Minutes of the
Network Seminar in Berlin
26 – 27 April, 2018

Venue: Wyndham Garden Berlin Mitte
Osloerstr. 116 a
13359 Berlin

Link Convenors or representatives: NW01 Hannu Heikkinen, NW02 Christof Nägele, NW03 Nienke Nieven, NW04 Tatjana Atanasoska, NW05 Michael Jopling, NW06 Petra Grell, NW07 Lisa Rosen, NW08 Monica Carlsson, NW09 Heike Wendt, NW10 M.L.White, NW11 Ineta Luka, NW12 Christoph Schindler, NW13 Paul Smeyers, NW14 Rocío García Carrión, NW16 Ed Smeets, NW17 Helena Ribeiro de Castro, NW18 Oliver Hooper, NW19 Sofia Marques da Silva, NW20 Christian Quvang, NW22 Christine Teelken, NW23 Pete Kelly, NW24 Javier Diez Palomar, NW25 Ann Quennerstedt, NW26 Petros Pashiardis, NW27 Florence Ligozat, NW 28 Paolo Landri, NW29 Catarina Martins, NW30 Jutta Nikel, NW31 Ratha Perumal, NW32 Michael Göhlich, NW33 Branislava Baranovic, ERG Saneeya Qureshi
Council: Julianna Mrazik
EXEC: Theo Wubbels, Maria Pacheco Figueiredo, Jani Ursin
Office: Angelika Wegscheider, Doretta Dow
Apologies: NW15 Phillippe Masson

Wednesday, April 25
Arrivals and welcome dinner

Thursday, 26 April

1   Welcome, introductions and warm-up activity

Warm up: How well do you know the networks? Maria Pacheco Figueiredo asked everyone to come to the back of the room and stand in a group. In 6 rounds, Maria chose 3 attendees to come forward and then asked people to stand next to 1) the representative of the network which had the second highest number of submissions (NW04, Inclusive Education) 2) the exec member who hasn't chaired a session at ECER since 2014 (Joe O'Hara, president-elect) 3) the person who is not a council member (Petra Grell) 4) the representative of the network which had the most joint sessions last year (NW26, Educational Leadership) 5) the Link Convenor who was the first to have the programme finished this year (Christine Teelken from NW22, Research in Higher Education) and 6) the representative of the network with the longest name (NW01, Continuing Professional Development: Learning for Individuals, Leaders and Organisation).
The warm up ended with "Adopt a Newcomer" in which link convenors who had been to previous Network Seminars talked with those who were attending for the first time.

2   Network Development – Self-awareness

2.1   Self-awareness: introduction

Maria introduced the topic of the networks' self-awareness by saying that we EERA insiders are OK with networks being organic/chaotic but it is hard for outsiders to understand how we organise networks. As network development is very important to EERA, we need a commitment to look at our structures. Jani Ursin added that we have all agreed and accepted that the networks are very different from each other, but as we have new networks and new Council Members it is important that we take a closer look at the

networks, this time with a focus on network identity. He suggested that networks should look at what they already have as an identity, leading us to the topic of self-awareness and the four questions:

- What are the building blocks of a network?
- What is the contribution of your network to EERA?
- What are the main challenges for networks in the future?
- How can Council support the development of networks?

Working groups were formed which all addressed the full set of the above questions.

2.2 Self-awareness: Reports from working groups on the questions of building blocks and contribution to EERA

Group 4
Hannu Heikkinen asked in his report what are the building blocks of networks and stated that the question is about collective identity. Some networks in his group have a strong sense of collective identity (NW02, NW08, NW19, NW27) which is based on things such as network publications, a core group coming to ECER so they know each other and thus have a stable identity. Other groups (for example his NW01) have a weaker sense of collective identity and are more a platform for discussion, a place for people to meet and talk. A third group of networks are on a continuum, they are in between a strong and weak sense of collective identity (NW13, NW26).

