



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Training "Deep Practitioners": 50-years of the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst

Item Type	article;article
Authors	Evans, David R.
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64290-7_10
Rights	UMass Amherst Open Access Policy
Download date	2025-05-22 21:35:17
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/7834

**Training “Deep Practitioners”
50-years of the Center for International Education
at the University of Massachusetts Amherst**

By David R. Evans

Abstract

This chapter presents a brief analytic history of the initial 50 years of the Center for International Education (CIE) at University of Massachusetts Amherst with the goal of understanding what made it possible and what can be learned from it for the future of Comparative and International Education programs in other universities. The chapter begins with the unusual context in which CIE was created and its commitment to a synergistic linkage between academics and managing funded, development education programs. The discussion then describes CIE’s defining characteristics, the challenges it faced, its current situation, and the insights that can be gleaned from its history. The chapter concludes with comments on the implications for the future shape of CE/IE graduate programs and centers at universities. The author is the Founding Director of CIE who has led the program for most of its 50-year history.

Chapter

**Training “Deep Practitioners”
50-years of the Center for International Education
at the University of Massachusetts Amherst**

By David R. Evans

This chapter presents a brief analytic history of the Center for International Education (CIE) at University of Massachusetts Amherst with the goal of understanding what made it

possible and what can be learned from it for the future of CE/IE¹ programs. The chapter begins with the unusual context in which CIE was created and its commitment to a synergistic linkage between academics and managing funded development education programs. The discussion then presents CIE's defining characteristics, the challenges faced, and the insights that can be gleaned from its history. This chapter concludes with comments on the implications for the future shape of CE/IE graduate programs and centers at universities.

The External Context - Comparative versus International Education Debate

In April 1956 the Comparative Education Society (CES) was founded and in its early years focused on organizing study tours to provide United States educators with first-hand observations of foreign education systems. In the following decade, the membership expanded beyond faculty teaching comparative education as a foundational course in teacher training. Increasingly, members brought two additional perspectives: the value of applying analytic tools and frameworks from the social sciences, and the knowledge based on applied education reform projects in developing countries. Debates over the focus of the society ultimately led to renaming the society as the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) in the fall of 1968.

The renaming of the Society created a larger umbrella to include research and activities undertaken by university programs as well as development agencies. Debates about the meaning of and relative importance of comparative versus international education flourished over the next decades (Wilson 1994). Different graduate degree programs chose to emphasize one or the other, often seeking a balance. Terms like “academic-practitioner” (Wilson 1994, p. 450) or “scholar-doer” used at the beginning of the program at Stanford (Carnoy 2019, p. 31), or the term “deep

¹ This chapter will use CIE to refer to the Center for International Education at UMass Amherst. Comparative Education and International Education programs will be referred to as CE/IE, not CIE programs as is often found in the literature.

practitioner” coined by the program at UMass Amherst, reflect various ways in which the tension between basic and applied research was conceptualized.

The Institutional Context – the School of Education at UMass Amherst

In the late 1960s, the School of Education at UMass Amherst was a quiet backwater set in a state university better known for its party atmosphere than its academic quality.² The School had trouble recruiting quality faculty and students. A recently appointed Provost charged with improving the quality of the University wanted to revitalize the School. He said at the time “The School [of Education] was ... recognized as pedestrian, non-progressive, dull. We couldn't even claim it was second rate” (Brainerd 1973, p. 121). To that end, in 1968 he recruited Dwight Allen from Stanford to become the new dean. Dwight was known as a charismatic, iconoclastic educator. The Provost got much more than he bargained for.

The new Dean had a vision of a school of education that was flexible, dynamic, student-centered and revolutionary – reflecting the heady optimism of innovation in education of the late 1960s. His goal was no less than the creation of a completely new organizational structure in the School. He wanted to replace departments and programs with centers which would be formed around areas of interest and led by teams of faculty and graduate students. One of his first actions was to throw out the entire existing curriculum of courses and begin a process to create a new School of Education.

