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I. Introduction

It has been an honor to serve as the vice-president, president elect and president of CIES, I look forward to 2011-2012 in which I will serve as past president. My work over the past three years builds on the work of others that have come before me. I especially would like to thank former President Henry Levin, past-President Gita Steiner Khamsi, President-elect Ratna Ghosh, and Vice-President David Baker for their work and support. Similarly the members of the Executive Committee and the CIES Secretariat and Treasurer--past and present--deserve recognition for their work to keep CIES running throughout the year. I am humbled by the excellent work and dedication of the members of the CIES Standing and Ad Hoc Committees who have an amazing intellectual capacity to envision and construct a bright future for CIES. A special mention is due to the work of our historian Erwin Epstein who helps us operate within the framework of the CIES constitution and bylaws, his work as parliamentarian and advisor is of great value to CIES.

What follows is a summary of the state of the society and of the work that has been accomplished on behalf of CIES over the last year. I do include a short report on the innovations introduced in CIES 2010 and reflections for future conferences.

II. State of CIES

a. Growth in Membership

According to the publisher’s report, the CIES membership continues to increase overall with its highest numbers in 2010 when the conference was held in Chicago for both USA members (1,399) and foreign members (664). There was a 12% increase in the number of members in 2010 over the number of members in 2009 with higher numbers for foreign members (above 14%).

---

1 The CIES Constitution specifies the following duties for the president: a. Represent the Society in keeping with its purpose; b. Serve as Chair of the Board of Directors and as Chair of the Executive Committee; c. After consultation with the Executive Committee, appoint the Nominating Committee; chair from among members not holding office in the Society; d. Establish ad hoc committees and appoint chairs of these committees; e. Serve as ex officio on Committees other than the Nominating Committee; f. Preside at the Annual Meeting and give the Presidential Address; g. Plan the business agendas and conduct the Meeting on the State of the Society at the Annual Meeting; h. In consultation with the Secretary, authorize those regional meetings, which may be held under Society auspices; i. Sign or authorize warrants on the Treasurer for disbursements other than those fixed amounts authorized by vote of the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee; j. Appoint a minimum of three tellers to tally election ballots and count other votes at the Annual Meeting. k. Appoint Society representatives to organizations with which the Society is affiliated; and l. Perform other duties consistent with the office.

2 While the highest numbers among the USA are students the reverse is true among foreign members; although the trend shows that in both cases students are coming to CIES in higher proportions.
Also according to the publisher’s report institutional subscriptions show a decrease of 2.1% in 2010 compared with a decrease of 6.5% in 2009. The highest institutional membership levels (958) occurred in 2008 (when the meeting was held in NYC immediately before AERA). Nevertheless given the economic downturn that began to be fully felt in 2010 the institutional subscriptions are only 3.7% below those in 2007 (this is good news!). The decrease in institutional subscriptions comes mostly from USA based institutions. For what I know so far about the 2011 conference we may be over the economic hard times and see a surge of subscriptions this year.

Overall in 2010 we had a record number of 3,093 individual and institutional USA and foreign members for a total increase of 6.7% in membership.

The change to an annual subscription schedule was done in 2010 and it does not seem to have negatively affected journal subscriptions. The CER publisher UCP deserves recognition for carrying out this smooth transition.

I have borrowed the nice graph produced by Michael Cunningham University of Chicago Press to illustrate trends in the CIES membership from 2007 to 2010.

![Graph showing CIES Membership Monthly Totals from 2007 to 2010](image)


b. Comparative Education Review impact factor

There is also good news in terms of the CER impact factor in the “Education and Educational Research” category. According to the UCP report in 2009 the CER ranked 50 in a field of 139 journals with an impact factor of 0.900; calculated as the ratio of the number of cites in 2009 to articles published in 2007-2008; over number of total articles published in 2007-2008. The CER editors need to be congratulated for achieving this milestone which seems to have begun a steadier trend in 2008 when the impact factor jumped from 0.388 in 2007 to 0.860 in 2008 and to the current 0.900 in 2009. My hope is that we can maintain this or a higher level of impact over the coming years since we seemed to have figure out how to achieve this. The financial health of the CER contributes to the financial health of CIES. I encourage you to read the CIES 2010
publisher’s report and the CER editors’ report to see the fantastic job that the CER group does on behalf of CIES.

c. Annual conferences: Instrumental to the financial health of CIES

In addition to the CER, the CIES serves its purposes via the Regional Conferences, and the Annual CIES Conference. The purpose of these conferences is to create a space in time and place for a gathering of Society members and interested public.

Mayor source of revenue - The Annual CIES Conference is usually held in March of each year and is devoted to scholarly and practical exchange, debate and networking. The main conference attracts the most members from all over the world and thanks to the purposeful fundraising efforts of presidents elect and the support they have obtained from their home institutions over the past several years the conference has become the main source of revenue for the society.  

The CIES 2010 Annual Conference - A number of key changes were made for the CIES 2010 Annual Conference:

1. Membership requirement to participate - The requirement that only members could submit papers in 2010 was a change in the right direction and brought an increase in membership and paved the way to this year’s conference requiring membership of all those who attend the conference much in the way that other organizations (such as AERA) function. The move to this policy will likely result in the highest level of membership in the history of CIES and it is a positive change that should be maintained.

2. Increase in registration fees - a review of registration fees charged by other similar conferences/organizations in 2010 revealed that CIES’s fees were comparatively low. The low fees made it quite difficult to, among other things, contract AV services for every room especially when the conferences were held at a hotel rather than at “free of charges” facility such as a university. It was hoped that this modest increase would help pay for the increasing AV costs for every room and other services such as child care, etc. In 2010 the costs of the AV were above 90,000; even with the increase in fees and in spite of my engagement in intense negotiation with the company renting the AV which brought the cost down to a little above 50,000 we were not able to cover all rooms and stay within our budget. Nevertheless and as we continue to build our reserves we should be able to more comfortably contract quality hotels and services for the annual conference. As previously reported, the increase in fees did not have any negative effect on attendance or levels of membership, a big accomplishment given the economic downturn.

3 Over the past few years presidents-elect have been strongly supported by their home institutions/ universities. In fact in my view it is the home university that have made possible the ongoing success of CIES certainly since the conference was held in Stanford. The latest 2010 conference generously supported by Michigan State University is the latest case. In addition presidents elect have also managed to raise funds from a number of organizations with a commitment to CIES such as AED, IEA, and ETS among others. This trend is a positive one which should be maintained in these and other creative ways.
3. Diversifying the format of the Conference – For the 2010 conference I made the decision to diversify the format of the conference as well as the requirements for abstract submission and review. These changes were seen positively by the majority of the participants (see the 2010 Membership Survey results) in the addendum to this report.

