This ad hoc committee was charged with reviewing the reports prepared by the following ad hoc review committees:

- Gender Committee Review (chaired by Erin Murphy-Graham)
- Awards Committees Review (chaired by Joel Samoff)
- New Scholars Committee Review (chaired by James Williams)
- SIG Committee Review (chaired by Paula Hunt & James William Jacob)
- Historian Review (chaired by Teresa Tato)

Each committee’s activities, report and recommendations are summarized below followed by this committee’s synthesis of these reports and recommended action points.

In reviewing each of the review reports listed above, it became increasingly clear that the growth of CIES has resulted in several unique challenges to the organizational effectiveness and broadly-beneficial nature of the Society. To ignore these challenges or the need to address them in what may seem to be some new or different ways than have been traditionally used by CIES leadership would be doing a great disservice to the Society and the broader comparative and international education community.

As a whole, we recognize the following:

1. Most reviews pointed towards the need for each committee and its membership to clarify its definition, mission, or identity both as a committee and as a part of the CIES more broadly.

2. Most reviews recommend or comment on some degree of frustration, confusion, or (in some cases) conflict regarding committee governance and decision-making, and that committee leaders’ relationship to the broader CIES Executive Committee needed to be clarified or enhanced.

3. Most reviews suggest that there is a need for improved communication or networking among committee members or constituents and the larger CIES membership.

**Summary of Gender & Equity Committee Review Report**

The Gender and Equity review report suggests the need to focus on two key issues: (1) the need to embed, mainstream and promote Gender and Equity as a topic and outcome for the CIES in its conferences, programming and awards and (2) the need to monitor the degree of embeddedness, mainstreaming and promotion of gender equity in CIES as a whole.

**Observations on G&E Committee Review Report**
It seems that this group takes on the persona of a SIG with added benefits through committee status. It seems that a gender committee to take on monitoring issues and a SIG to take on the promotion and programming activities would be a better way to organize these interests. As it stands, some of the funding requests and positioning make this committee appear to be a “super-SIG” with access to resources that are inequitably available to other groups (ironically).

There are some historical issues with the governance of this committee that are not fully explained or explored in the review report, but this seems to be a primary emphasis of the review report. Whatever the governance, it seems important for the Society to have consistency across groups and committees.

As mentioned above, two key issues seem to be the focus of the G&E review report. For the first, priority should be given to decision making around CIES practices and the governance of the CIES. G&E through its committee and its voice on CIES bodies (Conference Programme Advisory Committee, Awards Committee, Comparative Education Review) should be secured through mandatory membership. Practices and outcomes in terms of conference (spaces, timings, promotion) could be secured by the sense of a G&E impact assessment when decisions are made. Funding decisions for example through awards, travel awards, invited lectures and so on could be similarly scrutinised for G&E impact.

For the second, the report recommends the development of indicator data to enable monitoring and review of the impact of CIES practices including making historical trend analysis possible.

What seems to be emphasised is a twin role for G&E activity – as a stand-alone caucus and as a body integrated into each level of CIES governance to promote and monitor G&E mainstreaming. We wonder about the ‘E’ part of G&E and whether the integration within CIES governance would need to have Gender included as part of a broader Equity remit? The implication of this would be to open up questions of equity and governance within the CIES more generally while certainly not to downplay the gender and equity issue.

**Summary of Awards Committees Review Report**

The Awards Committees review report is pretty comprehensive and detailed and a picture develops of arrangements for awards, rewards, recognition and so on running ahead of clarified procedures, visibility, updating of CIES policies and so on.

The report identifies the CIES awards (Bereday, Kelly, Honorary Fellows, Cain, Kirk) and raises questions about the procedures in place for bodies doing the selecting, criteria of selection, promotion of awards and publication of details of award holders.

A number of proposals seem to be implicit in the report:

- Need to have a standardised, available and public set of procedures for award with specification by award and with provision for variation (at present there are numerous committees, sub-committees, advisory groups, scope for discretion, Presidential initiative and so on).

- Standardisation does not need to mean uniformity but the scope for discretion should be transparent and its purposes made clear (innovation, response to change, support of directions established by President, themes of conferences and so on)
• The Awards handbook has not been updated since 2000 and this task should now be undertaken with an eye to future proofing it (perhaps a 10 year life for each iteration should suffice provided that there is sufficient scope to respond and innovate within established guidelines).

• The handbook should provide for common patterns of award specification, review, designation, award and specification while providing for specified variation.

• Awards should be considered separately from travel awards, funded lectures and other initiatives designed to meet demands of emerging themes and issues for the CIES and participation in its activities.

