

Minutes of the EERA Council meeting held at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow - 1st and 2nd June 2002

Present:

Michel Caillot, President
Margaret Kirkwood, Secretary General
Kyriaki Doumas
Martin Lawn
Lesley Morrison
Carolina Pereira
Jules Pieters
Ian Stronach (Saturday only)

Apologies:

Raymond Bourdoncle, Ingrid Gogolin, Kirsten Hofgaard Lycke, Jorges da Lima, Sverker Lindblad, Risto Rinne, Bernard Schneuwly,

Introductions

The President opened the meeting by welcoming the Executive Council to Glasgow. The Secretary General listed the apologies and expressed regret that so many Council members were absent. She suggested that perhaps the low attendance was due to the timing and/or location of the meeting and agreed to contact those who were unable to come to see if this was the case. The possibility of moving next year's June meeting to May was proposed. It was also agreed that holding future meetings in more convenient locations may facilitate higher attendance.

Michel Caillot explained that since Fuensanta Hernandez-Pina stood down as President Elect, it still had to be confirmed whether her Association (AIDEPE) had also withdrawn from EERA. Martin Lawn also questioned whether Jose Esteve was still a Council member. Michel agreed to write to both Associations to clarify these membership queries.

Approval of the last Minutes

Martin Lawn explained that he had not yet been able to secure discussants for each of the keynotes. He noted that because Lohmann and Brown will participate in a roundtable organised by the Policy Studies and Politics of Education network, this session should be scheduled *after* their keynotes so that the issues raised in their speeches can be developed.

It was agreed that the Council meeting on Wednesday 11th September would now be held from 09:00-11:00 and the joint Council/Convenor meeting will be scheduled from 11:30-13.30.

Kyriaki Doumas highlighted that the support expressed by Antonio Novoa for the postgraduate pre-conference had been omitted from the last minutes.

1. ECER 2002

1.1 Main conference - report from EERA Office

Margaret Kirkwood reported that to date, 611 proposals had been accepted, 40 rejected and 17 had gone “missing” between the office and convenors. These had been resent and convenors asked for a quick response. Letters had been sent to all delegates with a reminder about hotel booking. A flurry of registration forms were now starting to come into the Office.

Although around 650 delegates are expected to attend, Margaret explained that this number is possibly lower than previous years because the dates of ECER coincide with those of the BERA conference. It was agreed that this needs to be remembered when setting the date for ECER 2003.

Margaret explained the need to streamline procedures to ensure a much smoother organisation for future conferences. She planned to ask convenors if the deadline should remain as strict in future. She also stressed that the Call for Papers needs to be improved so that the requirements are simple and clear. This, in turn, should ensure that the Office is provided with sufficient information to process submissions as quickly as possible.

Michel highlighted the problem of how to deal with those papers which do not come under a specific network and are therefore reviewed by the “Open Network”. He explained that although these papers may be academically sound, they are often too diverse and therefore difficult to schedule in the programme. He suggested examining the titles of those papers sent to the Open Network to see if there are any common themes. This could then prompt the creation of a new network. Martin Lawn felt that this point could be raised at the joint Council/Convenor meeting at ECER. Margaret felt that the network descriptors on the website need to be more complete and consistent to help authors decide which network is most appropriate for their paper.

Michel Caillot stressed that there should be better integration between the postgraduate pre-conference and the main event. It was agreed that in future, the pre-conference timetable should be included in the overall conference planner. Kyriaki Doumas agreed that this would help to make people more aware of the pre-conference strand of ECER. The President agreed to open the postgraduate pre-conference.

Margaret Kirkwood explained that because rooms at the University of Lisbon will be available until 21:30, Convenors will be able to hold network meetings after the main sessions. Martin Lawn explained that informal social events would be organised for each evening instead of an official conference dinner.

Margaret Kirkwood led a discussion on the scheduling of keynotes. Martin Lawn stated that his preferred order would be Lohmann, Stoer and Brown. Margaret felt that it was appropriate for Michel to chair the opening keynote. She also requested that Carolina Pereira ask Antonio Novoa to chair the second session. Martin offered to chair a session but, as he felt it inappropriate for him to chair an English-speaking academic’s session, proposed that Sverker Lindblad be asked to chair Brown’s keynote instead.

