CIES Ad Hoc Committee on Allocation of Funds and Fundraising

Final Report Submitted to the Board of Directors of the Comparative and International Education Society

Submitted on behalf of the Committee by,
Gilbert A. Valverde, Ph.D.
University at Albany / State University of New York

4.15.2011
1. The present report covers the discussions of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Allocation of Funds and Fundraising, for the period of the current presidency.

2. The Committee Members were: María Teresa Tatò, David Post, Alan Wagner, Hilary Landorf, Mark Ginsberg, Peter Moock and Gilbert Valverde (Chair).

3. The Committee was originally charged with the following tasks by President Tatò:

   - Set out recommendations regarding sensible policies to support the Executive Committee in meeting their obligations for attending the Annual Meetings and other Society obligations.
   - Recommend policies regarding Society fundraising

4. The Committee conducted business via the E-mail and teleconferences, and what follows is an account of the discussions.

5. **Allocation of funds to support the work of the Executive Committee**
   
   a. **Explanation**: Up to now, the Society has required that members of the Executive Committee both to volunteer their time, and to do all of their own fundraising in order to support their travel, meals and incidental expenses in relation to attendance to the Annual Meeting, with no financial support from the Society. The above is problematic as it introduces additional burdens on officers who are already volunteering valuable time and expertise in service to the Society. This also limits the pool of potential Society leaders - and is not in fact ever made explicit to candidates for office in the Society. The Ad-Hoc Committee is requested to examine whether a change in Society practice is warranted and if so, what type of change may best serve the Society’s interests. Additionally, there are currently proposals that the Executive Committee have a business meeting in the Fall, not associated with the Annual Meeting, and likely at the CIES Secretariat (currently in Albany, New York).

   b. **Options and considerations:**
      
      i. No change in current practice. This requires no additional considerations.
      
      ii. Including new items in the CIES Operating Budget to provide for Executive Committee travel, lodging and per diems for attending the Annual Meeting and the proposed Fall business meeting, if approved.

       1. **Further considerations**
          
          a. Per Diems could be set at the CONUS or US Dept of State figures for the conference venues.
          
          b. Negotiations with Annual Meeting venues can include a request/requirement for complementary rooms which can be allocated to Executive Committee members. It seems that
this practice is fairly common and can substantially reduce the cost of supporting Executive Committee attendance to the Annual Meeting.

c. Questions before the Committee
   i. Do we recommend a change in current practices that would require that the operating budget of the Society make allocations to cover expenses for the Executive Committee members to attend the Annual Meeting and the Fall Business Meeting if approved?
   ii. If we recommend such a change, what further recommendations (if any) do we have regarding how this supported is budgeted?
   iii. If we do not recommend such a change, do we have other recommendations or considerations we would like to put before the Board of Directors concerning this issue?

d. Discussion
   i. Among those that participated in the discussion, there was not strong support for the idea of covering in full the travel expenses of executive committee members.
   ii. Counterarguments to the issue of supporting executive committee member travel included:
      1. Objections on the grounds of affordability: it was argued that even if justifiable, the Society may not be able to afford reimbursement of these costs.
      2. Objections on the grounds of personal returns to Executive Committee members: It was argued that the prestige and professional / academic recognition accrued through Executive Committee membership warrant an investment on the part of those members and / or their institutions.
      3. Objections on the grounds of priorities: It was argued that other potential uses of CIES funds should take precedence over support for Executive Committee travel expenses, one example offered was supporting overseas students to travel to the Annual Meeting.
      4. Objections on the grounds of departure from budgetary model of the Comparative Education Review: It was argued that budgeting for Executive Committee travel should not differ from the model for such budgeting followed by the Comparative Education Review. There was further concern voiced that expenses such as those discussed have the potential to entail a sacrifice of the quality of the Comparative Education Review.
   iii. Participants in the discussion however supported the idea that any support for Executive Committee member travel should be limited, if it happens at
all, the figures of a $500 or a $1000 dollar flat grant for such travel were mentioned. One consideration expressed is that no such support should exceed the levels of support budgeted by the Comparative Education Review for the travel of the editors.

