



## **WE Charity/ME to WE Social Enterprises Inc Report on Educational Programming Partnerships March 23, 2021**

**To:** Planning and Priorities Committee

**Date:** 6 April, 2021

**Report No.:** 04-21-4067

### **Strategic Directions**

- Build Strong Relationships and Partnerships Within School Communities to Support Student Learning and Well-Being
- Create a Culture for Student and Staff Well-Being
- Transform Student Learning

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the report outlining the TDSB's partnership with WE Charity and ME to WE Social Enterprises Inc. be received.

### **Context**

ME to WE Social Enterprises ("ME to WE") and WE Charity are legally separate and independent entities. ME to WE is a partner of WE Charity, providing support by donating at least half of its profits to WE Charity. The other half is invested in the enterprise, offering socially conscious products and experiences.

At a Special Board Meeting on August 6, 2020, the Board passed a motion to suspend partnership agreements with WE Charity and ME to WE. The motion, which originated as an emergency motion from the Committee of the Whole on August 4, 2020, also stipulates that the Director review the terms of the current agreements between the TDSB, WE Charity, ME to WE and any other related organizations. The motion also requests a report be submitted to the Board, through the Committee of the Whole (now the Planning and Priorities Committee), on the scope, process, considerations, financial activity, and formal and informal connections between WE Charity, ME to WE and the TDSB. Full text of the Board resolution of August 6, 2020 is presented in Appendix A.

## Agenda Page 18

The TDSB had educational partnership agreements with WE Charity and ME to WE. Under the Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) documents, which were approved by the TDSB in accordance with the Educational Programming Partnerships Policy (P024) on March 1, 2018, WE Charity and ME to WE were to provide motivational speaker presentations for students and staff, and student leadership development programs. The services were to be provided in accordance with the following financial conditions: WE Charity presentations were to be delivered free of charge, while ME to WE student leadership development programs were billed as per the fee for service agreements. The two entities were also required to submit annual service reports to the TDSB, outlining the sessions delivered and total charges for the year.

In addition to these two educational partnerships, the TDSB also conducts other activities in connection with these two entities. For many years, TDSB schools have conducted fundraising and have issued donations to the WE Charity. TDSB schools have also made purchases from the Me to We Shop, Inc. through school fundraising accounts. A summary of all formal and informal connections between both organizations and the TDSB is provided in Appendix B. A summary of payments issued to WE Charity, ME to WE, and Free the Children is outlined in Appendix C.

The TDSB also had a previous partnership agreement with Free the Children (now WE Charity) dating back to September 2013.

In July 2020, the partnership agreements were suspended and later terminated by WE Charity and ME to WE. On July 28, 2020, WE Charity and ME to WE issued a notification that they will no longer be delivering educational partnership programming to the TDSB. On September 9, 2020, WE Charity and its Board of Directors announced that they were winding down the organization’s operations in Canada. The organization was to sell its assets to establish an endowment fund, to sustain the charity’s existing international humanitarian programs and digitization initiatives.

A literature review of key issues in global citizenship education and recommendations for future social justice work and partnerships is presented in Appendix D.

### **Action Plan and Associated Timeline**

N/A

### **Resource Implications**

N/A

## Communications Considerations

N/A

## Board Policy and Procedure Reference(s)

- Educational Programming Partnership Criteria Procedure (PR700)
- Educational Programming Partnerships Policy (P024)
- Educational Programming Partnerships Procedure (PR667)
- Fundraising Policy (P021)
- Fundraising Procedure (PR508)
- Vetting External Presentations Procedure (PR589)

## Appendices

- Appendix A: August 6, 2020 Special Board Meeting Resolution
- Appendix B: WE Charity and ME to WE Formal and Informal Connections with the TDSB
- Appendix C: Summary of Payments to WE Charity and ME to WE
- Appendix D: Working Towards Anti-Oppressive Schools – Lessons from WE Charity: A Critical Review

## From

Craig Snider, Acting Associate Director – Business Operations and Service Excellence, by email at [craig.snider@tdsb.on.ca](mailto:craig.snider@tdsb.on.ca) or by phone at 416-397-3188.

Jim Spyropoulos, Executive Superintendent, Human Rights and Indigenous Education, by email at [jim.spyropoulos@tdsb.on.ca](mailto:jim.spyropoulos@tdsb.on.ca) or by phone at 416-397-3678.