• Awards as such should be considered as reward and recognition for scholarly accomplishments.

• Each award should make clear its criteria of selection (for example in terms of date of publication to be considered, format of publication).

• The priority for awards should be on recognition and reward and the timing, publication, presentation of awards should be commensurate with the degree of esteem which the award suggests.

In sum, the report looks for steps to be taken to provide for a clear set of guidelines while allowing for specified variation. This would contribute to continuity, equity, and promotion of scholarly standards while at the same time allowing for new initiatives.

**Observations on Awards Committees Review Report**

This report has great background, but is lacking in recommendations. The closest thing to a recommendation might be the suggestion to scrupulously avoid “best” or change “outstanding” to “best”. A key underlying issue seems to be maintaining the integrity of awards between various SIGs and general CIES awards. It may be useful to create naming conventions to distinguish SIG awards and create some consistency with maintained autonomy in the SIGs. This may help to avoid any brand degradation issues as well.

**Summary of New Scholars Committee Review Report**

Central to the thrust of this report is the recognition that new scholars make up a growing proportion, now approaching 50% of members, and that this needs to be increasingly recognised and responded to.

New Scholars are well integrated into the CIES in terms of governance and the New Scholar Committee would seem to be working well to fulfil the mandate of improving participation, awareness and engagement of new scholars in terms of scholarship, networking, induction into field, preparation for employment.

The work of the New Scholars Committee will clearly be ongoing and developmental and a number of aspects for future development are suggested around composition of New Scholar Committee, opportunities for promotion and engagement through new media, newsletters, blogs, designated webpage and so on.

The report includes a summary of how New Scholars are integrated into the work of other scholarly bodies and conferences; there would be a range of innovations around programming, activities and so on which could be looked at over time.
Observations on New Scholar Committee Review Report

One aspect of the report, which should be the subject of further discussion, is the finding from their survey that new scholars are putting networking and employment prospects ahead of scholarly engagement with latest research. It may therefore be time to look at the scholarly content of activities and programming for new scholars, to consider the different kinds of experiences which new scholars have at conference in terms of presentation, interaction with established or indeed transitional scholars and so on.

Several options seem appropriate given the concerns expressed by the New Scholar Committee Review report:

- Recommend a better way to track data about members, particularly new scholars who have graduated and are no longer students.
- Outline a transition strategy and ideal to use the New Scholars Committee to get people acclimated to CIES, but then transition to other niche groups within CIES.
- Consider adopting the governance suggestions made by the New Scholar Committee as presented by the review report.
- The recommendations regarding social media are well-stated and the encouragement to upgrade the CIES website is also useful. The newsletter seems less effective than social media as people can easily opt out of social media updates. A newsletter seems “old” for a “new” scholars group.
- One of the best suggestions (p.9) is to consider ways to connect potential employers with qualified candidates. Something more suitable than a job fair would be nice, but this could save a lot of time and money as well as make CIES an attractive place for employers and candidates.
- Other worthy recommendations are on p.12, specifically: #1. Activities to structure interaction between new and established scholars; #2. Activities to meet needs of the broader new scholar community; and #3. Online forums.

Summary of SIG Committee Review Report

The SIG Review Committee reports that its main objectives were to (1) survey CIES membership and leaders to gain insights on possible ways of improvements of SIGs; (2) recommend the best way to collect SIG membership dues; and (3) develop a Handbook for New CIES Chairpersons. To achieve these objectives the SIG Review Committee: (a) conducted an online survey among all CIES members; (b) conducted interviews with 23 SIG leaders; and (c) incorporated suggestions from multiple meetings and correspondences research team members had with other CIES leaders.

Clear recommendations resulting from these data and in response to the review objectives are as follows:

1. Provide Permanent SIG Representation on the CIES Board of Directors
2. Promote SIGs through the CIES Website
3. Limit the Number To No More Than Two SIG-Highlighted Panels at CIES Annual Meetings
4. Establish a Standardized Process Regarding SIG Roles and Responsibilities at CIES Annual Meeting Preparations
5. Establish Annual SIG Membership Dues Guidelines
6. Encourage SIG-Sponsored Awards
7. Encourage SIG-Sponsored Projects
8. Encourage SIG-Sponsored Publications
9. Encourage Fund-Raising Efforts Linked to SIG-Sponsored Scholarship Activities
10. Require that Future SIGs Be Regional or Thematic in Scope
11. Establish a Process for Discontinuing SIGs
12. Review and Approval Handbook

**Observations on SIG Committee Review Report**

The clearly prioritized recommendation of the SIG review committee is to revise the CIES Constitution and Bylaws relating to SIGS, particularly the need for SIG representation among the Executive Committee (e.g., Board of Directors, etc.).