The Dean organized a School-wide retreat in Colorado, where working groups of graduate students and faculty were formed with the charge of creating centers, one of which was the Center for International Education. The retreat began a planning process which lasted a full

² Over the following fifty years, UMass Amherst steadily improved to the point of being ranked in the top 25 public universities in 2019 (University of Massachusetts Amherst 2019).

academic year and led to a planning document that established the goals, structures, and program for a new Center for International Education (Evans and Kinsley 1970).

The challenge faced by the School was to recruit high quality faculty and students to an institution that had little to offer at the time.³ The Dean set about creating an exciting, innovative, and dynamic vision for the School within a state university that was seeking to become more diverse and to respond more effectively to the changing social realities in society. CIE benefited from being part of that larger organizational revitalization and from the determination of the Dean from the beginning to create a Center for International Education.

The Birth of the Center for International Education

The Center for International Education was created in the national and institutional contexts briefly discussed above. The combination of the unbounded optimism for change of the 1960s and the highly unusual time at the School of Education at UMass, Amherst produced a unique graduate program.

In the first several years, students and faculty were attracted to the School and CIE primarily by the charisma of the Dean and the excitement of a radically different school of education that offered student-developed degree programs, no letter grades, credit for past experience, and above all an exciting environment.⁴

³ The author was one of about a dozen doctoral students that the new Dean brought to UMass from Stanford as newly appointed faculty members. We were all attracted by his vision of a new kind of College of Education and the opportunity to make a difference. The author joined two other faculty members in September of 1968 to start the Center for International Education.

⁴ A doctoral dissertation by a graduate of CIE provides a fascinating and well-documented history of the first 25 years of CIE (Pfeiffer 1995).

CIE faced the same challenges as the School of Education at its inception. How could it compete against elite CE/IE programs including those in two prestigious regional institutions: Harvard University and Teachers College, Columbia? CIE could not compete on the basis of academic reputation or institutional status; it had to offer something different and attractive.

From its inception, CIE was designed as a program for practitioners, students who were training for leadership roles in improving educational systems in the developing world. The first cohorts of students and the faculty all had extended experience working in education systems in developing countries. Initially almost all the students were returned Peace Corps volunteers (RPCVs). Faculty members all had two or more years of experience of living and working in developing countries. Reflecting the values and goals of its founding members, the program from the beginning was known as the Center for International Education without any debate about comparative vs. international education.

Eras of Implementation in the history of CIE

Over its 50-year history, there have been a succession of development education focuses at CIE: nonformal/adult education, expanding access for under-served populations, teachers and teacher education, higher education development, alternative education, and education in conflict and crisis. Each can be characterized as an era, although they overlap and persist even as new eras emerge.

Nonformal⁵/Adult Education

In the early 1970s, inspired by the then ground-breaking writings of Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich, CIE began exploring ways in which their ideas could be translated into practice.

⁵ This chapter will use the term nonformal without a hyphen. Sources vary on the preferred usage.

Both Freire and Illich visited CIE, with Freire making a series of annual visits during that time. CIE was also influenced by the work of Philip Coombs, especially his book *World Crisis in Education* which laid out the limitations of the schooling systems in developing countries. He argued that world universities have a responsibility to get directly involved through “the productive search for truth and knowledge” to facilitate “human development and progress toward peace” (Coombs 1968, p. 161).

CIE’s first nonformal education (NFE) project provided a chance to translate the ideas of Freire and Illich into a program with indigenous peoples in rural Ecuador (Andrade et al. 1975). The project pioneered the use of games and simulations in pursuit of practical and experiential ways of learning for rural populations in non-school contexts. The project ultimately produced a series of publications and dissertations based on that experience, thus providing an early example of how CIE would combine academic work with practical application.

The work at CIE was in contrast to the more academic approach to nonformal education undertaken by other universities at the time. In an early paper, the Non-Formal Education Information Center chronicled the work of Michigan State University in assessing various approaches to non-school education and presented a conceptual framework that delineated the key differences between formal and nonformal education. (Brembeck 1978). Other universities pursued similar analytic approaches.