Margaret Kirkwood asked if questions should be allowed after each keynote. Martin Lawn explained that although ten minutes of questions are usually allocated, there was insufficient time for this last year. It was therefore agreed that the length and structure of the keynote sessions should be indicated in the programme so that speakers can schedule 50 minutes for their speech and allow 10 minutes for questions.

Margaret Kirkwood explained that the AGA will be held on Friday 13th September to facilitate feedback on the conference. As no other sessions will be scheduled at this time, it is hoped that attendance will be high.

Martin Lawn requested that the EERJ Editorial Board meeting be allocated a one hour slot in session 7 (Friday 13th September, 11:00-12.30) and that the EERJ meeting be scheduled on the same day in session 8 (13:00-14:30). He also stressed that the reception for Antonio Novoa's book-launch must be scheduled for the Friday evening because an invited speaker for this event can only attend on this day.

Margaret Kirkwood explained that the next task was compiling the programme and publishing the abstracts. The possibility of producing the book of abstracts in CD-ROM format was discussed, however it was agreed that this would prove expensive. Martin Lawn felt that as EERA already pay Education-online to publish abstracts electronically, it would not be worthwhile paying twice. Margaret suggested that when the programme is sent out in July, a cover letter should be included to remind people that they can have online access to abstracts.

1.2 Main conference - report from local organisers

Carolina Pereira reported on progress in the local office. She explained that rooms will be available in three adjacent buildings and that each will have an information board listing session times and rooms. She highlighted that many Portuguese delegates have complained that information about submissions and registration on the website is unclear. She also explained that some of them did not understand the network descriptors and so submitted proposals without specifying a network.

Carolina explained that because not all rooms have sufficient audio-visual equipment such as PowerPoint, the local office would need a list of the type and quantity of equipment required by presenters. Margaret Kirkwood agreed that once the EERA office has all this information, it will send an AV list to Lisbon so that they can allocate suitably equipped rooms for each network. Carolina explained that there would be IT support and student helpers available throughout the conference to ensure the smooth running of each session.

Due to the importance of having a Chair for each session, Margaret suggested that Convenors are asked to check each day that all sessions have a nominated Chair. For any that do not, it would then be the Convenor's responsibility to find one. Martin Lawn suggested that student helpers could monitor sessions and inform the conference office if Chairs fail to show up to their scheduled slot. Margaret proposed asking each Chair to complete an evaluation sheet to report on how successful their session was. These could then be collected by student helpers and returned to the office at the end of sessions. It was agreed that the delegate pack for Chairs should include a list of all the sessions they are responsible for and an evaluation form for each.

Margaret stressed that each network must adhere to the schedule because problems arise when individual networks re-schedule their sessions and do not tell the conference office. Delegates from other networks then turn up for these sessions and are frustrated when they find an empty room. It was agreed that Convenors must be reminded to report any changes to their sessions to the conference office so that they can be highlighted to other delegates.

Martin Lawn explained that it was important to provide a social event each evening between 18:30-19:30 because there was to be no formal conference dinner this year. However, Carolina Pereira explained that, due to some initial confusion about this, the member of the local committee responsible for this had not yet organised anything. Martin

stressed that something simple must be provided to give delegates an opportunity to socialise after the day's sessions. Suggestions included wine-tasting, music and a barbecue. Carolina agreed that this should not prove too difficult to arrange and agreed to bring this point to the attention of the local team.