Marisa Chiu, Executive Officer of Finance (Interim), by email at [marisa.chiu@tdsb.on.ca](mailto:marisa.chiu@tdsb.on.ca) or by phone at 416- 395-3563.

Peter Chang, System Superintendent, Continuing Education, Adult Education, Secondary Alternative Schools, Educational Partnerships, Delegations & Heritage Months, by email at [peter.chang@tdsb.on.ca](mailto:peter.chang@tdsb.on.ca) or by phone at 416-393-8937.

**AUGUST 6, 2020 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING RESOLUTION**

Item 2, Review of Partnership Agreements With WE Charity/ME to WE (see page 27)

Trustee Pilkey, seconded by Trustee Story moved: **That the matter, Review of Partnership Agreements With WE Charity/ME to WE, be deemed as emergency business and considered.**

The motion was carried.

Trustee Pilkey, seconded by Trustee Story moved:

**Whereas, increasing media scrutiny on WE Charity/ME to WE has surfaced concerns regarding some of the organization's practices and policies both domestically and in the countries they seek to assist; and**

**Whereas, through existing partnership agreements, the Toronto District School Board provides WE Charity and ME to WE with a great deal of access to its students, staff, schools and families; and**

**Whereas, the WE Charity/ME to WE model intentionally engages schools as a conduit for their organization's fundraising efforts<sup>1(1)</sup>; and**

**Whereas, the TDSB's current partnership agreements do not expire until February 2021;**

Therefore, be it resolved:

- (a) That the TDSB suspend its current agreements with WE Charity/ME to WE and any other related organizations, pending a review of the agreements;**
- (b) That the Director review the terms of the current agreements in the fall of 2020, and present a report to the Board, through the Committee of the Whole, on the scope, process, considerations and outcome of this review before the end of the calendar year 2020, and before any consideration is made regarding any future contracts between the TDSB and WE Charity/ME to WE;**
- (c) That the report at Part (b) above include a detailed description of the financial activity between the parties, as well as an analysis of both the formal and informal connections between WE Charity/ME to WE and the TDSB.**

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.flare.com/news/we-charity-corruption-trudeau-kielburger/>  
G04(\\tidsbexeshr\exec\_silo\secretariat\staff\g04\01\200806 sp.docx)sec.1530

Trustee Kandavel, seconded by Trustee Sriskandarajah, moved in amendment: **That “That interested and relevant institutions and partners in academia be invited to provide academic commentary on the nature, implications, and substance of the programming offered by Me to We/WE Charity to TDSB students” be added as Part (d).**

The amendment was carried.

The main motion, as amended was carried.

Therefore, the Board decided:

Whereas, increasing media scrutiny on WE Charity/ME to WE has surfaced concerns regarding some of the organization’s practices and policies both domestically and in the countries they seek to assist; and

Whereas, through existing partnership agreements, the Toronto District School Board provides WE Charity and ME to WE with a great deal of access to its students, staff, schools and families; and

Whereas, the WE Charity/ME to WE model intentionally engages schools as a conduit for their organization’s fundraising efforts<sup>[1]</sup>; and

Whereas, the TDSB’s current partnership agreements do not expire until February 2021;

Therefore, be it resolved:

- (a) That the TDSB suspend its current agreements with WE Charity/ME to WE and any other related organizations, pending a review of the agreements;
- (b) That the Director review the terms of the current agreements in the fall of 2020, and present a report to the Board, through the Committee of the Whole, on the scope, process, considerations and outcome of this review before the end of the calendar year 2020, and before any consideration is made regarding any future contracts between the TDSB and WE Charity/ME to WE;
- (c) That the report at Part (b) above include a detailed description of the financial activity between the parties, as well as an analysis of both the formal and informal connections between WE Charity/ME to WE and the TDSB;
- (d) That interested and relevant institutions and partners in academia be invited to provide academic commentary on the nature, implications, and substance of the programming offered by Me to We/WE Charity to TDSB students

## **WE Charity and ME to WE Formal and Informal Connections with the TDSB**

### **Formal Activities**

Formal activities are services provided through educational programming partnership agreements by external agency personnel in our schools during instructional time. These are monitored annually through service reports provided by partners; and reviewed in full by TDSB every three years.

The formal activity through two agreements, terminated in July 2020, included the following work and engagement with schools:

- **WE Charity: WE Schools Programming**
  - Free presentations for student and staff audiences facilitated by motivational speakers with in-depth knowledge of a variety of global issues.
  - In the most recent term of agreement (from 2018 to its termination in 2020), 17 schools had presentations delivered by WE Charity personnel in schools during instructional time.
  