The addition of pre-conference professional development workshops, round tables, poster sessions, and workshop-type sessions to the traditional paper sessions and panels that had dominated CIES conferences in the past, allowed more flexibility and creativity when sharing our work. The diversity of formats brought challenges in the management of the abstract submission, review and notification. Meeting these challenges was possible thanks to the introduction to CIES of the All Academic system\(^4\) which was put into limited use first for the 2009 conference, and became fully implemented in 2010. The table below shows the number of sessions held in 2010. A total of 46 participants / sessions were rejected / deleted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/SubUnit</th>
<th>New Scholars Committee</th>
<th>Dissertation</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Paper Session</th>
<th>Poster Session</th>
<th>Roundtable Session</th>
<th>Special Session</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Session Total</th>
<th>Individual Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Total:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D Total:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted Total:</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The criteria for proposal submission to the 2010 conference was more rigorous than in the past allowing for more clarity in the development and review of the proposals for acceptance to the conference. While understanding that this was the first time CIES has implemented such guidelines and that innovations often require fine-tuning, the evaluation of the conference revealed that a majority of participants favored this process because it allowed them to develop better papers for and raised the quality of the presentations (see answers to questions 15-19 of the CIES members and non-members survey). More than 80% of the respondents suggested to keep the detailed guidelines; and close to 50% asked that the new length of the proposal be kept to 1000 words, and close to 30% asked that we try to arrive at a middle point say 750 words. Only 20% asked to go back to the 250 word abstract. I hope that in future conferences we go back to this more rigorous process as it raises the scholarly profile of the conference and helps potential presenters develop better their papers/presentations. In addition the more rigorous criteria allowed potential presenters to have in depth conversations with their advisors in order to come up with a proposal that meet the requirement for acceptance in the conference program.

\(^4\) All Academic, Inc.® helps to administer the meeting program online, streamline online submission and review, and provide immediate access to members worldwide. The system helps program chairs organize the call for abstracts, collecting and reviewing submissions for use as poster sessions, symposia, etc. Helps to place the program online, and organizes and produces a ready to print abstract book.
5. Abstract evaluation – The results of the proposal reviews showed that the major problems for failed proposals were lack of clarity with methods or with theory (see figure below). This is to my knowledge the first time we are able to evaluate the weaknesses in the proposals submitted to CIES in this manner. The more simple criteria of “relevance of topic for CIES or SIG” seemed to be too broad and less helpful for reviewers to discriminate the quality of a proposal as most papers submissions were deemed “relevant”.

6. Evaluation of the conference and of other CIES activities - A survey monkey was developed containing 30 questions and administered to members and non-members of CIES. The results are contained in the PDF files labeled “2010 Member Survey” and “2010 Non-Member Survey”. The summary of the responses are enclosed with this report (see addendum to the president report in the Secretariat website). In addition to containing important information regarding views on the different features of the 2010 conference to help plan future conferences, the survey included a series of questions asking members and non-members about their knowledge of key CIES activities, committees and officers. Most of the answers fell in the “not too knowledgeable” or “not at all knowledgeable” categories indicating that much work needs to be done in this respect.

III. The future of CIES: Ad Hoc Committees appointed in 2010

In order to move ahead the work of the society this year I appointed a number of Ad Hoc committees: the Futures Committees and the Review Committees (see Appendix 2 for the list of all committees-standing and Ad Hoc working on behalf of CIES in 2010-2011). The full reports of these committees are included in the Secretariat’s website along with the other reports.

In particular for the Ad Hoc Futures Sub-Committees a number of meetings have been held to discuss the various mandates and emerging ideas that will help shape the CIES in the future. In particular a meeting was held in East Lansing, at Michigan State University on February 24 to 26 to begin to think about issues having to do with transitions, fundraising and allocation of funds and the future of the CIES scholarship. In addition reports from the various Review Committees
were presented and discussed. A proposal for a consultative meeting with the Executive Directors emerged. In March 31st and April 1st members of the Ad Hoc Sub-Committees and available members of the Executive Committee had a teleconference for a total of 6 hours of consultative meeting in preparation for the Annual Meeting with the Board of Directors (BOD) in Montreal. The agenda and results of these consultative meetings are contained in the minutes in Appendix 3. Important action points will be derived from these and discussed in the meetings of the BOD in Montreal. Among these is the consideration of (a) an Executive Director to aid in the increasingly demanding administrative tasks that are now primarily in the hands of the president; (b) the integration of the many systems that CIES uses to carry out its daily activities and its annual conferences; these include: the secretariat website, the registrar website, the annual conference website, the All Academic website, and the information systems used by the University of Chicago Press; (c) better ways to think about how we construct, promote and reward comparative scholarship; (d) the ways we work in the many CIES standing committees and SIGs and whether CIES as an organization is responsive to these constituencies and how in turn these constituencies activities contribute to the stated goals of CIES.

IV. A new Secretariat and a new Treasurer for CIES for the next 3 years.

In 9/23/2010 I signed on behalf of CIES a new Secretariat and a new Treasurer located in the University of Albany. The Secretariat and Treasurer will function for 3 years and will help in the many transitions currently under consideration for the society as proposed by the Futures Committee such as the possibility of an Executive Director, the integration of a website, and how to increase a sense of community and the level and quality of comparative scholarship in times of a fast growing membership.

V. A conference organizer for 3 more years

After a RFP three conference organizers expressed their intention to submit a proposal. At the end U. Maryland withdrew and two companies submitted proposals. In 1/27/2011 the Board of Directors approved Indiana University Conferences as the conference organizer for a period of 3 years. They will be working with David Baker who will be organizing the 2012 conference, and with the organizers of the 2013 and 2014 conferences.

VI. Historian renewal for 3 more years

I asked Dr. Epstein to consider renewing for a second three-year term. The Executive Committee recommended that I carry out an evaluation of the office of the historian as part of a new wave of review processes that may be instituted for CIES Officers. Enclosed please find my report describing the process I followed and a zip file with the materials submitted by Dr. Epstein and the letters from the reviewers (the letter I sent to the BOD is included in an Appendix in this report; the zip file is available from the CIES Secretariat). Out of 15 voting board members 13 voted in favor of renewing the Historian for a second term, 1 member voted to table to the meeting. Erwin was excluded from the vote.
VII. Constitution Review

I have asked the historian to carry out a thorough review of the Constitution and the Bylaws. I am thankful to Dr. Epstein for the careful attention to much needed changes to this living document. I am also thankful to the Board of Directors for the careful reading and consideration of these changes. The review is ongoing and will be a major agenda item in the meetings of the BOD in Montreal.

VIII. Old agenda item

The report by the Investment Committee (Peter Moock, chair) mentions an old item that was not resolved in the BOD discussions in Chicago. That is the proposal to hire a competent financial advisor to help with investment decisions. I have included a memo prepared by Hilary Landorf in this regard in Appendix 5. I have been in contact with Peter Moock and I have asked him to move this item forward for BOD consideration and vote.

Finally I would like to express my deep appreciation to all the wonderful colleagues who have supported me over the last 3 years.