The experience in Ecuador laid the foundation for CIE’s approach to NFE in other contexts. Subsequently, CIE was awarded a USAID 211(d) contract to develop a NFE Center, and then an additional award to pursue pilot NFE projects in Guatemala and Thailand (USAID 1975). Next CIE undertook a large NFE project with the Ministry of Education and Culture in

Indonesia, financed by a World Bank loan, followed by a subsequent project with the Peoples Education Association in Ghana.⁶

Expanding Access for Under-served Populations

The NFE projects involved working with adults on literacy and numeracy, especially in non-school settings. That led to work in literacy, basic education, girls' access to education, and developing the distance education components of universities. CIE offered an annual summer literacy institute at UMass for a number of years, which attracted literacy workers from multiple countries.

The 1980s brought contracts in Lesotho and Swaziland working with their adult education programs in departments of extramural studies. USAID's emphasis on basic education led to a project in Botswana. USAID's priority focus on girls' access to education resulted in a contract to work with teacher training and schools to improve girls learning opportunities in Uttar Pradesh, India. Later CIE worked on a project in Afghanistan to develop a curriculum to help girls qualify for mid-wife training. More recently CIE undertook an evaluation of a girls' education project in the Democratic Republic of Congo. In addition, CIE's involvement in a large education project in southern Sudan focused on providing non-school education for rural girls in a conflict environment.

Teachers and Teacher Education

Almost all education projects have a component of teacher training, which led CIE to work on a variety of approaches to improve the effectiveness of teacher training, particularly in low-resource contexts.

⁶ Documents and research produced by many of the projects discussed are available on the UMass Scholarworks site: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie/>. Master's capstone projects and doctoral dissertations based on the projects are also available there.

Illustrative of this focus was a national-level project to develop a new system of training and supporting primary school teachers in Uganda. The new approach, known as the Teacher Development and Management System, sought to merge pre-service and in-service training with ongoing support for teachers in schools. It created an intermediate staffing level of Coordinating Center Tutors to build much stronger linkages with the schools and the teachers in them. The focus shifted from training to having an impact on what happened in the classrooms. This model was ultimately implemented on a national basis in Uganda (Ministry of Education and Sports 2000).

Multiple other projects focused on teachers and improving their effectiveness, including a series of Teacher, Text, Technology projects in Somalia, Tanzania, and Cote d'Ivoire, and a project to help teachers teach multi-grade classes in Senegal and The Gambia.

Higher Education Development

Over the decades priorities of development agencies gradually shifted from basic education to a recognition of the role played by institutions of higher education. CIE's projects reflected that shift. In the first project with a significant focus on higher education, CIE worked with the University of Malawi to create a new Master's Degree in Education – developing curriculum, training faculty, and offering advanced degrees to faculty members in the Faculty of Education. Subsequently CIE became involved in strengthening teacher training degree programs at several universities in Palestine.

In 2006, CIE embarked on what would become a sequence of three large projects over a period of 14 years to strengthen the national Higher Education system in Afghanistan. CIE introduced the first modern master's degrees, helped strengthen capacity of faculty and

administrators in public universities, worked to develop the capacity of the Ministry of Higher Education, and introduced associate degrees in five universities (Boardman et al. 2012; Shumaker et al. 2017).

Alternative Education & Education in Crisis and Conflict

Throughout CIE's history there has been a focus on non-school alternatives, first under the rubric of NFE, then variations of adult education, community-based education, accelerated education models, and most recently provision of education for refugees and immigrants in war and natural disaster contexts. Many of these activities were part of the recent Education in Crisis and Conflict Network project at CIE in collaboration with the Education Development Center (EDC) (Center for International Development n.d.).

Defining Characteristics of CIE

What then are the defining characteristics which made possible the unique nature of CIE at UMass? The paragraphs below outline the key components and how the synergy between them shaped the 50-year history of CIE.