- **ME to WE Social Enterprises Inc.: Student Leadership Development**
  - Fee for service student leadership development program, through which 30 selected students in interested schools are provided with a full day or more of activities specifically designed to nurture their leadership skills. (\$2,000 per session)
  - In the most recent term of agreement (from 2018 to its termination in 2020), 8 schools had student leadership sessions scheduled with Me to We Social Enterprises Inc. personnel in schools during instructional time.

### **Informal Activities**

- Me to We extracurricular clubs led by local TDSB staff in interested schools
- Learning Resource Products procured by local TDSB staff, as they deemed appropriate, to facilitate learning sessions
- Excursions to WE Global Learning Centre, Queen St.
- Excursions to WE Day, a province-wide special event held in Toronto each year

**APPENDIX C**

**Summary of Payments to WE Charity and ME to WE**

**Chart 1: Total Annual Payments to ME to WE from TDSB Budgets (See Note 1):**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Amounts Paid</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Amounts Paid</b>
2001-02	\$0	2011-12	\$178,311
2002-03	\$135,000	2012-13	\$5,603
2003-04	\$135,000	2013-14	\$15,060
2004-05	\$139,115	2014-15	\$740
2005-06	\$135,000	2015-16	\$3,955
2006-07	\$135,000	2016-17	\$61,047
2007-08	\$135,000	2017-18	\$83,609
2008-09	\$139,018	2018-19	\$54,310
2009-10	\$160,084	2019-20	\$32,688
2010-11	\$164,030	2020-21	\$0

**Chart 2: Cheque Payments from school non-board accounts issued to WE Charity and ME to WE (See Note 2):**

	<b>WE Charity</b>	<b>ME to WE</b>	<b>Free the Children</b>
2016-17	\$40,190	\$4,041	\$4,901
2017-18	\$79,473	\$16,400	\$2,573
2018-19	\$92,413	\$32,803	\$2,770
2019-20	\$11,272	\$5,578	\$5,971
2020-21	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- 1) Based on TDSB SAP system vendor payment records from 2001 to date.
- 2) Based on TDSB School Cash Online cheque payment records from August 2016 to date. Please note that the School Cash Online platform was not fully implemented at all TDSB schools until May 31, 2019. Hence, payments to WE Charity and ME to WE from school non-board accounts are not completely captured in Chart 2. Chart 2 figures are subject to errors and omission.

# Working Towards Anti-Oppressive Schools – Lessons from WE Charity: A Critical Review

## Background and Context

### A Need to Focus on Systems and Structures

In August 2020, TDSB's Board of Trustees proposed to suspend its current agreements with WE Charity/ME to WE and any other related organizations in light of increasing media scrutiny on the organization (TDSB, 2020b). Further research about the impact of WE on students and schools suggests alongside media scrutiny due in part to the federal funding scandal (CBC, 2020) and other concerns regarding the organization's practices both locally and globally (Brown, 2020; Lilley, 2020), WE's practices are also problematic because it "draws upon humanitarian discourse to posit post-racial compassion while nonetheless reinforcing white supremacy" (Jefferess, 2021, p. 2), white saviourism (Jefferess, 2012, Klaassen, 2020; Paradkar, 2020), and the notion that issues of global injustice are a result of individual dispositions rather than wider systems or structures of oppression (Jefferess, 2021).

While the TDSB recognizes the enduring negative effects of colonial structures on Indigenous, Black, and other equity seeking groups (ETFO & TDSB, 2021; TDSB, 2017), WE's initiatives don't interrogate how an inherently anti-colonial approach is necessary to effectively work towards justice (Shultz & Pillay, 2018). Unlike WE's stance on social justice, it is imperative to work with an approach that recognizes a need to counter capitalist, neoliberal, neocolonial and other hegemonic structures that perpetuate violence through things like the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous land, violation of UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples'), exploitation of the Global South by powers in the Global North<sup>1</sup>, etc. (Clyne, 2020-2021; Maynard, 2017; Manuel & Derrickson, 2015; Warner, 2019). Organizations like WE contribute to the mainstream discourse that individual dispositions and niceties alone are sufficient to challenge issues like racism and poverty (Jefferess, 2021; Nieto, 2017), but this discourse negates the very real reality of structures that are legislated and

