

# Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale

Volume 46

Issue 2 *50 Years of Comparative and International Education: Looking Back and Envisioning Forward*

Article 4

September 2017

## OISE-CIDEC-CIESC 50-year relationship: Lessons learned in leadership, mentorship, partnerships, identity and innovation

Mary A. Drinkwater

*OISE-University of Toronto*, [mary.drinkwater@utoronto.ca](mailto:mary.drinkwater@utoronto.ca)

Stephen Bahry

*OISE-University of Toronto*, [stephen.bahry@gmail.com](mailto:stephen.bahry@gmail.com)

Teodora Ajanovska Gligorova

*OISE-University of Toronto*, [teodora.ajanovskagligorova@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:teodora.ajanovskagligorova@mail.utoronto.ca)

Melissa Beaugard

*OISE-University of Toronto*, [melissa.beaugard@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:melissa.beaugard@mail.utoronto.ca)

Wales Wong

*OISE-University of Toronto*, [stristessa@gmail.com](mailto:stristessa@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci>

### Recommended Citation

Drinkwater, Mary A.; Bahry, Stephen; Gligorova, Teodora Ajanovska; Beaugard, Melissa; and Wong, Wales (2017) "OISE-CIDEC-CIESC 50-year relationship: Lessons learned in leadership, mentorship, partnerships, identity and innovation," *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale*: Vol. 46 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.

Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol46/iss2/4>

This Research paper/Rapport de recherche is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale* by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact [tadam@uwo.ca](mailto:tadam@uwo.ca).

**OISE-CIDEC-CIESC 50-year relationship:  
Lessons learned in leadership, mentorship, partnerships, identity and innovation  
Une relation de 50 ans entre OISE-CIDEC-SCÉCI : Leçons apprises sur le leadership, le  
mentorat, les partenariats, l'identité et l'innovation**

**Mary Drinkwater**, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
**Stephen Bahry**, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
**Teodora Ajanovska-Gligorova**, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
**Melissa Beauregard**, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
**Wales Wong**, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

**Abstract**

As we approach the 50th anniversary of CIESC, we heed Vandra Masemann's call to "gather and reflect on our historical memory" and to strive to "build our identity and broaden our reach". Data for this paper were gathered through a combination of interviews and document analysis. Interviews were conducted with 9 current and former OISE-CIDEC faculty and staff. Documents reviewed included: CIDEC newsletters, annual reports, director/co-director reports, CIE Journal and other academic journal article reviews, and book reviews. In order to trace the evolution of the relationship between OISE-CIDEC and CIESC, we undertook a chronological analysis broken into three sections: The Formative Years: CE at University of Toronto; OISE-CIECS relationship; Leadership and partnerships: OISE-CIDEC, CIESC and beyond; Issues of naming & identity (1960s-90s); Becoming Millennials: Impacts of globalization, internationalism and technology; and finally Post-50th Anniversary (2017): Taking the OISE-CIDEC-CIESC lessons forward.

**Résumé**

Comme nous nous approchons du 50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de la SCÉCI, nous tenons en compte l'appel de Vandra Masemann « de rassembler et de réfléchir sur notre mémoire historique » et de nous efforcer à « construire notre identité et élargir notre portée. » Les données pour cet article ont été recueillies en combinant des entretiens et l'analyse de document. Les entretiens ont été menés auprès de 9 actuels et anciens membres de la faculté et du personnel d'OISE-CIDEC. Les documents analysés comprenaient : les bulletins d'information de CIDEC, les rapports annuels, les rapports de directeur/co-directeur, la Revue ÉCI et d'autres critiques d'article et critiques de livre de revue académique. Afin de retracer l'évolution de la relation entre OISE-CIDEC et la SCÉCI, nous avons effectué une analyse chronologique divisée en trois sections : Les Années Formatrices : CE à l'Université de Toronto ; relation entre OISE-SCÉCI ; Leadership et partenariats : OISE-CIDEC, SCÉCI et au-delà ; Problèmes de dénomination et d'identité (années 1960-1990) ; Devenir Millénaires : Impacts de la mondialisation, de l'internationalisme et de la technologie ; et finalement, Post-50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire (2017) : Apprendre des leçons de l'OISE-CIDEC-SCÉCI pour aller de l'avant.

**Keywords:** historical memory, identity, leadership, mentorship, relationships/  
partnerships, OISE-CIDEC-CIESC, globalization, technology, innovation

**Mots-clés :** mémoire historique ; identité ; leadership ; mentorat ; relations/partenariats ;  
OISE-CIDE-SCÉCI ; mondialisation ; technologie ; innovation

**Introduction**

As CIE practitioners excitedly anticipate CIESC's golden jubilee celebration at CSSE 2017 in Toronto, CIE's special issue is particularly relevant to OISE, whose own 50th anniversary was in 2015. A team of OISE-CIDEC students and researchers accordingly decided to examine the 50-year relationship between CIESC, OISE, and its research and programmatic centre (CIDEC), and how they have contributed to our field in our own institution, nationally and internationally.

Guided by Vandra Masemann's call to "gather and reflect on our historical memory" and to strive to "build our identity and broaden our reach" (personal communication, Feb 14, 2017), we have focused on leadership, mentorship, partnership and network development, creating and shifting CIE identities, technology and innovation.

Our findings are grounded in the review of CIDEDEC newsletters, annual reports, director/co-director reports, CIE Journal and other academic journal articles, book reviews, and interviews with 9 current and former OISE-CIDEDEC faculty, students staff and alumni. These were analyzed, coded, and are now presented, following three broad themes: 1) The Formative Years: CE at University of Toronto; The OISE-CIECS relationship; Leadership and partnerships: OISE-CIDEDEC, CIESC and beyond; Issues of naming & identity; 2) Becoming Millennials: Impacts of globalization, internationalism and technology; and concluding with 3) Post-50th Anniversary (2017): Taking the OISE-CIDEDEC-CIESC lessons forward.