Financing of CIE

The financial basis for CIE has two major components. First, CIE was fortunate from the beginning and throughout its history to have multiple full-time, state-funded faculty positions – something that over the years became a challenge for many CE/IE programs at US universities. The other major source of financing has been funded projects and grants. These funds support a full-time financial manager, an administrative staff member, as well as student assistantships.

CIE has always been committed to combining practical project management with academic degree programs. While other CE/IE university programs also sometimes manage funded projects, CIE is unique in the extent to which they were integrated into its degree

programs. The size and scope of the activities are also noteworthy. In its 50-year history, CIE has managed more than 75 funded projects, contracts and grants with a total value of about \$97 million. The projects took place in more than 30 countries, including some in the U.S. working with Teacher Corps, Peace Corps, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Additional financing for CIE came from three other sources. First, UMass returns 10% of the indirect revenue generated by projects to the PIs managing the projects. These funds are used to support CIE activities. A second source is income from CIE's Endowment Fund, started in the early 2000s, which is now sufficient to partially support two graduate assistantships a year and is still growing in size. A third source is local fund-raising efforts that generate small amounts used to support the professional and social activities of CIE, such as its annual overnight retreat.

Taken together, these strategies have provided CIE with sufficient financial support to flourish for 50 years. It is noteworthy that the School of Education has not provided any funding for CIE over its history, other than the key input of faculty salaries. In fact, CIE has been a substantial revenue center for the School since it receives 20% of the indirect revenue earned by the university on external contracts.

Faculty

From its inception, CIE was in a favorable position in that it had state-funded faculty positions in international education. Initially there were three faculty members in CIE and over the years the number increased to four and sometimes even five state-funded faculty members. CIE also works with faculty from other programs as is needed in implementing projects. In contrast, many CE/IE programs have only a few core faculty members and must rely upon shared faculty from other programs or on adjunct and non-tenure track faculty funded by external projects.

Because of CIE's active role in managing funded projects, the faculty had to have personal experience working in development contexts and be willing to take on the responsibilities as principal investigators for projects. Recruiting faculty members willing to undertake such expanded responsibilities has proved challenging in recent years. Younger faculty members that joined CIE were less willing to carry the dual responsibilities of pursuing the academic work needed for promotion while simultaneously seeking and managing funded projects. For some there was the additional desire for a better balance between work and family life, something that was understandably more critical for female faculty members with young children or other family obligations.⁷

Students

From the very beginning students have been a central driving force of CIE, starting with what were known as planning doctoral candidates who spent the first year of their studies working with faculty to design CIE and its academic programs. Since then, students have played a central role in both project and academic activities of CIE. From the outset, admissions criteria required that new students, in addition to meeting academic qualifications, needed to have at least two years of experience working in a developing country setting. Many had much more experience. The belief was that such experience provided evidence of an informed commitment to careers in development education.

The goal was to create an on-campus learning community where students learned from each other, faculty learned from students and together they combined working on projects with academic work. Discussions in classes were always grounded in real-world experience. Theory

⁷ By the early 2000s half of the CIE faculty members were women.

and concepts were regularly confronted with the lived experience of the learners. CIE attracted students who did not want to pursue degrees with primarily academic programs in CE/IE, but wanted a combination of real-world practice and academic learning.

Initially the student community at CIE was predominantly US males, mostly RPCVs. In the 1980s and 1990s that began to shift as more women joined the program, until by the early 2000s women were in the majority. Gradually over the decades, the student population became more international so that by 2010 international students made up at least half of the student body. Many of the international students returned home to significant leadership positions in education. Over the 50 years, the on-campus CIE community has ranged in size from 20 to 30 graduate students, about two-thirds of whom were doctoral students.

Curriculum & Pedagogy

From the start, the curriculum at CIE was designed and driven by a dialogue among students and faculty. Pedagogy in the classroom was participatory and experiential, with almost every class session involving some sort of applied or participatory exercise. Experience from field settings was integral to the learning process with both faculty and students regularly citing examples and issues from their experience. If a reading discussed a particular context, there was usually someone in class who had first-hand knowledge of that setting or a similar one, leading to an informed and sometimes critical discussion of the issue.