A discussion followed on Antonio Novoa's request that the conference have an official closing ceremony. Martin Lawn stressed that this would have to be indicated in the programme to encourage delegates to attend. To close, Michel Caillot suggested that each Convenor sum up the main points of their network proceedings. However, Martin argued that this would prove too time-consuming and Ian Stronach felt that delegates would only be interested in what their own network had discussed. Margaret Kirkwood suggested asking one Convenor to evaluate the conference but Martin felt that it would be inappropriate to ask one Convenor to speak on behalf of all others. The possibility of approaching the Convenor of a large network, such as VETNET was discussed and Michel also suggested inviting a young researcher from the postgraduate network to contribute. To accommodate this it was agreed that the closing ceremony should be extended and run from 12:45-13:30, with the Council meeting commencing at 14:30. It was finally agreed that the closing speeches should be from Michel Caillot, representing EERA; Antonio Novoa, representing the host University; one Convenor, representing the Network viewpoint and a postgraduate student to present the view of young researchers.

For the Opening ceremony, which will be held between 15:00–15:30 on Wednesday 11th, it was agreed that Michel Caillot and Antonio Novoa would provide the welcome, followed by Estrella (President of the Portuguese Educational Sciences Committee) and the Dean of the University of Lisbon.

1.3 Joint Convenor/Council events at ECER 2002

Margaret explained that the joint Convenor/Council meeting would be take place on Wednesday 11th September, from 11.30-13:30. She felt it would be appropriate for her to ask the Convenors as a group to draw up an agenda. This would then enable her to produce a joint agenda based on the areas highlighted for discussion. It was hoped that this meeting would be a way of keeping the Convenors informed of important developments, such as arrangement for ECER 2003.

1.4 Request for PERINE project demonstration at ECER

Martin explained that a request from Phil Sheffield, on behalf of the PERINE project, had been made for a fifteen minute slot during the conference to demonstrate the project's trial database. As they would need access to a data projector, Carolina felt it would be best if this session take place in the main lecture theatre. It was agreed that this should be scheduled on Wednesday morning before the joint Council/Convenor meeting and perhaps again on Thursday between 10:30-11:00. Margaret would propose these two time slots to Phil Sheffield and if he agreed, they would be indicated in the programme.

1.5 Postgraduate students' pre-conference

Kyriaki Doumas led the discussion on the postgraduate pre-conference by expressing her thanks for the level of co-operation her network has received from the local committee. Professor Novoa had already agreed to welcome the students and Kyriaki asked Michel to speak about his support for the postgraduate network and explain how it relates to EERA as a whole. It was agreed that the pre-conference would provide a good opportunity for students to work with senior researchers who would give feedback and advice on

individual presentations. There would be fifteen postgraduate presenters in total and up to thirty research students were expected to attend. Kyriaki agreed to send the final pre-conference schedule to the EERA Office so that it could be included in the overall ECER programme.

Kyriaki and Ian Stronach explained that part of the strategic plan for the postgraduate network was the possibility of putting bids in to national organisations for doctoral training. If funding from the EU became available Kyriaki explained that a summer school could be started.

Although students presenting in the pre-conference do not have to pay, other research students whose papers have been accepted for inclusion in the main conference, must pay the full delegate fee. It was felt that for next year, this arrangement should be reviewed and a reduced fee for students should be set.

Kyriaki stated that she hoped to continue to incorporate the postgraduate network within EERA's activities and in this way ensure that the postgraduate strand would become a regular feature in future conferences. Michele requested that Ian and Kyriaki prepare a report on the goals of the postgraduate conference for discussion at the next council meeting.

1.6 Educationline and ECER

Margaret stated that when sending the programme to delegates, the Office will include a letter to remind them that they can post their full papers onto the Educationline website. She agreed to ask Phil Sheffield if, during the conference, he would be willing to demonstrate how the database works so that people can see how to search for past papers. Jules Pieters stated that the cost for mounting the abstracts on-line was £1,500. Martin pointed out that there was also a cost per paper. Margaret agreed to ask Sam Saunders to provide a financial report to illustrate the breakdown of costs for this service.