## **The Formative Years (1960s-90s)**

### ***Introduction of comparative education to University of Toronto***

Our field began to blossom at the University of Toronto as early as 1954 when Andrew Skinner came from Scotland to the then Ontario College of Education (OCE), where he infused comparative methods into his courses. There was a core of faculty including Andrew Skinner, John Mallea, Keith McLeod, Jack Holland and David N. Wilson who taught a number of courses that introduced students to the methods and value of *comparison* in education in order to learn more about policy, programming and pedagogy. Courses and topics often covered units of comparison within Canada, internationally, and cross-culturally. At that time, Masemann noted, female faculty and faculty from diverse cultural backgrounds were rare or absent in comparative education, as in Canadian higher education generally (personal communication, Feb 14, 2017).

A decade later, OISE was founded in 1965 as a stand-alone research institute under the Ministry of Education, whose Minister, Bill Davis, later premier, wished to "promote the infusion of new ideas in the system" (Gidney, 1999, p. 5). While the College of Education, later the Faculty of Education of University of Toronto, was responsible for teacher preparation, OISE was responsible for graduate education, basic and applied research, dissemination of findings, and field development activities in education. Key comparative education faculty included Andrew Skinner, John Mallea, Keith McLeod, David Wilson, Joe Farrell, David Livingstone and Vandra Masemann. Even in these early years, Mallea believed that the pressure to look internationally often took comparative education scholars away from important research and scholarship within Canada itself. As Mallea recalls "we were so quick to jump internationally, yet there was an abundance of possibilities of comparative and cross-cultural education work within our own country" (personal communication, Feb 6, 2017).

### ***Hope and optimism: OISE-CIESC relationship prior to CIDEDEC; Creation of CIESC (1967)***

It was during these early years that a number of Canadian academics interested in comparative education began to discuss the possibilities of building a Canadian organization of researchers and scholars who held a common interest in this field. As Majhanovich and Lanlin (2008) recount, under the leadership of Joseph Katz (UBC), 20 Canadian scholars, including University of Toronto faculty (Andrew Skinner) were invited to present a special topics panel on *Issues in Canadian education* at the 1966 CIES conference in Chicago. The impetus of this gathering, combined with the enthusiasm of the Canadian contingent to create their own group, quickly led

to the formation of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada (CIESC). Not surprisingly, in these early years during the operation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the importance of the bilingual structure and membership of CIESC was recognized and reflected in the dual translation (English and French) versions of the CIESC Constitution, which were approved at the Learned Societies Conference in Ottawa in June 1967, Canada's centennial year.

By the mid-60s, many academic comparativists in Canada began to feel a sense of hope in national and global institutions for support in comparative and international research. As Vandra Masemann describes "there was a lot of faith around the idea that the United Nations could actually be effective in doing things around the world" (personal communication, Feb 14, 2017). This Canadian faith in multilateral rather than bilateral international organizations was evident shortly after the founding of the CIESC, when Katz began to mobilize national and international colleagues around the formation of the WCCES. Andrew Skinner, who became the second president of CIESC, jumped in to work with Katz and others to help organize the first World Congress in 1970 in Montreal. Joining Skinner at the WCCES debut was another University of Toronto education professor, David Wilson. Masemann also attached this sense of hope to comparative education at OISE in her reflections on the early 1970s. She describes teaching the first women's studies course at OISE, engaging in anthropological and cross-cultural research in West Africa, and participating in a panel with David Wilson at a Canadian Association of African Studies conference. Through the late 70s, other OISE professors who were also very active in CIESC, and served as president included: John Mallea (1975-77) and Shiu Kong (1979-81).

### ***Leadership and partnerships: OISE-CIDEC, CIESC and beyond***

At the institutional level, the importance of leadership in the creation and further development of comparative education was highlighted by many interviewed. Masemann argued that strong leadership was essential during the foundational years of CIDEC to address the fragmenting or tangential nature of a cross-cutting or cross-institutional embedding of CIE (personal communication, Feb 14, 2017). She notes that such leadership was seen during the foundational years at OISE under the leadership and active involvement of Joe Farrell and David Wilson. In addition to the formal programmatic leadership, Masemann also spoke about the important role of OISE-CIDEC faculty in informal leadership, mentorship, student advocacy and professional development. In 1989, under the leadership of Joe Farrell and David Wilson, the collaborative CIDE program began to reach out formally and organically to graduate students and faculty from other departments at OISE to begin to build a community grounded in a common interest in research and praxis in comparative international and development education.

In addition to the collaborative programmatic model, a CIDEC students' association and numerous organically developed special interest groups (SIGs) also began to emerge. Masemann, Wilson and Farrell all stressed the importance of investing time and energy in younger academics and graduate students, and in the importance of creating networks of mentorship within the field (Masemann et al., 2010; Wilson, 1994). Masemann played a key role in supporting students' academic professional development through leadership in the annual CIDEC preparatory workshop on conference submission and presentation for students wishing to present at the annual conferences of CIESC, CIES and WCCES. CIDEC further supports students to attend these conferences through travel grants for students working on CIDEC research projects. As Anderson & Niyozov (2013) recount in their CIDEC co-director's report "CIDEC is among the best represented programs at these conferences (p.10).

In addition to the academic course development, Kathy Bickmore (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017) reflected on the visionary role that Masemann played in connecting theory with praxis. In her 1990 CIES presidential address, Masemann took the opportunity to elucidate her vision for the field, stressing the necessity for theory and practice to be more closely aligned, and urged for efforts to close the gap between academics and practitioners. Masemann stood behind this vision in urging and assisting CIDEDEC in the development of the CIDE *Practicum* Course.