---

<sup>1</sup> Bindra et al. (2018, p. 13) explain the "Global North refers primarily to nations in North America, Europe, Australasia, and developed parts of East Asia. These nations disproportionately control global resources in terms of wealth, housing, education, digital media access, and numerous other factors, while actively excluding countries in the Global South, which are home to the majority of the world's natural resources and population (Guzzetti & Lesley, 2015)." The Global North also actively overlooks its' role in perpetuating "need" in the Global South (i.e., "In 2012 the people/nations of the global North 'gave' more than \$126 billion in development aid to 'poor countries,' but more than \$3.3 trillion left these states through debt repayments, the profits of multinational corporations, and illicit capital flight, much of that a result of an unjust international system of trade" (Jefferess, 2021, p. 11).





institutionalized to contribute to systematic oppression of historically marginalized communities (e.g., the *Indian Act* in Canada; ETFO & TDSB, 2021). As such, even though the TDSB will be suspending its agreements with WE, to prevent collaboration with similar organizations in the future, it is critical to build capacity to center core pedagogical competencies that can allow interrogation of systems and structures of oppression.

### **Rethinking Competencies for Success**

While the Board has strategic priorities rooted in dismantling systems of oppression and racism, the approach to building competencies for success outside curricular goals do not clearly align with this vision. The Multi-Year Strategic Plan (MYSP) currently emphasizes the need to transform student learning through Global Competencies (GCs; TDSB, 2019) that “help students build knowledge and skills by: investigating the world beyond their immediate environment, recognizing their own and others’ perspectives, communicating their ideas effectively with diverse audiences, [and], translating their ideas into appropriate action to improve conditions” (TDSB, 2019, p. 19). However, these competencies are not organized to facilitate conversations of structural oppression (Auld & Morris, 2019; Idrissi et al., 2020), and thus, can inadvertently contradict priorities of anti-oppression and anti-racism (Grotlüschen, 2018).

For instance, while the Multi-Year Strategic Plan (2019), TDSB Equity Policy (2017), and other Board publications (ETFO & TDSB, 2021; Spence et al., 2020) recognize complex issues of human rights, anti-oppression, anti-Black racism, anti-Indigenous racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, anti-Asian racism, homophobia, transphobia, and the discrimination faced by those with physical and intellectual disabilities, are a result of larger systems of oppression than just a result of individual prejudices or discriminations; Global Competencies frame difference or oppression as something individuals manage, without successfully centering the skills students and staff need to engage deeply with difference or consider the ways in which wider systems of oppression shape individual and group differences in local and global contexts (Idrissi et al., 2020). Similarly, while Global Competencies are widely accepted across the world, they also illustrate hegemonic educational ideals that ignore the Global South (Grotlüschen, 2018), making it important to interrogate which populations they are working to serve, who is driving them, and whether they are truly in alignment with strategic priorities of creating more anti-oppressive and anti-racist schools (Auld & Morris, 2019; Engel et al., 2019; Kaess, 2018).

Researchers who have analysed the negative impacts of WE and similar organizations on schools have suggested one way to focus on systems rather than individual dispositions is by turning to the pedagogical approaches offered by Critical Global Citizenship Education (CGCE) (Andreotti, 2006, 2012; Jefferess, 2012, 2021), which works to bridge the gap between GCs and anti-oppressive schooling (Idrissi et al., 2020; Pashby, 2021). While GCs facilitate what can be dubbed “soft” global citizenship learning (Andreotti, 2006), CGCE works to dismantle oppressive systems and “empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their



cultures, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for decisions and actions” (Andreotti, 2006). CGCE helps students embrace a need to critically reflect on hegemonic structures and become agents of change in imagining radical futurities to solve the most pressing issues facing our world (Andreotti et al., 2018).

Instead of engaging in CGCE, however, organizations like WE frame social justice as a salvationist notion of “help as the burden of the fittest” (Pashby & Sund, 2019, p. 3). WE particularly framed social justice work through the orientation of saviourism, which “connotes the way in the global North, the global South is defined as (having) a problem, the global citizen or humanitarian is constructed as the solution to that problem, and the way it is the [white] “saviour” who has the power to delineate these roles and this relation” (Jefferess, 2021). Jefferess explains further:

“WE provides a variety of school-based Global Citizenship Education initiatives, including extra-curricular projects focused on entrepreneurship (i.e. fundraising), curriculum modules and workshops, as well as annual WE Day concerts, in which thousands of students pack into sports arenas to hear pop stars, celebrities, politicians, CEOs, and motivational speakers. While these activities are presented as providing much needed social justice education and personal empowerment, they provide what Andreotti (2006) calls ‘soft global citizenship education,’ constructing global inequality through a Northern lens that is ahistorical, depoliticized, and ethnocentric, offering simple solutions that reflect Northern paternalism and salvationism (Andreotti 2012).” (Jefferess, 2021, p. 3).