Respectfully submitted Saturday April 16, 2011.
Revised April 20, 2011 (editing changes made to Appendix 2 only).
Revised April 26, 2011 (editing changes made to Appendix 2 only).
## Appendix 1 CIES 2010 Annual Conference Summary Budget Report

### 2010 CIES Annual Conference Summary Sheet

**Conference Name:** CIES  
**Starting Date:** March 1 - 5, 2010  
**Chairman:** Maria Teresa Tato  
**Attendance:** 1,479  
**Coordinator:** Drew Norris  
**Last Revised:** June 4, 2010  
**Draft Number:** Draft R (w onsite)

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Registration fees</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$230,837</td>
<td>$230,837</td>
<td>$238,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exhibitor Table/Ads</td>
<td>$11,100</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$11,100</td>
<td>$10,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Campus Support</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Income</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$441.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Payments (SIG's &amp; chargebacks)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-$6,867.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$35,100</td>
<td>$230,837</td>
<td>$265,937</td>
<td>$243,116.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Food service</td>
<td>$16,807</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$16,807</td>
<td>$16,804.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Housing</td>
<td>$1,716</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,716</td>
<td>$2,700.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meeting rooms</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Audiovisual</td>
<td>$50,699</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$50,699</td>
<td>$50,464.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transportation</td>
<td>$2,462</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,462</td>
<td>$3,452.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Labor</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Honoraria</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exhibitor Tables Rentals</td>
<td>$3,374</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,374</td>
<td>$3,392.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Printing</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7,536</td>
<td>$7,536</td>
<td>$6,152.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Duplicating</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$1,907.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Postage</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$42.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All Academic</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Supplies</td>
<td>$4,144</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,144</td>
<td>$3,941.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Poster Boards</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Name badges</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Entertainment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Signage</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Desired Profit</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Registration Services</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$25,122</td>
<td>$25,122</td>
<td>$25,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Hotel Grauity &amp; Service Charge</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Contingency</td>
<td>$8,788.80</td>
<td>$2,612.64</td>
<td>$11,401.44</td>
<td>$4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. University admin. charge</td>
<td>$4,457.11</td>
<td>$1,234.47</td>
<td>$5,691.58</td>
<td>$3.134.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Hotel/Motel tax</td>
<td>$264.26</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$264.26</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. State sales tax</td>
<td>$1,932.81</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,932.81</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Conference management fee</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$146,802.97</td>
<td>$36,505.11</td>
<td>$183,308.09</td>
<td>$139,033.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECONCILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
<th>Net Total</th>
<th>Per Person Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>$265,937</td>
<td>$183,308</td>
<td>$82,629</td>
<td>$124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$183,308</td>
<td>$139,033.74</td>
<td>$44,274.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Total</strong></td>
<td>$82,629</td>
<td>$44,274.26</td>
<td>$38,354.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPOSIT:** No deposit is required if IU Conferences is receiving registration fees. If IU Conferences is not receiving registration fees, a deposit equal to 50% of estimated expenses is due two weeks prior to symposium.

### Explanation of Items

1. Registration fees: $0.00 (Early Member), $230,837 (Regular Member)
2. Exhibitor Table/Ads: $11,100
3. Campus Support: $24,000
4. Other Income: $0.00
5. Payments (SIG's & chargebacks): $0.00
6. Total Income: $265,937
7. Food service: $16,807
8. Housing: $1,716
9. Meeting rooms: $0.00
10. Audiovisual: $50,699
11. Transportation: $2,462
12. Labor: $14,500
13. Honoraria: $3,500
14. Exhibitor Tables Rentals: $3,374
15. Printing: $7,536
16. Duplicating: $1,038
17. Postage: $0.00
18. Name badges: $0.00
19. Entertainment: $1,500
20. Signage: $120
21. Registration Services: $25,122
22. Hotel Grauity & Service Charge: $0.00
23. Contingency: $8,788.80
24. University admin. charge: $4,457.11
25. Hotel/Motel tax: $264.26
26. State sales tax: $1,932.81
27. Conference management fee: $21,500
28. Total Expenses: $183,308.09
29. Net Total: $82,629
30. Per Person Expenses: $124
## Appendix 2
### SLATE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDING COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>Iveta Silova*</td>
<td>Peggy Kong, University of Hong Kong, Patricia K. Kubow, Bowling Green State University, Noel McGinn, Harvard University, Aleesha Taylor, Open Society Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lehigh University, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Carlos Ornelas*</td>
<td>Laura Portnoi, Fernanda Pineda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Gail Kelly</td>
<td>Kristin Phillips*</td>
<td>Inna Gorlova, Gustavo Fischman, Ernesto Treviño</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-George Bereday</td>
<td>Noah Sobe*</td>
<td>Joseph Tobin, David Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Honorary Fellows</td>
<td>Francisco Ramirez*</td>
<td>Bob Arnove, Reitumetse Mabokela, Emily Hannum, Andreas Kazamas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Vilma Seeberg*, Regina Cortina*</td>
<td>Erin Murphy-Graham, Lauren Ila Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UREAG</td>
<td>Kelly McFaden and Emefa Omoako *</td>
<td>Rachel Anderson, Jing Fu, Daniel Gakunga, Leslie Graybeal (this group was selected during UREAG's exec mtg, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Scholars</td>
<td>Nicole Ortegon* &amp; Saamira Halabi*</td>
<td>Desmond Odugu, Jose Cossa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Peter Moock*</td>
<td>R. Mabokela, M. Carnoy, A. Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ad Hoc Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Cain</td>
<td>Kassie Freeman*</td>
<td>Ailie Cleghorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Kirk Award</td>
<td>Karen Monkman*</td>
<td>Karen Mundy, Claudia Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel Award</td>
<td>Beatrice Avalos*</td>
<td>Suzanne Majhanovich, Maslak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ad Hoc Presidential Committees (Futures and Review)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures Committees CIES:</td>
<td>Rateh*</td>
<td>Ratna Ghosh, David Baker, Gita Steiner-Khamsi (D), Hank Levin (D), Bob Arnove, Christopher Collins, Peter Jones, Jason Lane, Alan Wagner, Peter Moock, Alex Wiseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-co on: Transitions such as:</td>
<td>David Baker*</td>
<td>Karen Biraimah, Inese Berzina-Pitcher, Gilbert Valverde, Saamira Halabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive director, new secretariat transition, consolidation of conference planner, website, membership, SIGs and young scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-co on: Allocation of funds &amp; fundraising according to CIES needs such as:</td>
<td>Gilbert Valverde*</td>
<td>Wagner, Post, Hilary Landorf, Ginsburg Peter Moock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel expenses for officers, hiring exec. Director, fundraising possibilities, student &amp; senior membership privileges, liability insurance, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Co. on: Development of Comparative Scholarship</td>
<td>Aaron Benavot*</td>
<td>Michele Schweisfurth, Ayaz Naseem, Beatrice Avalos, Susan Street, Jurgen Schriewer, Sangeeta Kamat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Latin American Scholarship for Comparative and International Research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ A systematic examination of what constitutes scholarship in CIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Others such as scholarship for special workshops, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Reorganization of other awards that may function as scholarships such as UREAG, New Scholars, Jackie Kirk Book Award, International Travel Award (?)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Chair(s)</td>
<td>Other Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Committee between the CIES and the Chicago Press</td>
<td>Ruth Hayhoe*</td>
<td>Steve Klees, Steve Heynemann, Epstein, David Post (ex-officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution Review</td>
<td>Erwin Epstein*</td>
<td>Bob Lawson, David Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Committees</td>
<td>Alex Wiseman*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Erin Murphy-Graham</td>
<td>Vilma Seeberg, Regina Cortina, Lauren Ila Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>T. Tatto*</td>
<td>V. Masserman, A. Wiseman, M. Hanson, Mark Bray, Bob Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG review</td>
<td>Paula Hunt*, James William Jacob*</td>
<td>Ailie Cleghorn, Fernanda Pineda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Scholars Co. review</td>
<td>James Williams*</td>
<td>Rhiannon Williams, Nicole Ortegon, Sarah Fuller, Inese Berzina-Pitcher and Patrick Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Awards Co Review (Gail Kelly, George Bereday, Honorary Fellows, Joyce Cain, Jackie Kirk, International Travel Award)</td>
<td>Joel Samoff*</td>
<td>Marco Aurelio Navarro Leal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=Member was invited by did not respond to invitation; D=Member was invited but declined.
* Denotes chair of committee.
## Appendix 3