In broadening the network beyond OISE-CIDEDEC to CIESC and beyond, numerous faculty were also integrally involved in cross-organizational leadership and partnership development. According to Masemann this cross-organizational leadership is also vital to the connections with CIESC, CIES and WCCES and other educational stakeholders with an interest in CIE, such as governmental, NGO and INGOs. During the 80s and 90s, many OISE-CIDEDEC faculty assumed formal and informal leadership roles within CIESC, as well as within CIES and WCCES. CIESC presidential terms were held by Vandra Masemann (1985-87); David Wilson (1987-89 and 1989-1991); and Eva Krugly-Smolkska (1995-1997). Another OISE-CIDEDEC professor who played a key role in supporting and contributing to the CIESC through the 80s and early 90s was Ruth Hayhoe. Even though Hayhoe was often not able to attend CSSE and CIESC conferences, because of conflicts with her research and teaching schedules in China, her connections with and understanding of the Chinese context and institutions of higher education in China were extremely valuable. Masemann (2008) asserts that the development of links between Canada and China through the overseas aid programmes of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the focus on China in the research of some CIESC members, such as Hayhoe, “influenced the CIESC to also foster links between the organizers of the Canadian and Chinese Congresses” (p. 43). Hayhoe asserts that these opportunities to come to Canada for conferences and to establish connections with CIESC are important for international scholars and institutions, as well as for creating opportunities for the free flow of academic ideas, dialogue and engagement (personal communication, Feb 8, 2017). Through their individual leadership, each of these individuals further shaped the field within CIESC and more broadly, as they brought forward their own perspectives and approaches.

While the CIESC was formally established as an independent organization, and the proposal for the CIESC to have a special relationship with CIES was never formalized, there has been a continuing scholarly exchange between the two organizations. Many CIESC members are also members of the CIES, and several Canadians have served as CIES presidents, including CIDEDEC faculty members Joseph Farrell, Vandra Masemann, David Wilson, Ruth Hayhoe and Karen Mundy. Hayhoe believes that Canadian leadership within both organizations has helped CIESC to establish its position as a parallel organization of CIES (personal communication, Feb 8, 2017). Masemann recounts that during the 1980s, CIESC became very involved in the tripartite relationship with CIES and WCCES with the scholars “bouncing *around* from one organization to the other” (personal communication, Feb 17, 2017). At the same time as Masemann and Wilson were leading CIESC, Joe Farrell was heavily involved in CIES. The intersections of these leadership roles created an opportunity for some important policy and program initiatives. During the period of 1985-1991, Masemann held what she describes as the “triple crown” of presidencies, serving as president of CIESC, CIES and WCCES. Masemann mused that “at one point, she was writing letters to her varying personae, in the varying leadership roles she held. The overlapping or interconnected leadership roles among these three organizations were vital in building and strengthening the relationship between them; identifying issues that were common across the organizations; and, working together to create solutions”

(personal communication, Feb 17, 2017). Yet, these partnerships or relationships were not without tensions and disagreement.

Even though the CIESC was established as a distinct society from the CIES, it does not have an independent status in Canada as it is currently federated with the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) that includes several national constituent associations. This ‘nesting model’ has provided both opportunities and challenges over the past 50 years for CIESC. In 1972 the CIESC became one of five founding associations within the CSSE. Consequently, as Majhanovich & Lanlin (2008) noted “membership in both the CSSE and the CIESC has been a requirement for CIESC members – something that could cause difficulties for international scholars who may be only interested in joining the CIESC” (p.174). Majhanovich & Lanlin also drew attention to the fact that “the CIESC executive was not unanimous in the decision to become an affiliate of the CSSE” and that many members had reservations about this relationship (2008, p.175). While there is an ongoing debate between members around whether CIESC is strong enough to stand on its own, Ruth Hayhoe (OISE) feels that the nesting model may serve the future of CIESC well in an era of globalization and with a vision of internationalizing institutions of higher education (personal communication, Feb 8, 2017).

### ***Naming and identity issues in comparative education: CIDEDEC’s identity within OISE***

During the discussions and debates around the formation of the collaborative CIDE program at OISE, numerous questions arose around its name and identity. Although David Wilson, in his 1994 CIES presidential address *Comparative and International Education: Fraternal or Siamese Twins?* had begun to unpack some of the issues arising from the relationship between the two major subfields in CIES, he did not tackle the aspect of *development* which was added to the name of the new OISE collaborative comparative education program that officially started in 1989. This section of the paper will discuss some of the issues, tensions and considerations that the founders and current faculty at OISE-CIDEDEC have had related to the rationale and visioning to call our program CIDE and our centre CIDEDEC. It will also begin to explore the implications for each of the individual aspects (comparative, international, development) on the program and field.

*Comparative Aspect.* One purpose of comparative education is to seek hidden aspects of our own and others’ practices and assumptions through comparison. Those wishing to assess the curriculum, for example, were typically formed by that very curriculum, and are thus likely to judge it as good. For such critics, adequate principles for identifying its inadequacy are found “by those who through some chance have moved outside the society by memory or by thought” (Grant, 1991, p. 131). Yet comparative education can explicitly go beyond chance to move us outside our own experience, sometimes bringing us up short to confront unexamined assumptions and arrive at new understandings.

Professor Skinner in his time at the Faculty of Education of the University of Toronto (FEUT) saw comparative education as potentially making a valuable contribution in this country, saying “Canada itself, within its own very extensive boundaries, offers wide scope and opportunity for enlightening comparative studies in education” (1972, p. 5). Similarly, in a classroom lecture in 2002-2003 in his Comparative International Education methodology course, at CIDEDEC, David Wilson emphasized that any two levels of education could be compared, for example, two Canadian provinces. Bickmore echoed this view, “as the notion of the nation-state has often been contested, so comparative was never *only* seen as necessarily international.” Additionally, Bickmore asserts that there is a need for more critical comparative work in and



outside of Canada on current and emerging issues related to justice, gender, age, centre-periphery, environment (conservation, preservation, decontamination, and political economy)” (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017). Hayhoe further argued not only for the importance of comparison within our field, but also for “infusing all educational studies with a comparative dimension” (personal communication, Feb. 8, 2017).