To effectively teach values of social justice in schooling it is important to shift from soft GC style global citizenship education to CGCE, which takes into account the inequities in the local contexts where such work is undertaken as well as the role of power and privilege as a result of structural and institutional injustices globally.

In an analysis of WE lesson plans in contrast to the Ontario Social Sciences curriculum, Jang (2018, p. 3) shares, “The current generations of youth are encouraged and highly motivated to “make a difference” and/or to pursue self-improvement by being responsible citizens that save the world through mission trips or NGO-sponsored activities in faraway countries (Andreotti, 2006),” but as Jang goes on to explain, while “this motivation has good intentions...it ultimately demonstrates the lack of awareness of the underlying power relations that compel one to act or think in this sort of civilizing way.” In 2018, a group of 15 economists explained this as, “Aid projects might yield satisfying micro-results, but they generally do little to change systems that produce the problems in the first place. What we need instead is to tackle the real root causes of poverty, inequality and climate change” (Alkire et al. 2018). Jefferess (2021) illustrates this as follows:

“The outflow of wealth from the South to the North, historical dispossession and ongoing displacement of people from their land (i.e. for industrial agriculture, mining, and wildlife



preserves), the exploitation of labour, neoliberal austerity programs that have decimated education and health care, as well as ineffective and harmful development projects – both micro and macro – make up a complex accounting of the ongoing history of impoverishment [aid projects otherwise aim to help]” (p. 13).

As such, to dismantle key issues like anti-Black racism or anti-Indigenous racism, which the TDSB has articulated as key priorities (TDSB, 2019, 2020a), a need to teach competencies that help students and staff understand oppression to be a result of ongoing, pervasive, and institutionalized structures than just a result of individual biases or prejudices, is necessary. Stemming from this, it is also necessary to teach competencies that don't just centre Eurocentric knowledge systems, but instead build from Africentric, Indigenous, and other non-Western knowledge systems to realize goals of Indigenous sovereignty and decolonial futurities.

### **Need for Capacity Building**

The messaging produced by WE schools can also be harmful to students and staff in some settings. In one instance, a teacher candidate shared the experience of similarly related campaigns having an unanticipated negative effect as follows:

“Some of the poverty relief funds raised were to be sent to places where many students have newly emigrated from, and students began to assume that every student coming from these countries have had the same impoverished experiences. These students felt, rightly, that their experiences before coming to Canada were being wrongly represented to the broader school community, and they were being marginalized and "othered" more than other new immigrant students were.” (Pashby, 2021, p. 10).

In this example though, staff decided to abandon such fundraisers and clubs instead of engaging with these types of complicated questions because they lacked the capacity to engage deeply with social justice work from a critical and anti-oppressive lens (Pashby, 2021). Consequently, it is necessary to help build capacity among students and staff to move away from saviourist, individualistic, and service-learning type pedagogic approaches to more critical understandings of global citizenship (Andreotti, 2006, 2012, 2018; Raddon & Harrison, 2015; Jang, 2018; Jefferess, 2012, 2021).

### **Recommendations**

Noting key issues emerging from the literature, the following recommendations are relevant to inform next steps with respect to informing future social justice work in TDSB schools:

1. Rethinking strategic priorities of transforming student learning using Global Competencies (GCs) and evolving towards a focus on Critical Global Citizenship Education (CGCE)



2. Revising criteria for working with NGO partners to include CGCE driven pedagogies as a core aspect of the partnership framework
3. Further research to think about the evolution of GCs and use of CGCE frameworks in TDSB's context

### **Rethinking strategic priorities of transforming student learning using Global Competencies (GCs) and evolving towards a focus on Critical Global Citizenship Education (CGCE)**