**Summary of Historian Review Report**

The Historian Review was coordinated by Teresa Tatto, and consists of five reviews by CIES members “with experience in the workings of CIES and with experience as historians, and who are familiar with the work of the historian…over the last three years.” In addition, the current CIES historian, Erwin Epstein, was asked to prepare a report of his work over the last three years alongside his annual reports for the past three years. Each reviewer prepared a short report in which they reviewed the historian’s fulfilment of the responsibilities outlined in the CIES constitution.

Each of the 5 reviewers recommended that Erwin Epstein’s position as CIES historian be renewed for another three-year term, along with some specific recommendations, which include:

1. Continue the review of the Constitution, Bylaws and Awards handbook that were started, but not completely finished yet.
2. Continue to encourage CIECAP and related enterprises to exist and be supported by the historian in order to encourage the continued and improved teaching of comparative and international education in universities worldwide.
3. Encourage the historian to head a project to analyze change in the organization and the media of CIES, which may have resulted in a change in the meaning of comparative education itself over the past several decades.
4. Encourage the Society’s executive leadership to make a decision about the CIEs archives and their continuance. Specifically,
   a. Provide the funding outlined in Epstein’s report for cataloguing the documents at their current location at Kent State University.
   b. Transfer the archive to an institution with the resources and willingness to manage the CIES documents as a component of its own archives.

**Observations on Historian Review Report**

The historian review was unique in that it consisted of five individual reviews and their comments and recommendations. Specifically, the overall message was that a historian for the Society was sincerely needed, but that the current position was successful largely because of the individual filling it (Erwin Epstein) in spite of the lack of resources and institutionalized commitment to the responsibility of
documenting and analyzing the Society. This is a particular problem for a Society whose reputation is partly based on the ability of its members to comparatively and appropriately contextualize information and its relevance to both individuals and communities.

**Synthesis and Recommended Action Items**

Several key areas for Executive Committee attention and possible action are recognizable in the review reports described above. These areas are as follows:

**Governance & Decision-making Authority**

1. *Autonomy of Decision-making* came up as a key point in several committee reports (e.g., Gender & Equity, SIG). In particular, the question of whether or not the committee in question was free to make committee-wide decisions that may involve the CIES membership more broadly or be related to the governance and activities of the committee specifically.

   **Recommended Action Item:** Clarify the degree to which or types of decisions that committees and other groups within CIES are empowered to make independently from the CIES Executive Committee, or inversely determine which decision-making activities need Executive Committee approval.

2. *Committee Leadership* was one of the key ways that autonomous decision-making was addressed. For example, do committees have the autonomy to appoint their own leaders independent from the CIES President or Executive Committee’s influence, and if not to what degree does the CIES leadership determine committee leadership?

   **Recommended Action Item:** Clarify the CIES Constitution and Bylaws concerning leadership of CIES committees and other recognized groups. Specifically, how are committee and other leaders selected, by whom, and how can these methods for leadership selection be regularized or standardized Society-wide?

3. *Representation on Executive Committee* of each committee’s leaders was a key question raised repeatedly. In other words, to what degree are each committee’s needs and perspectives represented with the core group of CIES decision-makers? The need for clarification here was raised as a question of membership on the Board of Directors as well as a simple matter of representation at key meetings. These questions, however, suggest that there is no consistent or clear guideline in this matter.

   **Recommended Action Item:** Decide the degree to which CIES committees and SIGs have representation on the CIES Board of Directors or Executive Committee, and institutionalize the decision in the CIES Constitution and Bylaws, as needed.

**Resource Distribution**

4. *Allocation of Resources* to each committee was questioned, especially in regards to those committees with significant memberships. The question is further muddied by the question of whether some (or one in particular) of the current committees is in effect a “super-SIG”. If a significant group of CIES members belong to a particular committee, does that committee warrant additional funding allocated by the Executive Committee or President, specifically?

   **Recommended Action Item:** Clarify the purpose and objectives of each of the reviewed committees, with particular attention to the potential of some committees to
become “super-SIGS” with additional access to resources that other committees do not have.

5. *Fund-raising or Alternative Funding Activities* were mentioned as a way for certain committees and their constituents to be able to provide resources for activities that would otherwise not be possible (e.g., funding the CIES archives or providing resources for SIG activities). The degree to which and type of activities that are available to committees and their members or would be acceptable or approved by the Executive Committee is in question.