### Advancement of CIES Ad Hoc Co. Meeting
February 24-26, 2011
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI, United States

#### Final Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day / Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday February 23, 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:00 Room EH 222</td>
<td>Erwin Epstein (follow-up from 2/2) “Comparative, Global, and International Education Research: What makes them similar/different?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday February 24, 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 9:30</td>
<td>Transition issues: the Executive director, support for the new secretariat, consolidation of conference planner cycles, website, membership, SIGs and young scholars</td>
<td>David Baker [Ratna may join from 9-9:30am]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-11:00</td>
<td>Allocation of funds &amp; fundraising issues according to CIES needs such as travel expenses for officers, hiring exec. Director, fundraising possibilities, student &amp; senior membership privileges, liability insurance, etc.</td>
<td>Valverde [Treasurer joins via Skype and also Peter Moock] and David Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Constitution Report</td>
<td>Erwin Epstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>Working Lunch: Development of Comparative Scholarship</td>
<td>Aaron Benavot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:00</td>
<td>Report on SIGs</td>
<td>William James Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 16:00</td>
<td>Report on NSC</td>
<td>James Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:00</td>
<td>Transition issues (continued)</td>
<td>Berzina-Pitcher [Secretariat joins via Skype]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:00</td>
<td>Reflections on the day and implications for changes in the Constitution n/Bylaws</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-8:pm</td>
<td>Dinner at the State Room at the Kellogg Center MSU Campus</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday February 25, 2011 [Room 133F]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 9:00 @ Room 116A</td>
<td>Allocation of funds &amp; fundraising issues (continued)</td>
<td>Valverde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:45</td>
<td>Transition issues (continued)</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>The development of comparative scholarship (continued)</td>
<td>Aaron Benavot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11:00 – 13:00 Room 132 CIES Panel Presentation
“Constructing global communities of learners.”
  Baker, Benavot, Valverde
  Moderator: Tato

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13:00 – 14:30 | Working Lunch: Awards Review Co.           | Joel Samoff joins us via skype at 13:30 – 14:30
|               |                                             | Skype: js3527 |
| 14:30-15:00   | Coffee Break                               | Tato       |
| 15:00 – 17:00 | Conclusion and next steps and looking forward to the BOD meetings in Montreal. | Tato |

Saturday February 26, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Specifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:00</td>
<td>Working breakfast</td>
<td>Baker, Valverde &amp; Tato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Itinerary Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Itinerary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epstein</td>
<td>Feb. 23: leave ORD at 10:40 am on AA5007, arrive Flint at 12:35 pm. Rent economy car @ $140. Arrive MSU at 2 pm. Feb. 25: leave Flint at 1 pm on AA 5007, arrive ORD 1:10 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benavot</td>
<td>Feb 23 leaves ALB 4:15 PM, arrives LAN 8:11 PM, Feb 26 leaves LAN 8:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Feb 23 leave SCE 5:00 PM, arrives LAN 8:11 PM, Feb 26 leaves LAN 12:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valverde</td>
<td>Feb 23 leaves ALB 4:15 PM, arrives LAN 8:11 PM, Feb 27 leaves LAN 12:05 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda in Detail.

**Constitution - Epstein**

The report will include the many proposed constitutional revisions that you have already seen; how possibly to incorporate CIECAP and similar projects into the Constitution and Bylaws; the prospect of altering the Constitution/Bylaws on the wording in regard the CIES Archive to include potential linkages such as that with the Hoover Institution; and the issue of needing a Publications Committee or Manager or Coordinator; and the value of having a Constitutional Committee as a standing committee. In other words, the agenda could look something like this:

1) Proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws, including changes to the Awards Handbook.
2) Prospects for constitutional revisions to incorporate CIECAP and other such projects.
3) Prospects for constitutional revisions to incorporate potential institutional linkages with the CIES Archive.
4) The issue of need for a Publications Committee, Manager, or Coordinator.
5) The issue of having a Constitutional Committee as a Standing Committee and what form it might take.
Futures – Baker

1) Half time Executive Director
2) Systems management and integration (Berzina-Pitcher et al.)
3) Budget for planning of 2012 conference
4) Initiation of work with Alan and Secretariat

Scholarship – Benavot

1) Various ideas of how to improve the quality of research and scholarship presented at the annual meetings
2) Whether the current set of awards and scholarships can be reorganized in any way?
3) Examine the criteria used by different award/scholarship committees (eg UREAG, New Scholars, Jackie Kirk, International Travel, as well as those used for awards within SIGs) and discuss whether there is a need for greater standardization; and if so, what form such standardization might take.
4) Advance the idea of a Latin American Scholarship for Comparative and International Research in memory of C. Braslavsky

Fundraising – Valverde

1) Allocation of funds & fundraising according to CIES needs such as travel expenses for officers, hiring exec. Director, fundraising possibilities, student & senior membership privileges, liability insurance, etc.
2) In addition to considering funding for activities of officers of the Society in General, consider expenses for the Editors of the CER and the historian.
Appendix 3 (continued)

Consultative Meeting of CIES Executive, Futures, and Review Committees in Preparation for the Exec Co Meeting and the BOD Meeting at the CIES Annual Conference in Montreal
March 31, 2011
Teleconference

Present: Maria Teresa Tatoo, Ratna Ghosh, Jason Lane, Alan Wagner, Erwin Epstein, Gilbert Valverde, Aaron Benavot, Gita Steiner-Khamsi (joined later in the meeting), Treisy Romero.

William James Jacob joined the conversation at 11:00am to address the report of the SIG Review Committee.

David Post was not able to participate due to technical difficulties. He joined for a few minutes.

Issues on the agenda:

- Executive Director
- Website integration
- Fundraising and funds allocation
- Changes to the Constitution
- Historian Review

Meeting commences at 9:10am

Tatto points out that the discussion of proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws will likely take a longer time, thus proposes to leave that for a future meeting. Epstein mentions that what Lane has proposed to move forward on this issue is a good idea (which is to select those topics on which there are no concerns and vote on them to be approved, while for those items on which there are concerns or observations then proceed with the discussion).