*International Aspect.* Another aspect of both the CIDE program and CIESC is to seek insight into international aspects of education while not necessarily incorporating comparative perspectives. A single case study of a context outside Canada would constitute an example of international education research, although it might have an implicit comparative purpose. In contrast, a study of two or more cases outside Canada would be both comparative and international. Some further types of international focus that CIDE or CIESC members might engage in are international influences on domestic education systems, the movement of students from an international origin to Canada or some other destination, or the activity of actors other than researchers and policymakers such as practitioners or NGOs in an international context. CIDE professor David Wilson (1994), in his CIES presidential address, noted that after the addition of international education to CES title and mandate we have seen an increase in the fusion of the two represented by practitioner academics who engage in international education project work, analyze this work, and disseminate it in academic forums, moving seamlessly back and forth between the two worlds.

This phenomenon has certainly been evident at CIDE. Hayhoe has been a diplomat at the Canadian Embassy in Beijing and a CIDA project director as well as a comparative education researcher in academia. Recent co-directors of CIDE, Professors Karen Mundy and Sarfaroz Niyozov are currently on academic leave engaged in practical work at the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) and the Institute for Educational Development at Aga Khan University respectively. This fusion of roles can be seen as emergent from both directions, with practitioners becoming academics as well as scholars becoming engaged practitioners. As Hayhoe has pointed out, in a classroom lecture (2003-2004), the Confucian ideal of scholars is not to be separate from, as in the western research university, practical work, but aims to engage in practical and political affairs.

*Development Aspect.* What is distinct about CIDE is its making of this last focus, *development*, one of its mandates. Development education, Harber (2014) argues, has commonly been understood as the study of education for personal, social or economic development, typically *in* the South, *for* the South, but often *by* the North. The term *development* is problematic on several levels. One use of *develop* is as an intransitive verb, describing a process that occurs. This is an organic and teleological metaphor, seeing personal, social or even economic development as a normal part of experience in which change occurs towards some positive end, rather like the physiological maturation of an organism. Yet *develop* can also be used transitively as intentionally acting to promote change towards a given, positive end. Under this metaphor, a seed will not certainly grow to maturity without an agent supplementing or altering the environment, adding fertilizer to the soil and irrigating the field. Dewey sees these two metaphors in tension due to either/or thinking that excludes intermediate categories:

The history of educational theory is marked by opposition between the idea that education is development from within and that it is formation from without; that it is based upon natural endowments and that education is a process of overcoming natural inclinations and substituting in its place habits acquired under external pressure (Dewey, 1938/1997, p. 17).

This second view of development at various times and places has been based on a central premise: that the goal is universal, and that the global North knows the way to achieve that goal, which can be applied universally.

For Wilson (1994), development education was seen as a subset of international education: “My typology of international education also includes the activities of contemporary personnel in bilateral, multilateral, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in national studies, usually related to a development project.” (p. 455). Why then the explicit focus on the D for development in CIDEDEC’s mandate? Masemann saw this as partly related to the research interests and work experience of CIDEDEC’s first co-directors, both of whom had done their dissertations and had ongoing research projects in development education (personal communication, Feb 17, 2017). In the final *visioning* section of this paper, we will revisit some of the tensions, controversies and complexities associated with naming and identity in the field of comparative education and their implications for the future of CIDEDEC and CIESC.

## **Becoming Millennials: Impacts of globalization, internationalism and technology**

### ***Shifting agendas; losing the ‘old guard’; passing on the torch; challenges and opportunities***

The move into the millennium brought with it a number of shifts in the OISE-CIDEDEC leadership, structure and programming as a result of the increasing impacts of neoliberal globalization on higher education, technological innovation and the unfortunate deaths and retirement of three foundational leaders and mentors. Both David Wilson and Joe Farrell passed away on December 8, in 2006 and 2012, respectively. Masemann retired from OISE in 2010, but continues in an adjunct position with CIDEDEC. Since 2005, the CIDEDEC directorship has been assumed by a number of different faculty, including: Karen Mundy, Kathy Bickmore, Sarfaroz Niyozov and Steve Anderson. Carly Manion has also assisted as an acting director.

These transitions have created both challenges and opportunities related to the OISE-CIDEDEC relationship. A review of the CIE Journal since 2006 indicates that OISE-CIDEDEC authors have had 23 articles published in the CIE Journal, yet only one of these authors, Steve Bahry, has served in an active leadership role (program chair, 2012-14) in CIESC. Additionally, a review of the CIDEDEC newsletters since 2005 reflects very limited to no reference to CIESC in many of the newsletters. Interview respondents believe that this shift in the active OISE-CIDEDEC-CIESC relationship may be due to the fact that a number of the previous CIDEDEC directors have themselves had limited active involvement in CIESC. A number of interviewees felt that the decreased involvement in CIESC may be due in part to an increase in the diversification and fragmentation of the field, as a result of globalization. With the increasing number of partner organizations with foci in comparative education, international education or development education, individuals are being pulled in multiple directions with limited time.

Throughout this period, formal and informal leadership from OISE-CIDEDEC faculty and students played a key role in maintaining and sustaining the OISE-CIDEDEC-CIESC relationship, as evidenced by Masemann’s CIESC promotions in CIDEDEC newsletters and Kathy Bickmore and Mark Evans’ participation as members of the CIE Journal review board. However, as Steve Bahry recalls, “if your CIDEDEC professor was not actively involved in CIESC, you received limited to no promotion about CIESC” (personal communication, Mar 12, 2017). For graduate students who studied part-time and were not in regular connection with OISE-CIDEDEC and/or who had limited funds and had to select conferences based on their research interests, this lack of



awareness about CIESC limited their attendance and active participation at the conference. Bahry added that, “as a student, I did not attend many conferences. My focus was on international and developing contexts, and the spread of ideas, practices and reforms globally. I did attend international conferences or conferences with an international area theme (Central Eurasia); however, I did not attend either CIES or CIESC in my early years perhaps because as a part-time student I was not connected to the grapevine (personal communication, 2017). One of the challenges facing graduate students who would like to attend the CIESC/CSSE annual conference is funding. Given the consistent cuts to funding for higher education, the institution by CIESC of the *Graduate Conference Travel Grant*; and the *Michel Laferrière Research Awards* is seen as an important policy to provide some support.