*Recommended Action Item:* Determine the degree to which committees and other groups within CIES may raise money or solicit additional resources for themselves specifically without necessarily contributing back to the CIES general fund or securing Executive Committee approval prior to engaging in the activity.

**Development and Involvement**

6. *Membership Management* was a core issue for several committees. For instance, how does a committee keep track of its membership records, dues (if needed), and then communicate or network among members? The consensus is that there are inadequate opportunities, resources, and avenues for these sorts of activities.

*Recommended Action Item:* Develop a system for autonomously managing membership in CIES (independent from the University of Chicago Press or other external entities) and institute a system of membership records-keeping that is uniform and systematic.

7. *Recruitment of New Members* was something that several committees raised as an issue to consider. How, for example, do new scholars find out about CIES and the New Scholars Committee in particular? What are the benefits of membership and how are these benefits communicated to the prospective new members?

*Recommended Action Item:* The membership of CIES has grown steadily, especially in recent years, but the ways in which new members are being recruited and retained are unclear. The Executive Committee should develop a strategic plan for the development of the Society, which includes a significant section on the recruitment of new members in order to understand who CIES is and where it is headed (the Society will become whatever its members represent).

8. *Incorporation or Transition* of members from one status to another (e.g., when does a ‘new scholar’ transition to ‘scholar’ status?) is unclear, nor does the CIES executive leadership systematically address it. In other words, a Society where almost half of its membership is a ‘new scholar’ will not function well if these new scholars are not given an opportunity to develop as scholars and transition to ‘regular’ members of the Society at some point.

*Recommended Action Item:* As CIES has grown steadily in the past several years, the majority of new members are also defined as “new scholars”, but the CIES executive leadership has yet to strategically plan for how new scholars are incorporated into the CIES community at large or transitioned from “new” to “established” scholars. A strategic plan for incorporating and transitioning new members is part of a larger need for the Society to establish its identity and that of its membership by clearly defining who “we” are, what we represent, and how we contribute to our professional community.

**Communication & Information**
9. *Information Availability* about the Society, about its members, about both regular and special activities and other information is not easily or readily communicated using the current methods (website, email). Recommendations for how information might alternatively be made available to or accessed by members are needed.

**Recommended Action Item:** The CIES Executive Committee should strategically plan for ways to market itself and its members both for the purposes of recruiting new and active members, but also for providing members with information about themselves and their Society as well as providing opportunities for external organizations and professional communities access to our members and their expertise.

10. *Institutional Memory* seems to be focused very specifically on undergraduates and specific areas where information is available rather than on the systematic acquisition of information about the Society, its history, leadership and members. And, this information does not seem to be as easily accessible or recognized by the Society’s membership as much as it should or could be.

**Recommended Action Item:** The Society’s commitment to historical and archival activity is at the bare minimum. The Executive Committee should decide what degree of resources and expected outcomes there are for the Historian and the activities connected with this position. In particular, the fate of the CIES archives should be decisively determined by making a clear set of guidelines for what is included, how it is stored and made accessible to the CIES community and the level of funding that the historical and archival activities of the Society can expect.

11. *Publication Opportunities* are limited for both new and established scholars within the Society. While there are the print journal (CER) and the electronic newsletter, there is recognition that other publication outlets are both needed and lacking.

**Recommended Action Item:** Alternative ideas for publication and dissemination of information about both scholarly research and pedagogical activity of the Society’s members should be entertained, and an ad hoc committee for evaluating the overall impact of the current publication outlets should be established.

12. *Recognition & Awards* for the Society as a whole and within specific committees does not have the requisite standardization, transparency or clarity to be either productive or truly representative of the highest quality work. These issues need to be considered for the Society as a whole rather than just within the Awards Committees or each SIG itself.

**Recommended Action Item:** Uniformity, transparency and availability (or lack thereof) of information about all of the awards both institutionalized and newly developed within CIES needs to be documented. An ad hoc committee to address these issues should be formed and charged.

**Accountability**

13. *Monitoring Equity* is something that was raised specifically in regards to gender, but the broader need for equity related to nationality, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and professional status (new or established) is recognized Society-wide. Therefore, the need for a separate monitoring or accountability unit may be needed.

**Recommended Action Item:** The Executive Committee/Board of Directors should discuss the need for an independent committee or unit within CIES to monitor the
equitability of decision-making, leadership, and resource allocation. It should also consider the formation of an ad hoc committee to research the possibilities and best practices for independent monitoring units like this for CIES.