When discussing the Contributions to EERA, Hannu Heikkinen mentioned "a platform for discussion" and asked members of the group what else their networks offer. Monica Carlsson raised the question if what the networks offer is more international or truly European. What is the advantage of the networks including, for example, the USA and Australia. How does a network remain open for international researchers while holding responsibility for European researchers? Paul Smeyers added that EERA/ECER offer people the chance to go to different networks and gain knowledge from other networks and other areas of research, which he valued a lot as Philosophers sometimes are less connected to other research fields. Christof Nägele reported that NW02 engages in a lot of activities other than ECER, they want to invest in identity building within the network, both in relation to ECER/EERA and also to itself. Florence Ligozat explained that NW27's strong identity comes from the fact that ECER is a unique chance for researchers from other countries to come together and explore beyond their own countries' Didactics. This is their network's specific contribution to EERA as Didactics are very diverse in different countries.

Group 3
Building blocks: Petra Grell reported that her group asked the question "What is in every network?". Their answers included: a strong core group; core themes (subthemes and subdivisions in big networks); research/theory traditions reflecting network history/knowledge; labeling and relabeling their identity; transparency for "outsiders"; some kind of social event; some networks have outside-EERA networks and institutions create platforms and strongly support network activities and research. She added that networks need to see and cherish these building blocks but also to make them transparent to outsiders. Theo Wubbels raised the questions of which people participate in the networks' social events? How many? What about the people who do not go to the social events? What about the new people coming to sessions? How do inculturation, exculturation and assimilation work? Petra Grell answered that in her network they invite all new people at sessions to come to the network meeting. The core group attends the social events. Angelika Wegscheider commented on the labeling and relabeling of a network that until now if a network changes its name, there is no public explanation for this change. She suggests we could begin explaining such changes and including them in the history of the network. Petra Grell finds this a good idea.

Contribution to EERA: The group raised the question "Are we expected to contribute to European research or to the Association?" Contributions included: discussing/balancing national/European/cross-context

approaches; focusing contributions on European space; supportive of and appreciating the culture of discussion/feedback; living the idea of European research.

Group 2
Building blocks: Christine Teelken listed a variety of different network types: some are disciplinary or subject oriented and some have substructures in themselves. She said the constructive principle says a lot about identity. NW22, for example, has 6 sub-themes which relate to other networks. Christine reported that in their group, NW18, NW25 and NW31 feel a strong connection to an international approach; which would be part of their identity. Both a multinational approach and a core team can be considered building blocks. Oliver Hooper added that a core group of convenors is important to network identity but that the convenors are not sure what their jobs are. NW18 is trying to establish a core following in order to maintain dialogue.

Group 1
Building blocks: Tatjana Atanasoska mentioned that their group is very thankful for support, both the deadlines and the flexibility but also said that the time factor for convenors is significant, it is like having a second job. They asked how best to cultivate members between ECERs and offered the possibilities of Network Summer Schools, joint publications, joint research projects. They would like more contact to local communities during ECER with more offsite activities. Further questions included: Why are some regions not represented? How can we support more people attending ECER from the countries with low attendance? How do we construct and deconstruct when borders are changing? How do we make the development transparent? How do we stay inclusive?

Contribution to EERA: ML White emphasized the questions What IS a network? What is the purpose of a network? What do we want to do? To share? We need to revisit purpose and include others while maintaining academic standards.

2.3   Self-awareness: General comments on working group reports on the questions of building blocks and contribution to EERA

Jani noted that it is interesting that the international approach was repeatedly mentioned, not just the European approach. This is important in order to be inclusive.

2.4   Self-awareness: Reports from working groups on the questions of future challenges and support from Council

Group 1
Challenges and support: Regarding funding, Tatjana Atanasoska asked if EERA can support more outside activities, more engagement with local communities at the conference. She mentioned a need to offer more special calls, to be more active between ECERs and asks if it would be possible to have one keynote address the current challenges of the host country. Maria explained that since Istanbul, efforts have been made to have sessions from local research communities, the "EERA Sessions". These sessions are invited by council and they are competing with networks' programs. For Bolzano 4 EERA sessions on local issues will be in the programme. Theo addressed the question of having a keynote on the topic of the challenges of the host country, explaining that Council recently discussed it there could be more than 4 keynotes and that future conference may see more keynote speakers, then maybe also with specific foci.