Ghosh suggests that in order to facilitate the discussion among the Board of Directors there be a space online, an online forum or chat resource. She supports what Lane has proposed and suggests that this process is followed on the web. Lane agrees to establish an online resource to develop the discussion by the end of the following week, to inform members about it and request the vote on the continuation of the historian.

Tatto proposes that since Joel Samoff has not been able to finish the report on awards, the revision of the report on awards be postponed for next week. She adds that Benavot and Samoff will get together to discuss the work they each are doing with their committees and bring together their common points. Tatoo also mentions that Wiseman, who is chair of the Review Committees, will do a summary of the reports of all committees. Some people will have additional reports next week.

Allocation of Funds and Fundraising Committee report

Valverde comments that he circulated the agenda after meeting in East Lansing. However, there there are some things that are not clear. The response to the circulation of the agenda focused more on a tangential matter: the issue of the Executive Director (ED). Although it wasn’t central, it was the item
that most people wanted clarity on. The questions were addressed by David Post with the attempt to
develop what an ED might be. Only a couple of committee members have participated requesting that
the ED’s actions be further detailed. The main issue is to establish the priorities for the committee.

Tatto clarifies that the name of the committee is *Allocation of funds and fundraising.* It originally
emerged given the huge mandate to move the Society forward and thinking of ways to do it. Now the
most urgent thing is to discuss the ED and the website issues.

Valverde had prioritized items during the meeting in East Lansing. Fundraising, however, has come to
the fore of the issues. He had attempted to focus most of the discussion on the items to support the
work of the Executive Committee. He raises the question of what the Executive Committee (EC) would
want to prioritize.

Epstein points out that it’s hard to think about issues without having the budget at hand.

Wagner states that part of the budget for this year is laid out, but that there are still some budget items
that have to be dealt with, and a question is whether the budget would incorporate items that are being
discussed now. He suggests working with the previous year’s budget with some modifications. Epstein
supports that the 2010 budget be distributed being that given the number of demands and proposals
put out it would be impossible to have this years’ at this point. Wagner agrees to have budget sent later
in the day. Ghosh agrees with Epstein but adds that having more knowledge on the disbursements to
date, would give good idea of what is happening.

Epstein suggests that Wagner make a list of all proposals for expenditures, with those provided in
Valverde’s committee report and the proposals he sent for hiring help for the archives. He also suggests
making a list of all the different proposals. Wagner agrees to send the budget later in the day and the list
of expenditures and proposals next week. This will allow to project possible expenses and establish
priorities. Ghosh mentions that she would like to see the whole operating budget and also the
investments – the kinds of investments, the returns.

Wagner provides the rough totals: more than half million in net assets. Investment account about
$80,000 in mutual accounts with Wells Fargo; the rest is very liquid, so it has been trending up.

Aaron Benavot joins the conference.

Tatto states that her idea that more thought need to be invested in action number one as stated in the
Future’s report [fundraising]. She also points to the need to schedule meetings outside of the annual
meeting to continue to do this work.

Tatto adds that the main fundraisers have been the president-elects and feels that some of these funds
should be allocated for the operation of CIES. It would better if we decide on important items and have
them as line-items in the budget such as for meetings with the Executive Committee (EC) without having
to negotiate every time. She raises the question of the possibility to financially support several meetings
of the EC, and to propose the policies and procedures to do this. Once we have an ED his/her main role
would be to “run” CIES business and raise funds under the BOD.

Epstein agrees but raises one question: fundraising for what? He points to the need to set the priorities
of expenditures. He adds that the idea of the EC meeting is of high priority; the EC used to meet once a
year outside annual meeting; those meetings were important and should be restituted. He suggests
doing them once a year.
Lane agrees stating that the organization calls for that the meeting of the EC more than once a year. His concern is fundraising for meeting expenses, which should be established as operating costs in the annual budget.

Tatto proposes to have money allocated so that there is one trip a year for the EC and to add this as an action item.

Epstein states that this is something that in general terms would be incorporated to the Bylaws. Ghosh supports that notion.

Tatto proposes to have this incorporated into the budget. She also points out that travel expenses need to be assigned to the president who travels during the year to regional meetings, for example, and that there should be more than the amount set aside in the budget ($500) for discretionary use.

Valverde raises his concerns over the issue: one, being able to have a worthy product by the Montreal meeting, with the several issues raised. He is not clear on the guidance given to his committee. He had assumed priority was to be given to the allocation of funds. There’s still the question of whether this committee should be looking at specific recommendations to support the EC.

Tatto clarifies that the priority of the committee has always been the fundraising. She mentions the existence of the investment committee for the allocation of funds.

Ghosh adds to Tatto’s points the need to consider travel expenses of past presidents to the CIES meeting and to add this as a budget item. Epstein agrees.

Ghosh points out the need for the funds to be targeted when doing fundraising. Funds should be assigned for a specific activity. She adds that the money from membership should be used for operating costs. Tattoo agrees but supports the idea that they can also be raised for the operating costs of the organization.

Epstein brings up the need to have a list of all endowments that have already achieved; in order to show prospective funds, it should be first clear what has already been accomplished. Tattoo adds to this point the need to also list the expenses for which there is no endowment, such as the New Scholars awards.

Valverde agrees to work on what appear to be the central items for the committee to work with and to circulate them within 2 days. He clarifies the expectations: collect information of successful fundraisers of the past regarding their approaches, connections, networks which may be useful to have a systematic source to build on. Tattoo clarifies that the committee should only, with respect to the issue of support for the EC, make recommendations about how to support its work. Epstein and Ghosh agree.

**Development of CIE Scholarship**

Benavot states the 3 issues the committee was charged with: 1) To establish a scholarship for Latin American (LA) scholars after Cecilia Braslavsky. The proposal has been submitted with the reports distributed; 2) Examination of the awards given by the society, both CIES awards and SIG’s awards. This includes a discussion of the extent of these awards, criteria used and other questions raised. From the discussion at Michigan State it was decided to await some of the work that Samoff has been doing, who has agreed to expand his view of many of these matters because of his experience and knowledge about the history of awards; 3) The issue of scholarship in the society. The main idea that has emerged is to
think of scholarship not as an object but as a process. He refers to the question raised by Steiner-Khamsi, to which he specified a couple of scenarios regarding the Braslavsky Award. He is open to suggestions with respect to the work of the committee.

Epstein commends on the work of the committee. He raises the problem that a set of criteria hasn’t been set in terms of proposals for awards- criteria for endowments, for memorial awards for outstanding work, for non-honorific awards such as the international travel award (ITA). He highlights the need to establish criteria and review resources for awards.

Benavot states this is something that is being worked on to discuss at the annual meeting. He intends to use the process of the Braslavsky award and expose the criteria being used to define the LA scholarship for the board to consider how reasonable this criteria is and if it should be used with future award proposals.