### ***Creating and Widening the Connections: New models and new communication technology***

In June 2014, faculty at OISE-CIDEC and the University of Western Ontario-RICE, led by Sarfaroz Niyozov (CIDEC) and Paul Tarc (RICE) created an innovative comparative education faculty-graduate student symposium entitled *Working with, against and despite global ‘best practices’: Educational conversations around the globe*. This approach to having a smaller, more regional symposium was well received as an easily accessible and cost-effective model for cross-institutional collaboration, networking, support and promotion of academic research and scholarship in comparative education. In addition, with the advent of various forms of communication technology and databases, the CIDEC listserv has provided a vehicle for the dissemination or sharing of information related to comparative and international education. Bickmore added that the listserv was an effective communication and promotion vehicle to assist in the joint coordination of the 2014 OISE/UWO comparative education symposium. Further, Bickmore felt that “one of the reasons why CIDE is so well represented at CIESC and at CIES may be because members of the CIESC and CIES leadership are also members of the CIDEC listserv” (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017). As Grace Karram Stephenson (CIDEC-OISE post-doctoral fellow) reflected, “in a humble way, even relatively simple communication technology, such as the CIDEC listserv, can help to share information, increase networks and mobilize student and faculty within and across OISE and CIESC” (personal communication, Apr 18, 2017).

With the innovations in *smart technology*, additional modes of digital communication began to open new opportunities to create and expand the relationship between OISE-CIDEC, CIECS and beyond. One of the early examples of the use of *smart technology* for enhancing the CIDE/CIESC communication and networking was through the creation of the CIDEC Smart Room at OISE. Under a Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) grant, Karen Mundy, former director of CIDEC, led a group from OISE to write a series of successful CFI grant applications (2007-2011) to create both a graduate student research lab and a *Smart Room* to facilitate teleconferencing and Adobe Connect classroom technology. The Smart Room has been used for research talks, student mock defenses, meetings with CIE partner groups (academic and NGOs) and global classroom connections. The Smart technology has also enabled the recording and live-streaming of guest lectures, seminars and the Joe Farrell Graduate Student Research Conference, which can then be posted on the CIDEC website.

Another example of innovations in partnership creation with and beyond academia was seen through Karen Mundy’s research on global perspectives in education. Although Mundy has had a limited direct connection and involvement in CIESC, her research and scholarship in issues of global governance, combined with her strong connections with educational partners in academia, government, private sector, NGOs and INGOs have pushed our understanding of the

important connections between comparative international education in academia and its implications in the public/government and non-governmental sectors. As Masemann recounts, Mundy was able to combine her role as Chief Technical Officer for the Global Partnership on Education, with her research and scholarship on global governance, and her Canadian experience to take theoretical components related to Global Governance, which were “spawned within the Canadian context of diversity and bilingualism, and embed these in global educational policy”. (personal communication, 2017). In addition, Mundy has been influential in promoting these new paradigms of global educational governance through her involvement in high-level policy formation in organizations such as UNESCO. Her connections to CIESC opened the opportunity for an innovative approach to partnership development in research entitled “CIESC and Global Perspectives in Canadian Education (GPiCE) which won a successful SSHRC grant proposal and was presented at the CIESC pre-conference in 2011. Members of this research partnership included scholars from research institutions across Canada as well as key stakeholders from prominent NGOs such as UNICEF Canada and World Vision.

### **Post-50th Anniversary (2017): Taking the OISE-CIDEC-CIESC lessons forward**

#### ***Identity: Naming, programming, structure***

As we move past our 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary to build and strengthen CIESC, these lessons from OISE-CIDEC and the OISE-CIDEC-CIESC relationship can be sources of reflections and future planning. The tensions, contradictions and complexities of identity within the field of comparative education at OISE-CIDEC, CIESC and globally continue to fuel discussion and debates around naming, programming and structure. The findings in this paper illuminate the diversity of perspectives that exist around the identity of comparative education in Canadian institutions of higher education and within CIESC. Masemann, on returning to Canada from a posting in the USA in the 1970s was told that it was now time “to devote yourself to your Canadian colleagues” (personal communication, Feb 17, 2017). Yet Melissa White felt that CIE in Canada follows a common approach to that of CIES in USA, although nevertheless always from a Canadian perspective (personal communication, 2017). In contrast, Niyozov took a stronger position stating that there was “a great need domestically and internationally for a strong independent voice through CIESC .... establishing a Canadian approach to the field that is not simply CIDE *in* Canada, responding to Canadian issues, and providing comparative analysis of Canadian contexts with each other and with international contexts” (personal communication, Feb 4, 2017).

The dilemma of how to be Canadian within comparative and international education and to achieve recognition for CIESC’s work has recently led the editors of *Canadian and International Education*, CIESC’s journal, to bring a motion to the members to change its name to *Comparative and International Education*. As Bickmore said:

the link to Canada is not *gone*, but you can see how the issues of name and identity illuminate shifts in mission and mandate. This name shift was meant to open the possibilities for *comparative and international education* to be done both within Canada, between Canada and other countries, and internationally....perhaps in an effort to broaden the reach and focus beyond the dominant CIE journal powers in the US and the UK. This has been extraordinarily important because comparative international education theories, research, publications and discourses have been so anchored to those two places (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017).