Group 2
Challenges: The annual report is seen as bureaucratic, the group wondered if there is an aggregate report? Continuation was seen as important, and some networks meet during the year. Ann Quennerstedt added the following challenges: smaller networks balancing the wish to have as many sessions as possible while

still keeping up the quality; where to draw the line on what is educational research, in their group they had big differences- for example Germans include social work as education, in Sweden they do not.

Support: In general it was stated that support often means funding. Could there be funding for a network to invite a big name? The dominance of the English language was mentioned and the question asked why we just stick to English and not open up for other languages offering translations. Paul Smeyers commented that previous experiences of having different languages at ECER created separate conferences and made the conference as a whole fall apart. A further idea for support was if EERJ could be presented more closely to networks? Also the rather successful BERA blog was mentioned and it was asked if EERA could do something similar. Joe O'Hara responded that the blog is an excellent idea as a way to highlight what the Networks do while raising the profile of EERA as an organization which offers high quality research. Petra Grell noted that on the one hand, she likes the idea of a blog but on the other hand it takes a lot of manpower and raises the questions of who is allowed to write on it. This would have to be dealt with delicately. Michael Göhlich asked if there might be funding for convenors to meet in the middle of the year (NW32 did so with funding from their universities). Oliver Hooper said that one big issue for networks is how to stand out/how to attract people/how EERA can help make each network unique. EERA funded a NW18 seminar which put their network on the map.

Group 3
Challenges: Petra Grell reported on their group's challenges: growing bigger while staying focused; keeping the label attractive; differences in publication cultures; opportunities to support poorer parts of Europe (accommodation costs) and/or find cheap venues; ECER time (hinders participation for some countries); lack of knowledge about EERA and the need to communicate more what EERA is and does; how to support colleagues from countries with little academic freedom (some networks are closer to this than others, some parts of Europe are in crisis, should we as networks or EERA offer them a possibility to raise their voices?); complicated political situations in Europe; inequality in terms of accessibility to research resources leads colleagues to not attend because their research is not up to high standards, how to support them? Jani responded to this last challenge by announcing that Council has thought of offering academic writing workshops in different countries in Europe.

Support: The groups ideas included: EERA should look for venues which are accessible/cheaper; financial support for additional meetings of network organizers; lessening the paper work; re-discussing proceedings/publication options; reconsidering funding criteria for network projects; offering rooms for longer capacity building workshops during the conference. In response to the wish for cheaper venues, Theo explained that EERA is approached by universities who want to host and these are usually in expensive places. EERA also actively approaches people and asks if they are interested. If the Link Convenors know of a university willing to host, they should let office know.

Group 4
Challenges and support: Paul Smeyers commented that Council, EXEC and Office do an excellent job in organizing the conference. One problem is the deadlines for funding. Link Convenors do not always distribute them to other convenors as too many things are on the table.

3   Network Development – Communication (World Café)

3.1   Communication: introduction

In order to address the question of how networks communicate themselves to EERA Council, ECER participants, the world (different audiences), a World Café with 20 minute discussions on the following 3 topics was held:

- Improving and easing the reporting of networks (chairperson Jani)

- Discussing what network information is crucial for the updated EERA website (chairpersons Joe and Angelika)
- Discussing what should be included in a short movie on EERA networks (chairperson Maria)

3.2   Communication: Reports from Chairs of World Café

Before beginning the reports, Maria asked the group if they liked the World Café. The answer was a resounding "yes".