The curriculum for the degree programs began in the 1970s with almost total flexibility for students to create their own degree program based on identified learning goals and outcomes. Over time, structure was added with certain core courses strongly recommended and after several decades some became required. On multiple occasions, a few students would work with a faculty

member to design and offer a new course. Several such courses ultimately became part of the core curriculum.⁸

The flexibility of the program was attractive to students who had a wide range of professional interests within the umbrella of international development education. But the extraordinary breadth of possible content in the field posed difficult challenges for faculty trying to decide what the content of CE/IE degrees should be (see e.g. Klees 2008).

The openness was also reflected in the relative lack of difference in the guidelines and content of master's and doctoral degree programs. Master's students took many of the same classes as doctoral students. They were treated equally in terms of access to financial support. CIE has never viewed master's students as a revenue source to provide financing for doctoral students, although in recent years there has been pressure from the University to do so. Until the 1990s there were no courses restricted to only master's or doctoral students. In the early 1980s CIE introduced a capstone project as a requirement for the master's degree and began offering a supporting seminar.

Funded projects and related activities formed part of the curriculum. Interestingly, smaller projects often provided better learning opportunities for students than larger projects which had much higher proportions of administrative tasks. By working on projects students learn how to respond to donor requests, write proposals, recruit and manage field staff, and, equally important, to experience the challenges of translating academic theories into effective educational interventions.

⁸ Examples of student-initiated courses included: Theory and Practice of NFE; Development Theories; Gender and Development; and Theater of the Oppressed.

Organizational Structure of CIE

At the beginning, CIE functioned as a committee of the whole, which led ultimately to the long-standing tradition of Tuesday morning community meetings attended by all students and faculty. These meetings became a defining characteristic of CIE and lasted for 50 years with CIE celebrating the 1,000th meeting in October of 2006. Typical meetings were combinations of CIE internal business, a speaker or presentation by a student, reports from CIE committees, etc. The meetings had less obvious benefits as well: students could count on finding faculty members to talk to informally about their programs, and CIE graduates knew that if they returned to visit on a Tuesday, they would find faculty and colleagues.

In the 1990s CIE developed a more formalized governance structure and set of procedures. The structure featured an executive committee, with faculty and student members; standing committees for admissions, academic affairs, and program development; and ad hoc committees as needed. CIE's annual calendar included a welcoming fall reception, an overnight retreat for the whole community in a regional venue, a fall tag sale to raise funds, a holiday party, and a spring picnic. The activities of the CIE community played an important social and academic support role for all students, particularly for international students who often lack a local network of family and friends to support them during their studies.

World-wide Network of Graduates

Over the 50-year period CIE has created an international network of nearly 700 members (almost 300 doctoral and more than 300 master's degree graduates) as well as those who were all but dissertation. Because of the strong on-campus community that they experienced as students,

graduates have a strong affinity for CIE and maintain contact both with CIE and with each other for years afterwards.⁹

The network helps CIE in many ways. Graduates help identify and recruit promising applicants to degree programs. They also provide leads on possible project funding, help with recruitment of staff for projects, and generally act as representatives of CIE in wherever they are working – there are graduates living and working in over 30 countries in the world.

The careers of graduates follow several patterns. A large proportion work as educational leaders in development settings. Many achieve national political positions as ambassadors or high commissioners, ministers of education, permanent secretaries, and even as the Speaker of the National Parliament in one case. Others are more directly involved in development activities as CEO or vice presidents of large international NGOs. More than half-a-dozen have served as chiefs of party for large USAID education projects, while others have become USAID Mission Directors, country directors or senior staff members with UNESCO, UNICEF, Peace Corps, and the LEGO Foundation.