As the OISE-CIDEC case highlights, in addition to *naming* the field, other tensions and challenges in identity formation arise when it comes to the structural and programmatic elements needed to build an institutional identity. One of the tensions or challenges which was discussed by the early founders of the CIDEC, that continues to exist in many institutions of higher education across Canada, is the lack of a centralized department or centre which focuses on comparative and international education. The CIDEC collaborative program presents a model in which faculty with research and scholarly interests connected to comparative and international education can be hired by specific disciplinary departments, but have an *affiliated designation* to the CIDE program and CIDEC. As elucidated by Hayhoe in a recent interview, this strategy provides opportunities for further collaborative programming, along with academic scholarship that would be directly connected to CIE. This embedding might take the form of either individual faculty within strategic departments focusing on CIE, or alternatively the infusion of all educational studies with elements of international and comparative education.

Kathy Bickmore adds some further considerations for institutions of higher education as they look for innovative approaches to embed comparative international theories and methods across departments within the institution. She points to some lessons learned from the CIDE collaborative program in that although some of the courses delivered by affiliated faculty “include aspects which are *international*, the lens or method of *comparison* is either missing or peculiar” (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017). Bickmore argues that “there is a difference between having other countries involved and having a kind of thoughtful, cross-cultural comparative perspective that takes into account issues such as power, political economy and global relationships” (personal communication, 2017). We would add that this *thin* conception of comparative education theories and methods lacks the criticality, complexity and intersectionality necessary to address many of these issues in a nuanced and meaningful fashion. Critical comparativists, such as Bickmore (2017), Drinkwater (2014) and Niyozov (2013) have argued that notions of development, methodological approaches, analytic approaches and issues of research positionality must be critically engaged with in order to illuminate issues of power, inequity, and marginalization. Drinkwater (2014) calls for a need to move toward *critical comparative education* to guide methodological and analytic approaches for research and scholarship for social justice and transformative education. Similarly, Bahry (2016) challenges educators, researchers and policymakers to rethink uncritical assumptions, and examine what is developed, for what and for whom. Bickmore asserts that these critical comparative lenses and approaches are vital within the CIDEC, CIESC and CIE academic community, as researcher and scholars engage with considerations around approaches to *development* work which be more *multi-directional* rather than *uni-directional* approaches in which “development agents or researchers from the north, who supposedly know more, go to the global south to help them” (personal communication, 2017). New and emerging fields in comparative international and development education, such as democratic peace-building and education in emergencies, are demanding a deeper engagement with research positionality, methodological approaches and analytic approaches which recognize and welcome the complexity and fluidity of the contexts in which the research is taking place.

### ***Wider Reach & Strengthening the Network: Innovative partnerships***

One of the most serious concerns for sustainability of the field in Canada expressed by interviewees in this paper has been the concern about the fragmentation of CIESC faculty across Canada (within their institutions; within CSSE, and also between CIES and CIESC). While some

key individuals from CIDEDEC have played leadership or active roles in CIESC, this paper has highlighted how the current relationship between the two organizations is much more tenuous. A large number of the participants spoke about the strong connections and relationships between OISE-CIDEDEC faculty and graduate students and the CIES and/or other sub-organizations ‘nested’ under CSSE. For instance, many CIDE-affiliated faculty at OISE regularly attend CSSE, but do not present or attend sessions offered by CIESC, as they are attending sessions in their own CIDE-related research areas, such as CASIE, CASEA, CASWE, CACS or CIESC-sponsored SIGs, such as CERN. Many argued that both the impacts of ‘globalization’ and the increasing interest in issues of ‘global or international’ at all levels of education have prompted many Canadian scholars to link more strongly with CIES in order to open up broader international networks. Masemann expresses this sentiment strongly, arguing “we have not even had a close relationship to our colleagues all across Canada, since we have been so interested in being ‘global’” (personal communication, Feb 17, 2017).

In addressing some of these issues, interviewees spoke about the importance of building a stronger identity for the CIESC and increasing efforts to widen and strengthen the network. Taking into account the current decentralization of CIE within Canadian institutions, White believes there is less likelihood that faculty within the same program share interests specifically geared towards CIE (personal communication, 2017). Given this increasingly decentralized approach, a number of interviewees envisioned an important role for CIESC to take the lead in the development and expansion of professional networks to maintain and connect communities of CIE scholarship within Canada. This expanded reach of CIESC might take on many forms in the post 50th anniversary strategic planning. However, an increased virtual presence in facilitating networks can be seen as exceedingly important. Recommendations for this increased virtual presence by Masemann and White include the re-instituting of a directory database, increased use of the organizational listserv, and compelling outreach through social media and other digital platforms (personal communications, 2017).

An additional area for growth and expansion, which frequently came up during interviews was an increased amount of collaboration between CIESC and other professional networks and organizations (Hayhoe, 2017; Mallea, 2017; Masemann, 2017; Sarfaro, 2017). Some interviewees offered some additional considerations around expanding networks and research partnerships beyond academia to include the educational programs of NGOs and government-funded aid agencies in the development aspect of our work in the field. They remarked, in particular, that practitioners and staff related to such agencies are notably present at CIES conferences in the USA, while fewer practitioners, project funders, and NGO and government agency staff are present or attend CIESC. Examples referenced within this paper, point to benefits (and considerations) of thinking outside the traditional mode of comparative education research, which privileges *theoretical knowledge* and research methods arising from institutions of higher education, to open possibilities for diverse educational stakeholders to bring their knowledge, skills, collaboration and contextual understanding to more engaged and critical research projects.

### ***Diversity, Equity, Inclusion***

In addition to expanding the membership of CIESC by number, numerous interviewees spoke of the importance of increasing the diversity, and continuing to strive toward a more inclusive and equitable organization. Sarfaro Niyozov, past director of CIDEDEC, has recently taken on a three-year position of Director of the Institute for Educational Development at the Aga Khan University in Karachi, Pakistan. This opportunity to work in the Central Asian context has given

Niyozov the opportunity to reflect from afar on the role that CIESC can play both in Canada and with international educational scholars and institutions. Niyozov shared the example of his involvement in a 7-year project between 2009-2016, STEP (Strengthening Teacher Education in Pakistan), that was supported by Global Affairs Canada, yet was rarely, if at all, presented or published in Canada. He pushed further to argue that CIESC could play a role in providing, supporting and/or promoting research dissemination opportunities, such as publications, workshops or special topic symposia on comparative education issues, inside and outside Canada, that have often been marginalized in comparative international education journals. Bickmore also suggested that the editorial board of the *CIE journal* could play a role in expanding the network of CIESC by encouraging guest editors from previously marginalized communities across Canada or internationally, to bring forward *special topics* that may not be covered in other comparative education publications, such as the *Comparative Education Review* (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017).