3.2.1 Jani Ursin on improving and easing the reporting of networks

Jani reported that the participants in the world cafés had an overwhelmingly positive response to the short survey of ECER directly after ECER and that they were also in favour of having the reports entered online via, for example, esurvey. It was decided that the reports need to be streamlined and there were 3 issues raised:

- There needs to be more focus on assessing the scientific quality
- Networks should decide how they would like to communicate and answer the question "What do we want to share?"
- In future the SWOT analysis will just be a SW analysis (strengths and weaknesses)

Jani explained to the groups several changes to the reporting process:

- The Link Convenors will be asked to send the minutes of their Network Meeting at ECER and any changes to the convenor team two weeks after ECER.
- The Annual Reports will no longer only focus on ECER (as Office will provide information on number of submissions, sessions etc and the Short Report will give general ECER feedback) but will also include other network activities such as season schools, etc
- Office will send the Link Convenors a list of their reviewers before ECER for those who would like to use the list during their network Meeting to update their list of reviewers for the coming year.
- 'For the Link Convenors' meeting during ECER 2018, Jani will prepare network reporting documents with a reporting schedule to be discussed and approved'

The Link Convenors made it clear that they would very much like to receive the information from the Session Return Slips as preparation for their annual report

1.1.1 Joe O'Hara reporting on what network information is crucial for the updated website

Joe reported that each group had different emphases and that the discussion with each group was enriching. The suggestion for the motto/claim "Research for the benefit of education and society" on the new website met with mixed reactions. Some liked it, some did not, some wanted it longer (for example "a community of educational researchers"). It was noted that it is individuals, and not EERA, who carry out research.
The groups were asked what information should be on the website to make life easier for the Link Convenors. It was suggested that having an annual timetable of tasks online would be helpful and the idea was extended to having different timelines for different groups (e.g. presenters, emerging researchers). The Link Convenors requested that the information be made more prominent.

They discussed which network content could be included on the website and which general data would be made public. Possibilities include:

- ECER Stats: submissions/formats/country of reviewers for each network; attendance, underrepresented groups

- History: a history section which also lists projects and summer schools as includes previous link convenors
- network-generated content
- links to social media
- info/annual timetable for convenors (within the Sections for Link Convenors and reviewers)
- password protected element to an individual network space, managed by the Link Convenor, to facilitate network communication
- password protected intranet
- mailing list
- link to conftool
- core network information
- link to search programme "   " social media
- biographies of convenors and new members
- archive of all Link Convenors
- own space/planning for Link Convenors
- blogs (at the network level, convenor as editor
- NW 18 does regular Throwback highlighting abstracts of previous years on twitter
- split publications and abstracts

3.2.2 Maria Pacheco Figueiredo on discussing what should be included in a short movie on EERA

Maria reported that the groups decided there would be one EERA networks video as an overview and 32 videos with interviews, one for each network.

The common credo was how people connect with each other but also how ideas are created during conferences. The conference should be used but the videos are not limited to just the conference as the networks are more than that.

4 News from ECER 2018 in Bolzano

4.1 ECER 2018 in numbers

ECER 2018 saw with 18% as compared to 2017 a sharp raise in number of submissions, which spread across the majority of networks but also affected some networks in particularly (eg NW 04 Inclusive Education). All in all, 2897 submissions (274 of which to ERC) were handed in to ECER and ERC 2018 (ECER/ERC 2017: 2462, 242 of which to ERC). Office will be working on stats to be presented at the time of ECER.

4.2 Reviewing the new redirection process

Angelika Wegscheider pointed out that the new redirection process had worked out quite fine. One aim – reducing the number of redirection had been met, the second aim – better information on the reasons for redirections – would still need to be worked on if this is kept as a an aim. Several link convenors welcomed the reduction of especially weaker redirections
But LCs also commented that it was often difficult to really point out why a submission does not fit in the scope of a given network.
Michael Göhlich asked what to do about redirected high quality submissions with good reviews which are not accepted by the 2nd network because the submission did not fit the network's focus and spoke of how difficult it is to send a rejection when the reviews are positive. Paul Smeyers commented that the author simply identified the wrong network both as a first and second choice and that the programme committee could explain that to the author. Florence Ligozat reported that she accepted 2 or 3 of the redirected

papers even though they did not fit into her network because they were of good quality and she feels it is important to be inclusive at that stage. Maria explained that this problem keeps popping up and many years ago she had the responsibility of keeping track of the "homeless" papers (ones which found no suitable network even though of high quality). She said per year there were only about 15 papers.