More than a dozen have founded or held leadership positions with smaller NGOs, some domestic and others international. Another large group have become university faculty members in the US and abroad, where they often rise to become department chairs or deans. Several dozen are members and active participants in CIES and one became president of CIES.

The career trajectories of graduates reflect CIE's commitment to training 'deep practitioners' who combine academic knowledge, policy and research skills with the commitment and ability to become leaders in education. It is notable that many of those who rose

⁹ See Members section of CIE Web site (<http://umass.edu/cie>) for profiles of over 300 CIE graduates.

to the most influential positions were master's degree graduates, validating CIE's commitment to valuing those students on a par with doctoral students. Master's graduates were less likely to pursue academic careers and thus sought careers in organizations committed to work in development education.

Lessons Learned from 50 years of CIE

The characteristics which seem to have been most essential to its growth and success include:

- Committing to a synergistic linkage between academic study, research, and direct involvement in substantial funded projects in primarily developing contexts.
- Recruiting a cadre of faculty and mid-career students with extensive development experience and a desire to apply their learning to the challenges of education and development.
- Creating and maintaining an active, participatory learning community on campus that seamlessly merged learning and practice – in courses and in the field.
- Encouraging and facilitating graduate students to take a significant role in developing both academic courses and projects.
- Having a clear vision and consistent long-term leadership committed to that vision.
- Maintaining linkages between the campus community and the world-wide network of CIE graduates working in international development.
- Producing substantial income for the University and the School which encouraged the administration to support or in some periods to at least tolerate the existence of CIE.

Challenges to Success of CIE

The defining characteristics of CIE discussed in the previous section are the primary factors that have enabled CIE to achieve much of its success. However, CIE has faced a number of challenges that other CE/IE programs may be facing:

- Many universities are unwilling to take the risk of having faculty or employees work in conflict and crisis settings. CIE was fortunate that UMass Amherst was supportive and willing to allow employees to work in challenging and sometimes insecure contexts.
- However, at the same time the environmental press of a university that was pursuing greater academic status based on traditional criteria of research and publication led to pressure to separate the academic program from implementation projects at CIE.
- Critiques that being reliant on external funding would limit the topics of research and compromise academic freedom and integrity (Carnoy 2019).
- Difficulty in recruiting faculty who were willing to make the personal sacrifices involved in managing field work while also meeting the demands of teaching, research, and publishing that are required for academic promotion. Faculty members with young children were particularly reluctant to accept such challenges.
- The discomfort of some Deans with the degree of autonomy of CIE and its substantial resources in contrast to other programs led to periodic attempts to restrict or even break up CIE.
- The problem of transition of CIE leadership after the founding Director had served for more than 45 years and was PI for most of the major funded projects during that time – the difficulty of finding and keeping a qualified successor.

Current Status

After 50 years CIE has entered a period of transition. The founding Director retired, and his immediate successor moved to another university to assume a leadership position after only one year, leading to the recruitment of a second new director. In the last several years the academic program in International Education has been separated from the Center, weakening many of the components that were at the core of CIE's strength. The IE program remains part of a department, while CIE is now a College-wide unit that reports directly to the Dean, not to the department chair. The new Director is working to build a center that is more broadly based with linkages to other programs in the College of Education¹⁰ and throughout the UMass Amherst campus.

What is future prognosis for CE/IE programs and centers?

There are many models in universities with CE/IE programs. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to analyze their variations in structure and purpose. Wilson (1994) provides an exhaustive and detailed genealogy of CE/IE programs, tracing multiple generations of students and the rise and fall of programs¹¹ at various universities but doesn't address their internal organization. A more recent review of CE/IE programs argues for more emphasis on recruiting students from, and preparing students for, non-academic positions in development education, but doesn't discuss how programs need to change to achieve that goal (Blosser 2016).

Programs vary widely in their structure as well as their content, but almost all CE/IE programs are separate from units that engage in implementation of funded field projects.

However, to varying degrees they all share a number of challenges:

¹⁰ The School of Education at UMass Amherst was renamed the College of Education in 2013.