The issue of linguistic diversity within OISE-CIDEC and CIESC was also raised by a number of interviewees, particularly in a bilingual country. *Mais est-ce qu'il est vrai que notre société est divisée, comme l'on a dit auparavant au sujet du pays entier, en deux solitudes?* What then is and should be the place of francophone researchers and CIDE research communicated in French? True, the CIESC journal publishes in French as well as English, the annual conference has every year presentations in French, and at CSSE 2016-University of Calgary, CIESC participated in an initiative to support bilingual presentations through the development of slides in two languages. Yet, as Bahry notes, presentations in French or from francophone institutions in Canada are underrepresented at CIESC conferences with a total of only seven in 2015 – 2016 (personal communication, Mar 12, 2017). For CIESC to be truly the national society for Comparative International (and development) Education, presence of francophone researchers and presentations would have to more thoroughly permeate the society and its activities. The commitment to reach out to francophone colleagues and institutions has varied over time according to Masemann:

We need to find ways to address the French-English communication and engagement. We used to keep all of our minutes in both French and English. .... There is an Association Francophone d'Éducation Comparée (AFEC) and many comparativists in Quebec belong to this organization instead of to CIESC. So we really are not doing very well at recruiting Francophones (personal communication, Feb 17, 2017).

Even within our own institutions, some of the interviewees felt that we often fail to look for opportunities that could lend themselves to comparative education work. An example is demonstrated in OISE's CREFO (Centre de recherches en éducation franco-ontarienne) which is an interdisciplinary research centre focusing largely on issues of educational, social and linguistic practices of the Francophonie in Ontario, Canada and the world. Given the specific work of CREFO around social differences, inequalities and social mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion, there should be some strong connections with comparative theory and methods, particularly critical comparativist approaches. We believe that these types of opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaborative work in CIE would be available in other institutions, as well. As interviewees in this study have recommended, it will take leadership within the CIE network at each institution to 'build these networks' and introduce new colleagues to the broader CIESC community.



### ***Mentoring (new and existing graduate students and faculty)***

In addition to building relationships and networks across departments, a large number of the interviewees felt that it was very important to continue to focus on advocacy for graduate students, both in the OISE-CIDEC program and in CIESC more broadly. Bickmore emphasized that this advocacy “should not just be in the abstract, but in those very tangible steps taken to help strengthen relationships, connect with CIE experience, and build *cultural capital*” (personal communication, Mar 20, 2017). The CIDEC student association (SA) is very active and is creating a broad variety of activities to build community, build skills (in communication and presentation), promote research sharing and engage in informal academic dialogue around emerging issues in comparative education with faculty, fellow students and often outside community groups.

Since its formation in 1989, CIDEC has also taken on a mentorship or facilitation role, like the CIESC, to nurture the organic development of sub-groups within the institution around an emerging theme. For instance, CIDEC has offered support on its website and through promotion in the newsletter and listserve for special interest groups (SIGs) such as the Grupo de Estudios Latinoamericano-OISE, Teachers In CIDE, and Canada-Afghanistan/CentralEurasia Education Research Group. Each of these groups has developed on its own, organically bringing together students and faculty who are interested in a common theme or research focus. Groups create their own meeting schedules and activities to enable members to share research and updates for the purpose of enriching the work of each other and creating collaborative networks between the learning teams. In some ways this is similar to the role that CIESC took on in nurturing the development of CERN as a sub-group under its umbrella within CSSE.

### ***Embracing technology for growth***

The CIDEC within OISE is a unique model that could be further tapped into via CIESC, as a communication and promotional avenue to build awareness, interest, and engagement of CIDE-affiliated faculty and graduate students with research and scholarly interests in CE. CIESC could take a valuable leadership role, as a *common hub* or *facilitator*, to help to increase awareness of the types of research and scholarship being done in *Canadian institutions, and to build and strengthen networks within Canada*, for graduate students and faculty with research interests in comparative education. A suggestion was made by one of the interviewees that it would be a great idea for CIE student groups at universities across Canada to create a common cross-Canada comparative international education graduate student Facebook group and that perhaps one of the graduate student representatives on CIESC could take on the administrative role to promote dissemination and sharing of information and broaden the outreach for early career CIE researchers and scholars in Canada. Increasingly over the past few years, the younger generation of graduate students and scholars in CIESC have begun to utilize social media interfaces, such as Facebook and Twitter to tap into the social communicative space of both the younger and older members of CIESC. In the Winter 2013 CIDEC newsletter, the two student representatives of the CIESC executive (Shelane Jorgenson & Allyson Larkin) reached out to the OISE-CIDEC community with a promotional note explaining the role and function of CIESC, benefits of membership, links to the CIESC website and Facebook page, information about the *CIE Journal* and publishing opportunities for OISE/CIDEC students and faculty, and noted a *student membership rate!* In the era of digital and virtual communication, these new modes of connecting and engaging should be pursued even further.

Another area where communication technology has significantly begun to impact comparative international education is in its potential to open new approaches for teaching, and



for cross-Canada or transnational collaboration. Three years ago, faculty from OISE-CIDEC (Drinkwater and Niyozov), the Melbourne Graduate School of Education and the University College London began an innovative tri-university virtual synchronous and asynchronous graduate course entitled “Democracy, Human Rights and Democratic Education in an Era of Globalization”. Students and faculty from these three universities have been able meet together in large groups and small cross-institutional breakout room groups to engage with presentations from guest lecturers, to share experiences and to collaborate in problem-solving around the issues presented. A more robust exploration and engagement with these innovative communication technology platforms could help to address some of the challenges that have been raised by interviewees in this project related to the creation and strengthening of collaborative research and academic networks across Canada. It is recommended that CIESC engage with its members to explore innovative communication opportunities to meet the needs and interests of its members, such as the hosting of virtual webinars, conferences and research symposia.