Given Board Strategic Priorities that emphasize the need to look at systems of oppression, particularly with respect to dismantling issues like anti-Black racism and anti-Indigenous racism (TDSB, 2019; TDSB, 2020a), research suggests the need to move from a focus on Global Competencies (GCs) in schools to Critical Global Citizenship Education (CGCE; Idirssi et al., 2020). Where GCs frame difference as something individuals manage, CGCE centres the skills students and staff need to engage deeply with difference and consider the ways in which wider systems of oppression shape individual and group differences in local and global contexts (Idirssi et al., 2020). Furthermore, GCs tend to foster educational goals that centre Western, Eurocentric ideals while ignoring Indigenous Knowledge systems of the Global South (Grotlüschen, 2018; Klaess, 2018), but CGCE opens up possibilities for applying decolonial and anti-colonial approaches to competency-development (Andreotti, 2011; Shultz & Pillay, 2018; Abdi et al., 2015). When doing social justice work in schools, Andreotti (2006, 2012) talks about the importance of critically examining why poverty or social inequality exists in countries students are being asked to help in the first place, and the role western systems of power can play in continually perpetuating such inequalities (Hickel, 2017; Maynard, 2017; Jefferess, 2021). CGCE serves as a bridge for anti-racism and global competency-based learning by providing a way of thinking about anti-oppressive praxis in schools through a systemic lens (Pashby, 2021).

### **Revising criteria for working with NGO partners to include CGCE driven pedagogies as a core aspect of the partnership framework**

WE offered pre-made lesson plans to students and staff with little room for critical interrogation (Jang, 2018; Pashby, 2021); however, the partnership standards for working with organizations like WE need to include a critical perspective that serves to establish core critical pedagogic practices as an aspect of the partnership framework. CGCE and research about identifying historical patterns of oppression often reproduced in global learning identifies a need to think of seven key principles: hegemony, ethnocentrism, ahistoricism, depoliticisation, salvationism, uncomplicated solutions, and paternalism (these principles are dubbed as HEADSUP; Andreotti, 2012). HEADSUP helps make visible repeated systems of oppression in local and global contexts (Andreotti, 2012) and can be an effective tool to help educators recognize which NGOs and social justice projects to engage with. Andreotti (2012) explains, originating from discussions in education by the Kony 2012 social justice campaign, HEADSUP:



“...has become an educational tool...to support engagements with local and global initiatives to address social justice. In line with critical literacy approaches, it is based on the principles that, if we want to work towards ideals of justice, we need to understand better the social and historical forces that connect us to each other” (p. 1).

Frameworks such as this one (see Image 1) can help schools ask critical questions that look at social justice issues in all their complexity while simultaneously facilitating Board strategic priorities of transforming student learning and facilitating critical consciousness development in areas of anti-oppression and anti-racism.

**Image 1: HEADSUP Framework (Andreotti, 2012):** “The questions in the second column aim to identify the reproduction of the patterns in the checklist, the questions in the third column aim to identify awareness of and challenges to those patterns.” (Andreotti, 2012, p. 2).

<b>Hegemony</b> (justifying superiority and supporting domination)	a) does this initiative promote the idea that one group of people could design and implement the ultimate solution that will solve all problems?	b) does this initiative invite people to analyze things from different perspectives, including complicities in the making of the problems being addressed?
<b>Ethnocentrism</b> (projecting one view as universal)	a) does this initiative imply that anyone who disagrees with what is proposed is completely wrong or immoral?	b) does this initiative acknowledge that there are other logical ways of looking at the same issue framed by different understandings of reality?
<b>Ahistoricism</b> (forgetting historical legacies and complicities)	a) does this initiative introduce a problem in the present without reference to why this problem exists and how 'we' are connected to the making of that?	b) does this initiative offer a complex historical analysis of the issue?
<b>Depoliticization</b> (disregarding power inequalities and ideological roots of analyses and proposals)	a) does this initiative present the problem/solution as disconnected from power and ideology?	b) does this initiative acknowledge its own ideological location and offer an analysis of power relations?
<b>Salvationism</b> (framing help as the burden of the fittest)	a) does this initiative present helpers or adopters as the chosen 'global' people on a mission to save the world and lead humanity towards its destiny of order, progress and harmony?	b) does this initiative acknowledge that the self-centered desire to be better than/superior to others and the imposition of aspirations for singular ideas of progress and development have historically been part of what creates injustice?
<b>Un- complicated solutions</b> (offering easy and simple solutions that do not require systemic change)	a) does this initiative offer simplistic analyses and answers that do not invite people to engage with complexity or think more deeply?	b) does this initiative offer a complex analysis of the problem acknowledging the possible adverse effects of proposed solutions?
<b>Paternalism</b> (seeking affirmation of authority/ superiority through the provision of help and the infantilization of recipients)	a) does this initiative portray people in need as people who lack education, resources, maturity or civilization and who would and should be very grateful for your help?	b) does this initiative portray people in need as people who are entitled to disagree with their saviors and to legitimately want to implement different solutions to what their helpers have in mind?