¹¹ Wilson (1994, p. 470) mentions CIE in a paragraph that names the faculty members who helped start CIE and where they earned their degrees.

- International Education is not central to the mission of colleges of education, especially at state universities, despite the fact that many universities have committed to internationalizing their programs. Universities seem to give priority to promoting internationalization across all activities rather than by supporting individual international programs.
- Most colleges of education do not finance faculty positions that are full-time in CE/IE, so such programs have to seek part-time commitments from faculty employed in other education programs or disciplines.
- Graduate education has become very expensive, so strong financial support is necessary to recruit students to CE/IE. Simultaneously, the employment market for new faculty in the US is tight. While opportunities for work with development agencies are still plentiful, increasingly such agencies are hiring staff from developing countries which provides career opportunities for international students.
- CE/IE programs often need to seek external funding, but in most universities funded projects are housed in separate centers that are not directly linked to degree programs.
- A few universities have created new models (Arizona State and Virginia Tech are recent examples) in the form of institution-wide centers which engage actively in implementing development projects, drawing upon relevant faculty members as needed. However, linkages to academic content and degree programs are mostly opportunistic and rely almost exclusively on the initiative of individual faculty members.
- Schwille's chapter in this book describes the approach used at Michigan State University when it abolished the CE/IE program in favor of adding an international component to all programs in education.

- Another model is emerging where a center or institute like CIE becomes a campus-wide hub for multi-disciplinary approaches to research on developing educational systems because of the linkages to other sectors like health, agriculture, and economic development. (Harvard is an example.)

CIE is quite unique and does not offer a model that is likely to be emulated elsewhere, although there are lessons to be learned from the CIE model about the benefits of embedding funded projects in an academic program. The current challenges are such that many existing programs face ongoing struggles for survival under financial pressures and changing market demand for graduates. Some will likely be merged into other programs, while others may persist in a weakened state. Those in prestigious universities will likely survive with support from grants for scholarships and research funding. New programs are unlikely, except in rare, unusual contexts.

The late 1960s were a period of societal upheaval and innovation, perhaps not unlike what is occurring in our present era. In the future, centers may be less about replicating or adapting existing models of CE/IE programs, and more about generating innovative new structures that did not previously exist. This will require visionary leadership that resists the environmental press in higher education to conform to existing institutionalized norms, particularly for universities seeking to improve their academic ranking.

References

Andrade, Diego., Alcocer, Beatriz., Barriga, Patricio., Bourbeau, June., Borja, Amparo., Bing, John., Evans, David., Hoxeng, James., Moreno, Carlos., Ochoa, Alberto., Pulupa, Pedro., Smith, William., Tasiguano, Enrique., Toaquiza, Enrique., & Villacis, Rodrigo. (1975). *Nonformal education in Ecuador 1971-1975*. Amherst: Center for International Education. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_nonformaleducation/3. Accessed 18 April 2020.

Blosser, Allison H. (2016). Program development. In Erwin H. Epstein (Ed.), *Crafting a global field: Six decades of the Comparative and International Education Society* (pp. 71-81). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong, and Dordrecht: Springer.

Boardman, Gerald R., Sylvester, Roxanne M., Khalid, Mohammad Fahim., & Shaheed, Mohammad Rateb. (2012). *Final evaluation: Afghanistan higher education project (HEP)*. USAID Mission to Afghanistan. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACT899.pdf. Accessed 16 April 2020.

Brainerd, Lyman B. (1973). *Radical change in a school of education, September 1967-November 1969: A study of leader-dominated change in a university subcomponent* (No. 2788) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst]. Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2788. Accessed 14 April 2020.

Brembeck, Cole S. (1978). *Formal education, non-formal education, and expanded conceptions of development*. East Lansing: Non-Formal Education Information Center.

Carnoy, Martin. (2019). *Transforming comparative education: Fifty years of theory building at Stanford*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Center for International Development. (n.d.) *Education in conflict & crisis network - CIE with EDC (2014-2019)*. <https://www.umass.edu/cie/our-work/education-conflict-crisis-network-cie-edc-2014-2019>. Accessed 14 April 2020.

