as varied as gender violence, armed conflict, home-based schools, refugee youth, women teachers, identity and visual representation of women and girls, peace education and fragile states. Her work examined global contexts and also local realities. She was committed to encouraging integrated, holistic, systemic change in order to increase access and equality in education for everyone. The book award that will be supported from this fund will acknowledge an outstanding book that is reflective of Jackie Kirk’s commitments.

Call for Nominations: Jackie Kirk Award for Outstanding Book

The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) recognizes an outstanding book annually with the Jackie Kirk Award. This award was created in 2010 to honor the prolific professional life and deep commitment of Jackie Kirk to our field and to CIES. This award annually honors a published book that reflects one or some of the varied areas of expertise represented in Jackie Kirk’s areas of commitment, primarily gender and education and/or education in conflict (fragile states, post-conflict, peace education). Jackie Kirk was also committed to work on identity (particularly of girls and teachers), globalization as a context for local practice and visual participatory research methodologies. Furthermore, Jackie Kirk was professionally committed to encouraging dynamic and equitable collaboration between academics and practitioners, the global South and the global North, and comparative/international educators and teachers on the ground. While the award will be granted primarily on the basis of the two main areas of commitment (gender and/or conflict), these additional areas of commitment will be used as a secondary set of criteria so that the award reflects the spirit of Jackie Kirk’s legacy.

The Jackie Kirk Outstanding Book Award will be awarded annually, as follows:

1. The book can relate to one (or more) of the following topical areas:
   a. Gender and Education. Books in this area would deepen the field’s understanding of gender dynamics or relations in education in ways that challenge education to understand gender in a more nuanced way, one that can help educators to acknowledge the full humanity of all students and teachers, and to work toward social justice in education.
   b. Education in Conflict, Post-Conflict, Fragile States, and/or Peace Education. Work in this area would reveal the realities of the challenges of education in demanding contexts, and/or the work that people are doing despite the challenges.

2. The book must be published within the past two calendar years, as noted by the copyright date. (For example, a book selected for the 2013 award would be published in 2011 or 2012.) Books can be authored or edited (individually or collaboratively), and can be research-based, conceptual or theoretical in nature, or policy oriented.
3. Books are to be nominated by CIES members, but can be written/edited by non-CIES members. Nominations should include how the book relates to the areas outlined above, and what makes the book worthy of a designation of “outstanding.” Nominations are due September 1.

The book author(s) or editor(s) should provide an executive summary of the book by September 1 of each year. The committee will determine a short list by October 15, and request books from the authors/editors for a full review. Books must be provided to the com
8. Awards Committee Records Section

Awards Committee Records

Section
This Section was initiated by Vandra Lea Masemann in July 1990. Each Awards Chair should add the Final Report of the Awards Committee, the announcement of the previous year’s winner(s) of the George Bereday Award for Outstanding Article in the Comparative Education Review, and the Gail P. Kelly Award for Outstanding Dissertation, published in the November issue of the Comparative Education Review, as well as the names of Honorary Fellows and any documents of policy and procedures from the current term. Relevant abstracts from CIES Minutes should also be included.