### Further research to think about the evolution of GCs and use of CGCE frameworks in TDSB’s context

More research should be done to explore successes and limitations of Global Competencies, along with how current priorities of fostering GCs can be evolved to better align with strategic



priorities of anti-racism and anti-oppression. Frameworks like HEADSUP can also be useful starting points to identify the types of critical perspectives that are necessary to establish core pedagogic competencies; yet across other educational contexts, they are also actively adapted to meet varying local needs of educators (Pashby & Sund, 2019). As such, it should be explored how CGCE frameworks can be adapted to meet specific contextual and capacity building needs of schools in the TDSB.

## Further Reading

- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3: 40-51.
- Andreotti, V. (2012). Editor's preface: HEADS UP. *Critical literacy: Theories and practices*, 6(1): 1-3.
- Idrissi, H., Engel, L., & Pashby, K. (2020). The diversity conflation and action ruse: A critical discourse analysis of the OECD's framework for global competence. *Comparative and International Education*, 49(1): 1-19.
- Jefferess, D. (2021). On saviours and saviourism: Lessons from the #WEScandal. Forthcoming publication in *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*.
- Jefferess, David. 2012. The "Me to We" social enterprise: Global education as lifestyle brand. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practice*, 6(1): 18-30.
- Klaassen, R. (2020, July 15). [We really need to talk about WE's white-saviour problem.](#) *Huffington Post*.
- Paradkar, S. (2020, July 30). Voluntourism by charities like WE is based on faulty ideals of feel-good white saviourism. *The Toronto Star*. <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/star-columnists/2020/07/30/voluntourism-by-charities-like-we-is-based-on-faulty-ideals-of-feel-good-white-saviourism.html>

## References

- Abdi, A. A., Shultz, L., & Pillay, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Decolonizing global citizenship education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Alkire, Sabina, et al. 2018. "Buzzwords and Tortuous Impact Studies Won't Fix a Broken Aid System." *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2018/jul/16/buzzwords-crazes-broken-aid-system-poverty>
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3: 40-51.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). (Towards) Decoloniality and diversity in global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9: 381–397.
- Andreotti, V. (2012). Editor's preface: HEADS UP. *Critical literacy: Theories and practices*, 6(1): 1-3.
- Andreotti, V., Stein, S., Sutherland, A., Pashby, K., Susa, R., & Amsler, S. (2018). Mobilising

- different conversations about global justice in education: Toward alternative futures in uncertain times. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 26, 9–41.
- Auld, E., & Morris, P. (2019). The OECD's assessment of global competence: Measuring and making global elites: In L. C. Engel, C. Maxwell, & M. Yemini (Eds.), *The machinery of school internationalization in action: Beyond the established boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- Bindra, G., Easwaran, K., Firasta, L., Hirsch, M., Kapoor, A., Sosnowski, A., Stec-Marksman, T., & 15 Vatansever, G. (2018). Increasing representation and equity in students as partners initiatives. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(2): 10-15
- Brown, J. (2020, July 3). Crime and fraud at WE charity in Kenya. *Canadaland*. <https://www.canadaland.com/crime-and-fraud-at-we-charity-in-kenya/>
- CBC. (2020, July 28). *The WE charity controversy explained*. CBC. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/we-charity-student-grant-justin-trudeau-testimony-1.5666676>
- Clyne, C. (2020-2021). *Anti-racist educator reads*. VOICEd Radio. <https://voiced.ca/project/anti-racist-educator-reads/>
- Engel, L. C., Rutkowski, D., & Thompson, G. (2019). Toward an international measure of global competence? A critical look at the PISA 2018 framework. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 17(2), 117–131.
- ETFO & TDSB. (2021). *Addressing anti-Asian racism: A resource for educators*. <https://www.tdsb.on.ca/Portals/0/docs/Addressing%20Anti-Asian%20Racism%20Resource%20Booklet%20final%20web%20Jan%202024.pdf>
- Grotlüschen, A. (2018). Global competence—Does the new OECD competence domain ignore the global South? *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 50(2): 185–202.
- Hickel, J. (2017, January 14). Aid in reverse: How poor countries develop rich countries. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2017/jan/14/aid-in-reverse-how-poor-countries-develop-rich-countries>
- Idrissi, H., Engel, L., & Pashby, K. (2020). The diversity conflation and action ruse: A critical discourse analysis of the OECD's framework for global competence. *Comparative and International Education*, 49(1): 1-19.
- Jang, C. (2018). *Critical global citizenship education: Spaces and possibility in the Ontario context* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Toronto.
- Jefferess, D. (2021). On saviours and saviourism: Lessons from the #WEScandal. Forthcoming publication in *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*.
- Jefferess, David. 2012. The “Me to We” social enterprise: Global education as lifestyle brand. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practice*, 6(1): 18-30.
- Kaess, K. (2018). The cross-Atlantic knowledge divide, or PISA for development: Should one size ever fit all?. *Atlantic Studies*, 15(3): 349-364.
- Klaassen, R. (2020, July 15). We really need to talk about WE's white-saviour problem. *Huffington Post*. [https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/we-charity-volunteer-white-saviour\\_ca\\_5f0e0652c5b648c301f07314?utm\\_hp\\_ref=ca-perspectives](https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/we-charity-volunteer-white-saviour_ca_5f0e0652c5b648c301f07314?utm_hp_ref=ca-perspectives)
- Lilley, B. (2020, July 16). WE charity listed real estate holdings worth \$43.7 M in 2018.