Coombs, Philip H. (1968). *The world educational crisis: A systems analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Evans, David R., & Kinsley, Dale. (1970). *Draft of proposed process for structuring, monitoring, and recording the doctoral program in international education* [Unpublished Document]. Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts.

Klees, Steven J. (2008). Reflections on theory, method, and practice in comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(3): 301-328. <https://doi.org/10.1086/589978>.

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2000). *Final report on the evaluation of the teacher development and management systems (TDMS) programme*. Development Consultants International and Incafex Consultants Ltd.

Pfeiffer, Katherine G. (1995). *Using historical narrative as a tool for organizational analysis: A twenty-five year history of the Center for International Education* (No. 2269) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst]. Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2269. Accessed 1 April 2020.

Shumaker, John W., Davenport, Michele M., Wafeq, Manizha., Rezaie, Ammar., & Haroon, Rohina. (2017). *Mid-term performance evaluation of the university support and workforce development program*. USAID Mission to Afghanistan.
https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00MJZ4.pdf. Accessed 16 April 2020.

Wilson, David N. (1994). Comparative and international education: Fraternal or siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review*, 38(4), 449-486.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/447271>.

University of Massachusetts Amherst. (2019). UMass Amherst moves up to no. 24 among public universities in latest U.S. news rankings. <https://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/article/umass-amherst-moves-no-24-among-public>. Accessed 8 April 2020.

USAID, Office of Program and Methodology. (1975). *A directory of institutional resources supported by section 211 d grants: U. S. Centers of Competence for International Development*. The Office, 145-146.

Index:

Center for International Education UMass, Amherst
University of Massachusetts Amherst
CIES, name change
Comparative vs International Education
Deep Practitioner
UMass School of Education, history
Dwight Allen
Center for International Education, origin
RPCV
training practitioners
Nonformal/Adult Education
Paulo Freire
Ecuador
Michigan State University
USAID 211(d)
Indonesia
Ghana
non-school education projects
Basic Education
Girls' education
India
Afghanistan
Teacher Education, Uganda
Teacher, Text, Technology Projects
Higher Education Development, Malawi
Afghanistan, Higher Education
Education in Crisis and Conflict
Defining Characteristics of UMass CIE

Financing of UMass CIE
Education development projects
funded projects
CIE Endowment Fund
UMass CIE as revenue center
State-funded faculty
faculty as Principal Investigators
UMass CIE graduate students
UMass CIE student qualifications
learning community
international students
Curriculum and Pedagogy
participatory pedagogy
student initiated courses
flexible degree programs
treatment of Master's students
funded projects & curriculum
UMass CIE organization
learning community meetings
graduate program governance
World-wide network of graduates
role of graduates
careers of graduates
founders of small NGOs
Key characteristics UMass/CIE program
Challenges to sustainability of UMass/CIE
Current status of UMass/CIE program
transition of leadership
projects separate from academic programs
Future of CE/IE graduate programs
projects separate from academic programs
new models for international education centers
campus-wide centers
survival of CE/IE programs

Bio:

David R. Evans served as the Founding Director of Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst for over 45 years. His work combined academic and practical activities. He was directly involved in the design and management of dozens of educational projects in Latin America, Asia, and Africa and worked as a consultant on numerous development education projects. He taught graduate courses, published research, and worked with graduate students for over 50 years, chairing more than 80 completed doctoral dissertations. For years he worked on projects in Anglophone Africa, after starting his career as a teacher and researcher in Uganda in the early 1960s. More recently, his experience has been in Malawi,

Southern Sudan and Afghanistan. From 2005 to 2019, he was the Principal Investigator of three large, higher education projects in Afghanistan. During his career he worked in various capacities in over 30 countries. He has been a member of the Comparative and International Education Society since 1967 and is a former member of the Board of Directors of CIES.