

ECER 2018, Bolzano

Network 25 meeting, 6 September

Minutes

27 participants including convenors
Minutes by Z. Moody

1. Reviewing and selection of papers

2018, the network had a record number of submissions 55 + some redirections
First time we have had to reject papers of sufficient quality.

List of reviewers 2018. Double blind peer review.

- Ann Quennerstedt, Sweden
- Nina Thelander, Sweden
- Silvia Edling, Sweden
- Guadalupe Francia, Sweden
- Jenna Gillet Swan, Australia
- Jonathon Sargeant, Australia
- John L'Anson, UK
- Ionna Palaiologou, UK
- Zoe Moody, Switzerland

There is an imbalance with respect to countries and regions represented, which will be worked on during the coming years.

In the review process for ECER2018, 2/3 papers were selected based on quality (highest scored in review). 1/3 were selected by the link convenor on the basis of three criteria that have been agreed on in earlier network meeting: priority given to emerging researchers, underrepresented nations and new/under researched topics.

The following question was addressed to the network: Should these criteria remain a basis for selection if the network receives more proposals than slots available again?

The discussion raised the following aspects:

1. Prioritize network members that have shown commitment to the network as a fourth and last criteria BUT the problem is that the network could be narrowed to regulars and the discussions could become under-fertilized.
2. Quality should be the only criteria (e.g. all papers retained should be the highest ranked papers) BUT in some countries new researchers can not get funding if they don't present and there should be room for emerging researchers to learn OR some researchers from underrepresented countries could be excluded solely on the basis of the fact they do not master English language as well as others although their research would be of interest for the network.

3. Redirections could be used to not exclude good quality papers BUT the network receives more or less the same number of redirections as it redirects itself.

The meeting decided to not move forward with the suggestion made in point 1.

A vote was taken in respect to point 2: 2 participants wanted to prioritize quality, the rest favored the diversity criteria. **The meeting therefore decided that the same criteria for selection as used this year should be used** until a network meeting decides otherwise.

The link convenor raised the matter of information given to authors when the result of the reviews are sent out. The network has earlier decided not to show the points attributed to the proposals in the review result information, only the comments, but the option to show them to authors are available. The link convenor asked the meeting whether to keep the earlier practice or to change it and show the points. After a short discussion, a **vote to decide whether or not to show the points or not was taken.** 1 participant wanted to show the points, a majority did not. **The meeting decided to keep the earlier practice and not show the points.** It was mentioned that it could be relevant mainly for rejected papers BUT it could also become a way to appeal against decisions.

A criterion for presenting in the network is that proposals should have a clear 'educational relevance'. This criterion has previously not been emphasized to the reviewers to the same extent as the criterion 'make a clear reference to children's rights' has. The network receives proposals that have only a vague connection to education, and the link convenor asked the meeting whether educational relevance should be strengthened and more closely scrutinized by reviewers.

Discussion: We should strengthen the educational relevance, or clarify links to education BUT educational contexts are very broad so we shouldn't exclude papers that are of educational relevance although they don't make it explicit.

Suggestions from participants as alternatives to the "educational relevance" criterion:

1. Children's rights in or to education
2. Impact on education as a broad phenomenon
3. Formal or informal educational contexts

No decision was taken on how to reformulate the criterion. The network page on EERAs website will be reviewed this autumn, and the convenors will return to network members with a draft of a revised network page. Network members will be invited to comment the draft.

2. Special call & Joint sessions

For ECER2018, a special call "Inclusion and Exclusion in Education: a Children's Rights Perspective" related to the ECER main theme was launched. Two joint

sessions with other networks (teacher education, sport pedagogy) were organized. Organizational issues related to special calls and joint sessions were discussed – they offer possibilities for collaboration but take up space in the programme. The question of whether to organize a special call next year, and how to deal with joint sessions were discussed.

Concerning joint sessions, they were seen to be valuable opportunities both for collaboration and to demonstrate the network's interest to new people, but they should not be too many. **The meeting decided that 1 joint session is preferred.**

Concerning special calls, the meeting decided that the network will launch a special call again in 2019. Several ideas for a special call was raised:

- a) Joint special call with network 7: *Educational rights of refugee children*
- b) *Focus on the future*: a special call on the next theoretical or topical steps we would like to take as a network – or new or under research areas in the network's field.
- c) Joint special call as a strategic approach of other networks that do not usually speak in right
- d) Special call on school dress-codes, wearing religious symbols, etc.

The network decided to move forward with a special call, and the convenors will return to network members with a vote on topic.

3. Network collaboration day?

The possibility of a network collaboration day on the Monday before ECER starts was discussed. Many members support the idea, and some suggestions for a content was raised:

- a. It shouldn't be a replication of the conference, there should be much more activity.
- b. Comparisons on how the UNCRC affects real people in different countries.
- c. Journal issue from the network.

The convenor team will take this forward and return to members in good time before next ECER.

4. Publications

EERA invited proposals for edited book series two years ago, and the network has sent in one. There has been some issues with negotiating the contract with the series but the process is ongoing. Jenna Gillet Swan assures that the contributions have not been forgotten, and there is still opportunity to contribute. If anyone wants to join in, email Jenna.

Anyone wants to lead a Journal special issue until next year? If interested, contact Jenna Gillet Swan.

Children Australia (Global), Cambridge University Press wants papers or commentary, they are short of everything at the moment

5. Feedback - summary

Network specific comments - positive

Good network communication
Nice, small and interesting network
Good quality of presentations and discussions
Excellent chairs
Practical workshop
Range of rights issues covered and diversity of viewpoints
Atmosphere
Stimulation about research
Opportunity to learn about other research areas

Network specific comments – negative

Too little opportunities for discussion
More theory in papers
More diversity for representation from countries (e.g. Asia/Africa)
Thinking spaces to discuss ideas/thoughts about topics (less structured)
More opportunities to network with the research /topic interests
Too many peer reviews to review
Network meeting at lunchtime

General ECER - positive

Location, organisation, communication & help assistance
Layout great
Focused keynotes
Challenging topic
Timing and spacing of program
Social events and full dinner at reception
Communication
Open Wifi & App
Going green
Network connections with other networks

General ECER - negative

Accommodation problems
Not able to drink after losing cup (no alternatives), range of food in breaks, the voucher lunch experience
Poor streaming and ppt quality during keynotes
Screen projections in room

Small rooms and audio problems
Map of venue should be built up in App
Program would be clearer if organised by network not by time

6. Other questions

No other questions
Please fill out the evaluation form
Sign up on the mailing list on the web page