1.7 Reduced fees for delegates from countries with low GDP.

Jules explained that at ECER 2001, delegates from countries with a GDP less than \$5,000 (US) had been entitled to a reduced fee of £25 (compared to the "early-bird" fee of £130 and the standard fee of £170). The registration form for Lisbon, however, made no mention of such a reduction. Jules and Michel agreed that it would be appropriate to offer a similar reduction this year. However, Martin felt that because those delegates who had already paid would therefore have to be refunded, it was perhaps better not to offer any reduction this year and reconsider it for next year. Michel pointed out that it would be difficult to ascertain which countries qualified because GDPs in Europe had now increased. Martin said he had a recent report outlining GDPs which he would send to Jules for review. It was agreed that Jules should make the final decision on this and pass the information onto the office so that they could inform the relevant delegates.

1.8 A.G.A.

Margaret stated that the A.G.A. would be scheduled for Friday 13th September from 17:00-18:00. It was agreed that the EERA constitution should be a topic of conversation, given that EERA is still registered as SCORE. Martin also felt various queries about EERA membership should be clarified, such as, who exactly EERA's current members are, the number of votes each person gets and who has paid their membership subscriptions. Jules explained that since 1999, no letters asking for membership fees had been sent. Martin felt that if members had not therefore paid their fees they were technically not entitled to vote.

He also stressed that the benefits of membership should be clarified before people were asked for money. Michel said he preferred to develop membership through National Associations rather than through individual memberships. As Jules had the membership database, it was agreed that he should draft a letter requesting fees which Margaret, Michel and Martin would then comment on. Margaret pointed out that this could possibly generate more work than the Office can currently deal with and felt that any queries over membership should be dealt with by either her or Jules.

2. ECER 2003/2004

2.1 Location and local organisation

As no definite venue for ECER 2003 had been decided on, possible venues were discussed. Michel pointed out that following Fuensanta's resignation, Spain was no longer an option for next year. Jules also reported that Amsterdam was a possibility for 2004. Martin explained that information and prices from commercial conference agencies had been provided however, most of these proved too costly with certain tie-ins, such as expensive accommodation and catering. Jules said the budget for next year's conference was £50,000. Margaret said that instead of dealing with commercial organisations it would perhaps be cheaper to work with a University venue.

Martin stressed that an attractive location is a major factor in drawing large numbers. It was therefore agreed that a combination of an appealing city and the efficient organisational support of a University was needed.

Margaret suggested asking selected Council members, such as Ingrid Gogolin in Hamburg and Kirsten Hofgaard Lycke in Oslo, to investigate the possibility of their institution acting as host. It was agreed that Margaret should contact them to pursue this as a decision must be made by the end of June.

3. EERA DEVELOPMENT

Relations with EARLI

Michel explained that he had written to the EARLI President expressing EERA's wish to foster inter-organisational collaboration and to maintain a more official relationship with EARLI. However, he had still to receive a reply. It was agreed that, although each Association has a different focus, there could be greater co-operation between them. Jules pointed out that as the EARLI conference is recognised by the EU, this would therefore be a good contact for EERA to make. The possibility of a bi-annual EERA/EARLI conference was also discussed. Michel agreed to invite the EARLI President to ECER 2002 as a symbol of future co-operation.

Michel called the meeting to a close at 18:30 and the discussion reconvened on Sunday 2nd June at 9am.

EC Expression of Interest for Integrated Projects or Networks of Excellence

Michel explained that in order to apply for project funding in November, an expression of interest had to be submitted by the deadline of 7 June. He expressed regret that, due to other commitments, he would be unable to submit anything by the deadline. Martin felt that, given the tight deadline, EERA should wait and see what other bids are submitted by the deadline and then see if EERA could support or be involved in one of these. Michel

suggested taking the main ideas from the 2000 Brussels document and organising a rationale around it. Jules agreed to produce a general 5 page document outlining EERA's goals of developing research training in Europe which he would circulate to the Council for comment before submission. It was agreed that this should be discussed further at the joint Council/Convenor meeting at ECER. Margaret agreed to send the document submitted by Jules to the Convenors in advance of this.

Canadian Association Conference: invitation to EERA

Margaret explained that following a late invitation to the Canadian Association's conference, Rae Stark had offered to represent EERA. While it was agreed that such bilateral relations were worthwhile, it proves too expensive to send someone each year to other Association's conferences.

