

Network meeting

Thursday 5 Sep 2019 (17h15-18h45)

Chaired by Ann Quennerstedt

Minutes by Zoe Moody

1. Welcome

Short presentation of the 22 participants

2. Information about submissions, review and programming for ECER 2019

a. *Figures*: 32 submissions, 4 rejected (12.5%), 28 accepted (2 withdrawals)

b. *Network meeting*:

This year the network meeting has been scheduled during a session (versus at lunch time).

The participants are asked what they think about it.

Most participants agree that it is preferable to have the network meeting during a session.

They say ECER is a stressing conference and skipping lunch makes it uncomfortable. They add that it is also a good idea to have the network dinner just after the network meeting. Finally, the last session on Thursday is considered a good time, all being tired.

c. *Special call and joint sessions*:

This year over half of the submissions were sent to the special call. Co-convenor in charge of the special call has selected 6 papers to organise 2 sessions.

Regarding joint sessions, the experience of last year has not been renewed. Participants agree that joint sessions primarily make sense when it is a symposium or a planned joint session.

They suggest it is possible to organise symposia by finding colleagues in other networks, together identifying what is topical, what could bring people together?

In conclusion: preferably favour planned joint sessions rather than those organised by link-convenors, with loose papers.

d. *Reviewers*: the origins of reviewers have been more diverse this year and the link-convenor has not reviewed.

3. Experiences from ECER 2019 – network, general

a. *Network*

Pluses

One participant says she has learned a lot, especially in respect to theoretical dimensions. Another adds it is the strength of the network: the thinking and possibilities of processing ideas are increased because members attend multiple network sessions. This is confirmed by another participant who says it was her first time in the network and she notes that the quality of the theory was better in NW25 than in other networks. The impact of the link-convenor in this respect is highlighted. Finally, some consider that the quality of the presentations is getting better, also there is more reaching out to the audience to ask questions.

Minuses

The room was uncomfortable, we have had continuous battles between having oxygen (opening windows) and dealing with the noise, as well as seeing each other with the lights on or the presentation, which only showed in the dark.

b. *ECER*

Pluses

Sustainability approach

Really good catering

The footsteps were really helpful and the signing in the buildings were really good

The organisation was good

Minuses

The location of catering was problematic, at least plan coffee in every building

BUT: By having to go to the centre you open up to other people

The streaming for the keynotes did not work.

The catering staff did not speak English and could not provide enough information about the dietary details of food. Also, there was no gluten free food.

Finally, why were there only cakes?

4. Network activities since last conference

- a. Application for network funding – network project (declined)
Explanations by co-convenor: notably it is highlighted that what EERA wants is activities that benefit many members, preferably reaching outside the network. The application was not framed this way.
Considering the network's topic it would be easy to reach out, but is it what the network wants?
- b. Development of special call: half of the papers were submitted to the call
- c. Annual report to EERA (see website)
- d. Twitter account is doing well (129 followers)
- e. Network publication/s:
Network book: work in process 18 chapters, 13 countries
Co-convenor collects publications of NW25 members, which should be sent by email to get the work spread.
- f. Collaboration session
- g. Newsletters to network members

5. Thoughts on network activities coming year

- a. Try again for network funding?
Suggestion is made to invite the Scottish children's commissioner, the children's parliament as a NW keynote
Rachel Shanks could organise this
- b. Should the network pause special call or launch a new one?
Most participants consider the special call can be replicated. The following topics are proposed:
 - UNCRC 30 years old
 - Involving teachers in research
 - Brexit: Europe as a community
 - Children's rights and culture

6. Election of convenors 2020

Network convenors' period ends next ECER – suggestion for process for election of convenor team:

- a. April – network members are invited to nominate for (i) link convenor, and (ii) convenors.

Nominated persons should write 100 words on who they are and what their plan to do.

Members of the NW before the nomination period starts are eligible to vote.

People who are present at the network meeting formally elect link convenor and convenors for a new 3-year period. The election process will take place on a secret paper vote.

Each member can nominate 1 link convenor and 2 co-convenors.

The link-convenor and co-convenors can all be re-elected for a period of time.

Criteria to be nominated:

- Link-convenor: has participated in at least 3 ECER, and has to be based in Europe
- Co-convenor: has to be able to attend most of the ECER conferences

Rachel Shanks is elected to handle the election process.

7. Other issues

No other issues.

16/09/2019, zmo