Ghosh points out that the Committee should consider as criteria that there should not be an award which is not funded, even if it’s not fully funded it should have some funds of its own.

Tatto comments that it is also important to establish what should be defined as an award. Ghosh agrees and adds that awards should be categorized.

David Post raises his concern for Bereday Award which is not funded. Tatto states that this is also something that should be considered as part of the budget and fundraising.

Benavot points to the need to address all issues: standardization in criteria, guidelines, funding, endowment.

Epstein raises a constitutional issue: the Bereday and Kelly Awards are incorporated into the bylaws; others are not yet. It would be difficult to delete these 2 awards. So there should be caution in what is incorporated into the Bylaws about awards.

Ghosh points out that fundraising is not enough. It should be an endowment which should be kept and its generated interest used. Unless there’s an endowment there should not be an award.

Epstein expands that there is a standing investment committee and that maybe its provision should include fundraising. Tatto recalled having proposed it but Carnoy said no, that the investment committee invests.

Valverde expresses his concern that the discussion is not only towards funding for different goals, but that issue of having a new officer whose main role is fundraising. He suggests there may be a need for some standing group of the society to overlook that part. He agrees to make a recommendation in this sense.

Tatto commends on the work of the committees represented in the meeting.

Benavot suggests that the discussion is carried out by email while Samoff and he have the chance to discuss the issues, and once the outline is defined it can be decided if it’s sufficiently developed to share with the rest of the Board.
Constitution and Bylaws review

Epstein expresses that the changes to the constitution is an ongoing process, a major reason why he proposes to have a committee. This proposal of changes to the constitution is the most extensive since a lot of ideas in these had been neglected and ignored. He encourages the approval of a standing constitution committee.

Tatto extends her appreciation to Epstein for his work and expresses her concern on how to make the constitution more known to the membership. She also points out that there is not a good induction process for society’s elected vice presidents or other board members on these matters.

Tatto raises the question for meetings the following week, one with the board of directors to discuss constitutional changes, and another meeting related to the Benavot and Samoff’s committee’s work.

A program is tentatively scheduled for Thursday from 9 to 11.

SIG Review Committee.

Jacob provided the conclusions of their work with SIGs chairs, based on qualitative feedback. They interviewed all SIG leaders, about 30 chairs. A survey was also sent out a survey to the CIES membership. The report will be ready on the 21st and Sent to Tattoo and the Secretariat.

Gita Steiner-Khamsi joins the teleconference.

Epstein points out that the survey made by the committee was very well done. He raises the following issues: (1) are guidelines for the admission of new sigs going to be established? Is the only requirement that 15 people join to admit a SIG? (2) are SIGs going to have their own website, newsletters? There should be some kind of control over them since they are a face of the Society. He suggests the future publications committee might be able to assist in that regard.

Lane comments that there are also liability issues in terms of publications. There has to be insurance for CER. If any of SIGs want to formally associate with the journal that’s another issue. SIGs are not aware that they need approval from board for several things.

Tatto asks whether a provision about this has been put in the Bylaws. Ghosh supports the notion and the need to establish controls for SIGs.

Epstein identifies the provision in this regard: Art 4 section 5 i: the SIG committee shall advice the Board of Directors on admission of SIGs’. The committee would be obliged to report to the Board on all proposals.

Regarding publications Epstein refers to the proposal for the publications committee.

Tatto expresses the need to communicate all this to the SIGs.

Jacob comments on the gap in leadership in the SIG’s that occurs due to the discontinuity from leader to leader, who always have to re-learn. The proposal from the committee is to establish 2 chairs and have differed transitions so that the can knowhow be given to the new leader.

Steiner-Khamsi suggests that before giving the proposal to the Board, feedback from the SIGs be obtained.
The issue of governance of SIGs is raised by Ghosh. Epstein points out that nothing in the bylaws stipulates how SIG chairs are appointed. Steiner-Khamsi comments that it can be a matter of governance.

Jacob comments that from the interviews it’s evident there’s no overarching procedure as to how SIGs appoint leaders and that there’s no continuity. Some are appointed; others follow a democratic process, others volunteer. There’s not even a term limit.

Ghosh opines that there should be some regularity and it should be defined. The question is whether they should appoint their chairs or establish guidelines.

Tatto comments on the importance of distinguishing between what would be regulated of SIGs: when SIGs represent CIES in publications, websites, awards, but in terms of governance they basically should follow a principle of self governance.

Benavot suggest that Jacob and the Committee look carefully at the proposed changes in the Bylaws and reflect in the report any particular thoughts as well as the concerns not reflected in the proposal to provide the Board the opportunity to consider those as well.

Regarding the submission of the reports Steiner-Khamsi suggests that a short version of the report be provided to the Board by the 15th of April, given the difficulty in finishing the complete report by this deadline.

In relation to the highlighted panels that SIG’s are assigned during the conference Steiner-Khamsi suggests that they only be given one highlighted session. Ghosh agrees; having many makes the highlighted characteristic lose significance. Valverde questions that the number of highlighted panels assigned is based on the membership number and not on the substance of their proposed topics. Jacob and Ghosh agree.

Epstein raises the question of the hold on accepting or approving new sigs and when it expires. Tattoo clarifies that it would be in the next Board meeting, when clear criteria is established. The BOD voted to establish this hold in the last annual conference due to the lack of clear guidance.

**CER Liason Committee.**

David Post has left the line; Epstein comments on the committees’ work.

Epstein comments on the committee asked for information from UChicago Press. The journal is in very good shape. Editors have done a very good job. UCPress also has done a good job. There are still some questions from the information Michael Cunningham provided that need to be considered. Epstein suggests that the deficit periods are linked to the year 2000-2001, when the CER was delayed for almost a year. He mentions as one of the issues the change in the impact factor in a certain period. He adds that there has been a large increase in the number of complimentary subscriptions and the questions remain as to why. He adds as a third point that membership data access should be made more convenient for the Secretariat.

Benavot suggests that the explanation for the change in CER impact factor is that previously book reviews and even bibliographical essays were included in the pool of articles to be checked and to be cited, decreasing the ratio of cited material from CER. When Post asked to exlude that material from the pool, the impact factor went up.
Agenda for following day meeting, from  9-11am: Discuss Transitions Committee work and information on the budget.

Meeting is adjourned at 11:42

Consultative Meeting of CIES Executive, Futures, and Review Committees  
April 1st, 2011  
Teleconference

Present: Maria Teresa Tatto, Ratna Ghosh (has to leave early), Jason Lane, Alan Wagner, Erwin Epstein, Gilbert Valverde (joins later), Aaron Benavot, David Baker (for an hour), Treisy Romero.

James Williams joined the conversation at 10:20am to address the report of the New Scholars Review Committee.