- Toronto Sun*. <https://torontosun.com/opinion/columnists/lilley-we-charity-listed-real-estate-holdings-worth-43-7-m-in-2018>
- Manuel, A. & Derrickson, Grand Chief R.M. (2015). *Unsettling Canada: A national wake-up call*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Maynard, R. (2017). *Policing Black lives: State violence in Canada from slavery to the present*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Nieto, S. (2017). Nice is not enough: Defining care for students of colour. In S. Nieto, *Language, culture, and teaching* (28-31). Routledge.
- Pashby, K. & Sund, L. (2019). *Teaching for sustainable development through ethical global issues pedagogy: A resource For secondary teachers*. Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Pashby, K. (2021, February 19). *Lessons from Me to We: Using HEADSUP as a framework for critical global citizenship education*. Professional Development Workshop, Toronto District School Board.
- Paradkar, S. (2020, July 30). Voluntourism by charities like WE is based on faulty ideals of feel-good white saviourism. *The Toronto Star*. <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/star-columnists/2020/07/30/voluntourism-by-charities-like-we-is-based-on-faulty-ideals-of-feel-good-white-saviourism.html>
- Raddon, M.B. & Harrison, B. (2015). Is service-learning the kind face of the neo-liberal university? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 45(2): 134-153.
- Shultz, L., & Pillay, T. (Eds.). (2018). *Global citizenship, common wealth and uncommon citizenships. Volume 17 – Comparative and International Education: A Diversity of Voices*. Leiden: Brill
- Spence, J., Senk, T., Murray, K., Donsky, D., Holder, L., Gaymse-San Vicente, A., & Mohamed, R. (2020, September). *Anti-racism, anti-Indigenous racism & embedded school/site improvement P.A. day, September 2020*. Professional Development Workshop, Toronto District School Board.
- TDSB. (2017). *Enhancing equity task force*. <https://www.tdsb.on.ca/Portals/0/community/docs/EETFReportPdfVersion.pdf>
- TDSB. (2018). *Equity policy (PO37)*. <http://ppf.tdsb.on.ca/uploads/files/live/97/200.pdf>
- TDSB. (2019). *Multi-year strategic plan: Action plans (2nd ed.)*. [https://www.tdsb.on.ca/Portals/0/docs/Multi-Year%20Strategic%20Plan\\_AODA\\_Oct%202019\\_Appendix%20A.pdf](https://www.tdsb.on.ca/Portals/0/docs/Multi-Year%20Strategic%20Plan_AODA_Oct%202019_Appendix%20A.pdf)
- TDSB. (2020a, June 4). “Top priorities for the interim director and board (next six months)” in *Special Meeting* [Board Meeting Minutes], p. 5. <https://www.tdsb.on.ca/Leadership/Boardroom/Agenda-Minutes/Type/M/Year/2020?Filename=200604+Sp.pdf>
- TDSB. (2020b, August 6). “Review of partnership agreements with WE Charity/Me to We” in *Special Meeting* [Board Meeting Minutes], p. 5-6 <https://www.tdsb.on.ca/Leadership/Boardroom/Agenda-Minutes/Type/M/Year/2020?Filename=200806+Sp.pdf>
- Warner, R. (2019). *Human rights and (racial) equity: Towards a conceptual framework*. Toronto District School Board.