SOROS Foundation and EU

Martin explained that he had written to the SOROS Foundation to express EERA's wish to support the expansion of educational research across Europe. SOROS would then encourage, through its agencies, the idea of setting up Educational Research associations and then EERA would ask the EU to fund the participation of representatives from these countries at ECER. The benefit to EERA would be that new European Associations would be eligible to become members of EERA. Martin would keep the Council informed as to whether EU funding is available for this.

III. EERA Organisation

1. EERA Office

Margaret explained that Lesley Morrison had been seconded as the new EERA Administrator until the end of November. She explained that at present Lesley is supported by 2 part-time secretaries, Nan and Terri. Nan will have the responsibility for book-keeping and had agreed to do 4 hours per week overtime to accommodate this. However, it is now obvious that this will not be sufficient to cover this extra workload. Margaret said that there is a need for a full-time secretary to support the office and she agreed to monitor the workload to avoid over-loading the office.

2. Finance

2.1 Treasurer's report

Jules did not have a written report to table but explained that he was unsure of the exact revenue from Lille. Although money had not been lost, over £3000 had to be refunded to people who had paid but were then unable to attend.

2.2 Progress with 2002 Audit and insurance cover

Margaret said due to the difficulties in tracing transactions from ECER 2001, John Queen had kindly agreed to work with the Office to try to ensure things run smoother for the 2002 Audit.

Margaret also explained that EERA's insurance cover was provided by Royal and Sun Alliance and Council members were protected against employment practice liability.

3. EERA Council

Membership 2002

Due to incomplete archives, Margaret explained that it was difficult to tell when Council members started and were due to end their terms. She suggested that when Jules is updating the membership records, he should also try to define who each Association's representative member is on the Council.

With regards the election of a new President, Martin said that this would have to be an experienced member of Council and someone who is already an office-bearer, either Margaret, Jules, Ingrid, Jorge or Bernard.

4. Group remits

Michel stated that although it had been agreed at the last Council meeting that each member would submit a report on their specific responsibility, Jorge da Lima was the only one to do so. Martin suggested asking those with outstanding reports to submit them for the A.G.A.

Postgraduate/summer school

Kyriaki urged the Council to become more conscious of the postgraduate network and make it a focus of EERA. Margaret agreed that because it is so important to encourage young researchers, Network 21 is very important for the development of EERA. It was agreed that the postgraduate network needs special support and Martin felt that the website should have more information on it because this is the public face of EERA. He suggested that Kyriaki and Ian write a report on their network's activities for inclusion in the journal. Michel and Margaret urged Kyriaki to work closely with the Office so that they are aware of her plans because not everyone was aware that the pre-conference would be free. Jules pointed out that he had not been informed of this and felt that all decisions like this must be discussed at Council.

Website

Martin explained that, although the website is not his responsibility, he had worked with a web designer to revamp the site. Wish to make information more accessible for users. Inclusion of a new logo. He would communicate with Jorge on this. He will send a working version of the new site to Margaret for comment. Martin said Jorge would ask the convenors what information they want about their networks, in order to improve network descriptors.

EERJ

Martin explained that a flier will be sent to all Universities in Europe to convince their libraries to buy the licence. Although he was keen to get more subscribers, the emphasis must be on producing a good journal. Martin asked Carolina if it would be possible for Triangle to exhibit their website at the conference. He agreed to ask Triangle if they would like this opportunity. Margaret said this demonstration could take place during one

of the half hour slots between sessions. He also said that he could get fliers from Triangle which the office could send out with the programme. If this is the case he will let the office know.

IV Reports

Michel stated that the President's report was ongoing. Margaret queried whether a written report from the Secretary General was necessary at every meeting. Michel commented that the monthly report from the Office was very important in keeping the council and convenors up-to-date. Should be maintained. Michel finished by saying that, due to lack of time, not all items on the agenda had been discussed and that these were just to be noted. He closed by thanking Jules for agreeing to prepare the Expression of Interest submission.

Next Council meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 11th September from 09:00-11:00, followed by the joint Council/Convenor meeting from 11:30-13:30.