Issues on the agenda:

- Budget
- Executive Director
- Website integration
- New Scholars Review

Executive Director

Baker mentions that the charge of the board for the Committee was to look at the possible models for Executive Director. After the preliminary research, the Committee came up with a proposal to present to the board. The decision to make is whether the Society should bring in an individual manager or work with a firm. Given the functions being requested of the position and the size of the Society he suggests appointing an individual person. Firms manage associations larger than CIES. The Committee needs to propose the job responsibilities, the kind of model, where the ED would be located, if it is a full of half time position, the degree of professionalization, if ED is required to do fundraising, be a face of the Society, and the pros and cons of different approaches. All of these have implications for the kind of person to be hired. The salary is estimated at $70 – $80,000 a year for full time. If it is somebody behind the scenes the salary would go down.

Tatto commends the Committee on their good work and detailed work and points to the need to establish a time frame to carry this out.

Baker comments on the possibility of the transition to the ED happening while the Secretariat is at Albany, for another two years. In addition, the Committee has to consider the role of the Secretariat in the transition and with the hiring of an ED.

Lane suggests to have a transition plan ready to be approved by the board for next year’s annual meeting and to establish a committee to examine the propositions and how the management issues would change. However Tattoo suggests the process moves much faster. By that time, possible ED’s would have been interviewed. Baker agrees with having the transition move faster but also agrees that
it is necessary to take the time to analyze the issues. Lane proposes a 6 month timeline and meeting in the Fall to move things forward. A meeting of the EC is suggested by Baker to discuss the timeline, while the people appointed to the Committee would analyze the proposals. People possibly proposed to be in the committee are Tatto, Lane, Baker, Landorf, Ginsburg.

Tatto suggests clarifying in the proposal that the ED would not substitute the role of the president, but only working in management related activities to relieve the president of these tasks, mainly fundraising. Baker agrees, adding that the ED would be accountable to the Society leadership and to the board. Accountability mechanisms would have to be established. He proposes to have a memo and circulate it next week in order to have a report by April 15th.

Epstein asks to consider that it is necessary to keep in mind the need to work with the historian throughout this work in order to regard the changes this would imply for the Constitution.

[The revised proposal for the ED is included at the end of these minutes]

**Website**

Regarding the Website Baker refers to the plan presented in the East Lansing meeting: to hire a firm to come up with an integrated website that would be stored on browsers and that could be used for the conference and by the Society. The conference planner wouldn’t have to redesign a website.

Tatto comments that the interchange with the firm proposing the website design has been extensive and recognizes that it is expensive work. They sent a more detailed estimate. She suggests appointing a committee to establish the specifications for the website design proposal and after they are approved by the board to announce the request for bids in order to consider the choices, other estimates, and decide.

Baker agrees. He points out that it is a high expense, 70-80,000, although a one time and asks to consider whether it makes sense to do it.

Tatto points out that it takes time to go through with the bidders to help them understand the complexity of the changes proposed, given all the different elements (websites and systems) involved. It was necessary, for example, to talk to Cunningham, to understand what he manages – membership issues, All Academic, the local website for the conference, the registration website (managed by the conference organizer), and finally the Secretariat website; what they offer is integrate all these systems. In addition part of the additional money included in the proposal is for maintenance of the system.

Lane clarifies that the annual fee is $18,000 a year.

Tatto adds that working with all academic and UCPress is a huge undertaking. The work that Cunningham does every year is overwhelming because he has to do everything all over again with All Academic. He has repeatedly pointed out that this is not his job.

Tatto comments that part of the previous Secretariat’s proposal was to actually engage in the website. Currently with Baker as chair of the Committee on transitions he would be in charge, although Baker’s suggestion is that the Secretariat takes the lead. Lane notes that the budget originally proposed by the Albany Secretariat team was not approved.

Baker proposes that both, he and Lane, can come up with a plan to gather more information and send this forward, given his current work overload. Lane agrees.
Tatto comments that it would be convenient to have Baker on the Committee on transitions and secretariat to work together in order to integrate a strategy to help the Secretariat be more effective. Lane agrees to have the website and ED issues included in the agenda.

Budget

Wagner clarifies that the Secretariat has been working with the 2010 budget in the absence of the 2011, which will be approved in May. The current expenditures have been based on the 2010 budget with some adjustments for which the Secretariat has solicited approval from the BOD, for example the additional $100 from the $900 budgeted needed for the election process. The 2012 budget is also being put together to present in the same meeting. He clarifies that the budget is established on a yearly basis, depending on the kinds of activities in which there seems to be the need to spend and on the estimates for them. He is additionally considered items derived from the current discussions.

Tatto points out that she does not see the conference income and expenses reflected in the 2010 budget.

Wagner clarifies that the conference budget is presented, organized and approved separately. The conference is only reflected in the general budget in terms of advances for conference expenditures, for example the advance just sent for the reception at the Montreal conference, and in the net revenue generated by the conference, considered for future expenses. Expenditures and income of the conference are not detailed in the Society budget.

Tatto points out that she believes there should special line that reflects the conference expenses and revenues since it the main source of income to CIES for operating expenses. It appears that the conference income is not reflected at all in the budget.

Wagner agrees and clarifies that this is the way it has been presented and is not certain of how or why it is presented in this manner. However, what was sent to EC members was not the entire financial report, it was only the 2010 budget, only to have a basis for discussion of the proposals.

Tatto suggests formulating, if reasonable, a budget for CIES that will include the conference. Wagner clarifies that it would only include projected expenses, not revenue.

Lane points out that it is being worked on. However, since the income from the conference can only be predicted it is not to be approved by the BOD and it is not included in the budget. But the profit statement would reflect the profit from the 2010 conference.

Epstein comments that having a list of all requests of all committee and officer reports will be essential when the BOD is asked to approve requests. Wagner adds that there may be some requests without a figure attached.

Tatto raises her concern over the approval of matching funds. Approving the matching of funds continuously decreases the funds of the Society, funds that would be considered for other expenses, such as the hiring of the ED or website. Matching funds should be approved when there is enough money backing up. This is why the issue of raising funds is fundamental. Tattoo points out the need to know how much money there is and how much can realistically be offered to an ED for a year before this person starts raising funds to support his own salary; how much money there is for the integration of the website, which raises the question of how much money should be saved in order to remain financially stable. It’s also important to educate the Board about this.
Wagner points out that the Society has budgeted very conservatively, which addresses the point of the inclusion of the conference revenues in the budget. More revenue than has been budgeted has been generated from the membership, thus, revenues have extensively covered the expenditures approved. If all sources of revenue were regarded, there would probably be about $200,000 a year in income predicted. Those are the revenue streams. But there are one time expenditures to consider and also just how sustainable the sources of revenue are. Thus, broad parameters are considered. These figures are important in establishing a reserve.

Lane clarifies what the sources of revenue are: (1) the guaranteed stream, which is the membership income through Chicago Press. This is the revenue considered for the budget; (2) a percentage of excess profits, from $30 – 45000, which can be expected each year from CER, regardless of membership or journals. This is given that the contract stipulates that if they make over an additional $100,000 the profits are split. And given that it has become a requirement for conference participation to be a member of CIES, membership revenue has increased; (3) that conference organizers have been raising over $100,000 over the past years. But this is something that can’t be guaranteed. This, if budget is made considering revenue there is the risk of being left without money. The fact that there’s independence on how conferences are run, then a profit is not guaranteed.