### **Closing remarks**

One of the significant findings of this 50th Anniversary project points to the importance of what Masemann refers to as *institutional historical memory*. Both Masemann and White spoke of the need for a stronger focus within the CIESC to engage in the systematic collection and preservation of archival data (Masemann, 2017; Wilson, 2017). Bickmore noted that with the approaching 50th Anniversary still a few years away, Masemann had already begun to open the dialogue with the CIESC executive concerning the planning of a number of special events to help celebrate and to showcase the work of the CIESC for other associations that would be attending Congress 2017. Masemann’s message to the group again was one of *advocacy*, as she urged them to plan for “what do you want to say to people not already committed to comparative education work *about* comparative education” (personal communication, 2017). However, it is not sufficient to just collect and archive this data; it is vital to critically reflect individually and collaboratively across the organization to draw lessons from the past in order to help inform possibilities and pathways for the future. As we critically reflect on the major findings of this paper, the significance of strong leadership and partnership development within both OISE-CIDEC and CIESC are key factors in supporting the growth and sustainability of both organizations. In moving forward, it is clear that as one of the few centralized, albeit hybrid, departments of comparative and international education in Canada, CIDEC leaders, faculty and graduate students have important roles to play in contributing to and learning from a strong collaborative partnership with the CIESC.

### **References**

- Anderson, S., & Niyozov, S. (2013). *The Comparative International and Development Education Centre Co-Director’s Report: Prepared for the OISE/UT Internal Centre Review Process*. Toronto: OISE.
- Bahry, S. A. (2016). Development of what, for what, and for whom? Deweyan perspectives on education for minority nationalities in western China. In J. C.-K. Lee, Z. Yu, X. Huang, & E. Hau (Eds.), *Educational Development in Western China: Towards quality and equity* (pp. 37-76). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Bickmore, K. (2017). Conflict, Peace-building, and Education: Rethinking Pedagogies in Divided Societies, Latin America, and around the World. In K. Bickmore, R. Hayhoe, C. Manion, K. Mundy & R. Read (Eds.). *Comparative and International Education: Issues for Teachers, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised & expanded edition* (pp. 268-299). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938/1997). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan Co.

- Drinkwater, M. A. (2014). *Democratizing and decolonizing education: A role for the arts and cultural praxis: Lessons from primary schools in Maasailand, southern Kenya*. (Doctoral dissertation). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses @ University of Toronto (Order No. 3686844).
- Gidney, R. D. (1999). *From Hope to Harris: The Reshaping of Ontario's Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Grant, G. P. (1991). *Technology and empire*. Toronto, Ontario: House of Anansi.
- Harber, C. (2014). *Education and International Development: Theory, Practice and Issues*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Majhanovich, S., & Lanlin, Z. (2008). Chapter 14: The Comparative and International Education Society of Canada (CIESC). In V. Masemann, M. Bray, & M. Manzon (Eds.). *Common Interests, Uncommon Goals [electronic resource]: Histories of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies and its Members* (pp.170-181). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Masemann, V. (2008) *Chapter 4: The Long Road to Montreal and Beyond: 1987-1991*. In V. Masemann, M. Bray, & M. Manzon (Eds.). *Common Interests, Uncommon Goals [electronic resource]: Histories of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies and its Members* (pp. 39-49). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Masemann, V., Majhanovich, S., Truong, N., & Janigan, K. (Eds.) (2010). *A tribute to David N. Wilson: Clamouring for a better world*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Niyozov, S. (2013). Towards Justice, Inclusion, and Hope: Exposing the Invisible, Rethinking the Assumed, and Reviving the Creative Possibilities in Curriculum and Schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(3), 291-304.
- Skinner, A. F. (1972). Transition: A note of the record. *Canadian and International Education*, 1(1), 4-6.
- Wilson, D. (1994). Comparative and international education: Fraternal or Siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review*, 38(4), 449-486.

**Mary Drinkwater** is a Lecturer at the OISE, University of Toronto, in the department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, with a cross-appointment to the collaborative specialization of Comparative, International and Development Education. Mary's research interests include critical and decolonial theory and praxis in education, arts and cultural praxis, transformative education, critical leadership, educational policy development. Mary has just completed a 2-year Aga Khan Development Network research project on *professional learning networks* in Kenya, with Dr. Steve Anderson and Dr. Carly Manion.

**Stephen Bahry** is currently permanent staff of the English Language Program, School of Continuing Studies, University of Toronto. He has a doctorate from OISE, University of Toronto where he is a researcher at the Comparative and International Development Centre. His work focuses on educational equity and curriculum reform, language-in-education policy and practice, stakeholders' quality perspectives, and cultural and linguistic diversity in education with publications and presentations on language and quality education in Afghanistan, Central Asia, China and Canada.

**Teodora Ajanovska - Gligorova** recently completed her MEd in Educational Leadership and Policy and the Comparative, International and Development Education Collaborative Program at the OISE, University of Toronto. She also holds an MA in Human Rights from the Central European University. As a passionate advocate for child rights and right to education, Teodora's research interests focus on the rights to, in and through education, and the relationship between global education policy and international human rights.

**Melissa Beauregard** is a Masters student at the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre, OISE, University of Toronto. Her research focuses on the use of English language instruction within the context of development. She is also interested in social justice education through English language teaching, multilingual education, and how language policies are used as development tools.

**Wales Wong** is a doctoral student and recently completed the Collaborative Specialization at the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre at OISE, University of Toronto. Her current research is on second language learning and identity (re)shaping of adult students in Ontario's continuing education programs. Her main research interests include second language learning, translanguaging, identity construction, and gender issues.