6. Fundraising

a. Explanation: A number of Executive Committee members believe that there has arisen a tacit expectation that CIES Presidents devote considerable effort (and are expected to be very successful) in fundraising for the Society. The perception is that this expectation seems to be the same irrespective of the specific profiles of strengths and skills that each President brings to the role. There have clearly been fundraising activities (for example, to fund awards and recognitions) although the Society has not formulated an explicit policy in this regard. Additionally, there is no comprehensive registry of past Society fundraising efforts and the networks, relationships and other resources that are involved. There is also currently discussion of the possibility of introducing a new figure into the Society governance, an Executive Director, that would be accountable to the President, Executive Committee and Board of Directors. Some of the models currently discussed for the Executive Directors, include making this person responsible for fundraising.

b. Further considerations:
   i. There is considerable confusion at present regarding the scope and extent of fundraising activities conducted up until now.
   ii. There is also some disagreement regarding what precisely constitutes fundraising
   iii. There are a number of specific policy considerations that substantial and systematic fundraising efforts entail. One example is the question of charitable remainder trusts, in regards to which the question arises of whether or not the Society can attract and grow these types of endowments by agreeing to cover the legal costs.
   iv. Another example is the question of fundraising that is conditioned on the Society's agreement to match funds. What should the policy of the Society be regarding these? Providing matching funds introduces new constraints on the Society's budget and a purposive consideration of policies that might help enhance fundraising without introducing undue constraints on the Society's budget may be in order
   v. There are also calls for the careful documentation and systematization of information regarding fundraising activities carried out in the past, including information on philanthropies, networks, contact people, etc.
   vi. Questions before the committee:
1. Do we recommend that the Board of Directors set explicit policies regarding Society fundraising activities?
2. If so, do we have recommendations on a process whereby such a policy should be formulated?
3. Do we also have recommendations for the Board of Directors regarding issues such as:
   a. Specific goals and priorities we would like to see in the Policy
   b. Specific forms of coordination and monitoring of fundraising initiatives.
   c. Specific goals or methods for compiling and sharing information on fundraising activities, successful and unsuccessful efforts, important networks and other resources, and best practices.

   c. Discussion
      i. Among those that participated in the discussion, there were varying opinions and concerns.
         1. The limited scope of fundraising: Committee members felt that fundraising has been circumscribed to efforts to secure some funds to defray conference expenses, almost always obtained from the home institutions of the Vice President - or to taking advantage of unique opportunities to establish or contribute to specific endowments.
         2. The lack of a mandate for fundraising: Committee members are concerned at the emergence of the idea of a presidential mandate to raise funds. This is not a constitutionally defined function of the presidency, vice-presidency or president-elect and is not otherwise formulated in CIES policy.
         3. The goals of fundraising: One opinion was that fundraising should be addressed to specific initiatives and not for general Society expenses. This being the case, the CIES committee advancing such a project or initiative would be in the best position to carry out fundraising, not a possible Executive Director or similar figure.
         4. A University Development Office model: Another opinion was that the CIES could regard fundraising as similar in function to university development offices, and that perhaps an Executive Director would be an appropriate figure following that model

7. Recommendations
   a. Debate in the Committee arrived at no specific recommendations regarding policy in funds allocation to support Executive Committee travel-related expenses, nor regarding Fundraising activities. However, there are two courses of action that the
Committee recommends that the Board of Directors and Executive Committee consider:

i. **Recommendation 1:** If the question of allocation of funds for support of Executive Committee is deemed to warrant further consideration, a new committee should be formed to explore the issue. It is further recommended that:
   1. The Chair of such a committee not be either a member of the Executive Committee, the CIES Secretariat, or anyone else that might be viewed a potential beneficiary of policy changes that the Ad-Hoc Committee might recommend.
   2. Similarly, that any such persons as might be regarded as potential beneficiaries be a minority in any such Ad-Hoc Committee.

ii. **Recommendation 2:** Fundraising questions entail a number of considerations that should be assessed independently from the allocation of funds to support the Executive Committee. Should this issue be viewed as a priority, an Ad-Hoc Committee focusing on this alone could be formed, it is further recommended that:
   1. Such a committee include in its charge an examination of the mandate - tacit or explicit - that Presidents regard fundraising as a priority of their role.