Epstein agrees and adds that at some point conferences were carrying large deficits. Thus, this supports the need to have a reserve.

Lane proposes that a financial explanation be given to all Board members during the annual meeting. Tattoo and Epstein agree seeing it as the basis for Board members to be able to judge the large investment proposals being considered.

**New Scholars Review**

James Williams joins to provide a summary of the report of the New Scholars Review Committee. He states that the committee was charged with the definition of ‘new scholars’, making recommendations to the board, preparing a manual, time line, or booklet to help the New Scholars Committee prepare activities during the year. In coming up with a definition, William highlights that 45% of CIES members are students. A distinction was made between new scholars and established scholars. There new scholars who are simply new to the academic field, students and those who are in the early stages of the career. The NS dissertation workshop reached a small group of that larger number. Over the last years a series of activities have been set up – workshops, networking activities, to help NS face particular issues as they try to become part of the established scholars community. A poll was carried out to get feedback on what new scholars should be doing that and how to do that. The report of the Committee includes a historical review, issues of governance, and activities at the conference. In relation to the conference the committee points out that the activities planned for the NS often compete with other events which reduced their opportunity to network with some of the more established scholars. The report points out the need to foster interaction between established and new scholars, through different kinds of activities. The committee is working on proposing some of these activities.

Tatto commends on the report of the NS Review Committee. She raises the concern for the extent to which opportunities for interaction between established and new scholars are fostered for NS and to what extent the activities segregate NS. This would mean NS are taken away from important opportunities to see a more holistic view of what CIES is.

Williams agrees with the concern. However, the work of the committee has diminished such concern. The dissertation workshops take about 60 people away people form conference, including faculty. There
doesn’t seem to be an overlap of NS activities with the plenary, and segregated activities are few. New scholars have particular kinds of activities but these are open to everyone.

Tatto suggests the committee to propose specific action items.

Williams mentions that recommendations were made, although not framed as action items. The committee recommends: to develop technology to improve communication among CIES community; that a subcommittee structure according to function be formalized; and a new governance approach for the NS committee, plus other suggestions included in the report.

Tatto questions on whether it would be convenient to have the chairs of the committees present their reports to the BOD. Lane suggests having those reports presented which have critical or important items for discussion. He further suggests that committees also consider the issue of fundraising. To this Epstein adds that most reports are good ones but emphasize consumption of resources and not what they can do to raise funds. This should be something required of all committees. It is important for them to be aware that asking for funds implies using valuable resources. Tatto agrees that it is something to be included in the proposals – plans to raise funds –, pointing out that NS is a group that uses a lot of resources, and expresses disagreement with the uneven distribution of resources among groups.

A final clarification is made on the Constitution and Bylaws issues. Epstein emphasizes the need to regard the Constitution in addition to the Bylaws. Lane agrees to send the result of voting the following week.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00am.
March 28, 2011

Dear CIES Board of Directors:

Dr. Epstein’s three-year term as Historian will end in May, 2011.

I have asked Dr. Epstein to consider renewing for a second three-year term.

The CIES Executive Committee recommended that I carry out an evaluation of the office of the historian as part of a new wave of review processes that may be instituted for CIES Officers.

Accordingly and after asking members of the Executive Committee for nominations for reviewers I asked seven CIES scholars with experience in the workings of CIES and with experience as historians, and who are familiar with the work of the historian to serve as reviewers for Dr. Epstein’s work over the last three years. Two said they could not do justice to the review because they were overbooked until CIES. Five agreed to do the review.

In preparation for this review I asked Dr. Epstein to prepare a report of his work over the last three years and I also submitted his annual report for this year.

I asked the reviewers to submit a short report (2-3 pages) addressing how in their view Dr. Epstein had addressed the mandate stated in the CIES Constitution. Also I asked them for help in “looking towards the future”. I reminded them that according to the CIES Constitution the historian is expected to:

ARTICLE III. OFFICER DUTIES. Section 7. The Historian shall:
a. Serve as advisor to Society officers on matters of historical fact and process and ensure that the historically significant documents and records of the Society are collected by the archives;
b. Supervise the work of organizing and cataloging the Society’s files and records;
c. Report annually to the Board of Directors, and on special request, about the state of the Society archives;
d. Supervise the collection of new documents, facilitate research projects, and coordinate communications with other collections related to the archives of the Society; and
e. Serve as parliamentarian in Society meetings.

Enclosed please find the letters from the reviewers and two pieces of the several materials I sent to the reviewers: Dr. Epstein Three Year Report and the CIES Historian Annual Report 2010.

Please vote yes or not to renewing Dr. Epstein as a CIES Historian for another 3-year term.

Send your vote to me with a copy to the CIES Secretariat.
I would like to have your vote within a week.

Warm regards,

María Teresa Tatto
CIES President

Reviewers were M. Bray, M. Hanson, V. Masemann, R. Lawson, A. Wisemann.
Executive Summary

As of November 2009, our amount in liquidity is $379,873, allocated in our checking and saving accounts. Our CD account in Bank of America holds $66,920, and in Wachovia, $73,063. We plan on investing $200,000 this year, and $20,000 each additional year for the next 5 years, expecting 4% of return over inflation. We could accept 5% loss over a three-month period, 5% over a one-year period, and 2.5% over a five-year period.

Investment Objectives

CIES has as financial goal to gain $12,000, or 4%, and to have $65,000 in liquidity on a regular basis for the following 5 years, assuming that our income and expenses remain stable. Estimated costs of these financial costs are $1,000 for every year, for the following 5 years.

Investment Philosophy

CIES considers a pivotal aspect to maximize the financial benefits that our members could receive (in the form of quality conferences and reduced rates) through wise investment decisions. Our liquidity mainly comes from membership dues and conference revenues, and we strive to offer back to CIES the fruit of careful investment.
Our philosophy regarding risk is to minimize losses and to make responsible and informed investments. CIES will gear all investment efforts towards having a solid, reliable core.

In regards to diversification, CIES would like an evenly balanced and diverse portfolio so as to minimize risk. However, given the limited resources in tracking and managing the CIES portfolio, the investment instruments should not be too numerous.

In regards to costs, CIES will seek to maximize the use of the money, choosing the best offers, yet not lowering our quality standards.

Since we are a non-profit organization, we are tax-exempt. However, we file our tax return every year. Our philosophy about taxes is that careful book keeping, in spite of our tax-exempt status, will help us to maintain this status and also be accountable internally.

**Investment Selection Criteria**

CIES investment selection criteria for mutual funds are as follows:

Low-risk with growth at a minimum of 4% annually.

CIES investment selection criteria for stocks are as follows:

A minimum of AA-rated stocks at a minimum of 4% annual return.

**Monitoring Procedures**

The CIES appointed officer, the Treasurer, will monitor the portfolio on a monthly basis, and she/he will determine how well the investments are doing based upon the feedback of our investment advisor and the Bank’s advisor. In order to determine how well CIES portfolio is doing and to determine whether losses fall within our accepted range, the same procedure will be followed.