Decision: Angelika also informed the group that she would send an email to those reviewers who graded the redirections with a zero reminding them that in the new process they are asked not to do so and to please be aware of this for next year.

4.3   Programme planning & rescheduling of presentations

4.3.1 Comments on programme planning

Maria Pacheco Figueiredo emphasized the importance of having session titles. It is very hard to navigate the app without them. Helena Ribeiro de Castro said that they have session titles but in the last few years they have had withdrawals which have rendered the titles meaningless. Maria said there needs to be at least a "generic" session title. If the networks do not fill in titles, Office will fill in a generic one.

Angelika reminded convenors that the session titles need to be in by July 29 for the printed programme, later for the programme app.

4.4   Information on conference venue, session rooms & socials

Angelika gave an overview on the different buildings in use and pointed out that she would like to keep the conference together as much as possible, which means trying to avoid a 5th building. Tatjana Atanasoska asked about the possibility of using the mensa. She has been to a previous conference at the University of Bolzano and say it was very practical to be able to buy vouchers to have lunch at the mensa. Angelika responded that she will look into this.

4.5   Information on accommodation and transportation

Accommodation in Bolzano as such is rare meanwhile, said Angelika. There were also a couple of complaints and therefore office and loc had started a survey to see who faced problems when booking accommodation. LOC meanwhile organises rooms in adjacent communities.

4.6   New screensaver for all ECER computers

Maria presented a work in progress version of the new screensaver. Heike Wendt suggested more color contrast in order to be able to read it easier, Hannu Heikkinen suggested a bigger font, Tatjana Atanasoska asked if there could be printed versions in the rooms as well, ML White suggested more diversity and more women and that the color be used more for the messages/content and less for the people. In general the response to the screensaver was very positive.

4.7   Request for Mentors for the ERC from Saneeya Qureshi

Saneeya Qureshi thanked the Link Convenors for their help during the reviewing period and asked them for their support in mentoring/chairing the ERC, especially on the Monday. She reported that Office would send them a doodle survey after the seminar.

Friday, 27 April

1	Collaboration between Networks at ECER 2018

4.8   Forming joint sessions

After an hour of lively discussion and collaboration, around 40 joint sessions were created.

5 ECER General

5.1 Problems with Symposia

Jani reported that there is relative a high proportion of symposia which do not meet the requirements for the number of papers in a symposia due to withdrawals or are lacking the 3 country perspective. Angelika added that 10 – 17 % of symposia end up not meeting the requirements due to withdrawals.

Paul Smeyers asks his reviewers to use a higher standard when reviewing in order to reduce the number of symposia. He and Petra Grell think that even if there are withdrawals in a symposia, it should still take place as it is unfair to "punish" the other authors in the symposia. Paul suggests Office could make it very clear to submitters of symposia how important it is that all presenters show up. Theo suggested that in the future this information could be added to the acceptance email. Angelika said that an email will be sent to symposia presenters this year as well. Paolo Landri reported that the try to avoid having symposia by stating in the special call that they will only accept a small number of symposia. He also wondered if we should ask why the number of symposia is increasing. Nienke Nieven's network encourages the submission of symposia as they are well attended, they foster good discussions. They encourage their members to being thinking about symposia for the next ECER at the current ECER.

5.2 Renaming Capacity Building Workshops

Working group with Hannu Heikkinen, ML White, Petra Grell and Anna Tsatsaroni

5.2.1 Report from the Working Group

The group communicated via email on how productive "capacity building" is and how to have these workshops represent a wide range of activities while maintaining the EERA ethos. They suggested a new name for the workshops "EERA Community Workshops". They propose this name as it is wide enough to include various topics and it includes the word "community" which puts focus on working together and inclusivity.

5.2.2 Comments on the report from the Working Group

Maria commented that while the names makes sense for us because we are used to the EERA language and ethos, people from the outside may not understand it. She gave the example of how the term "council-invited sessions" was misunderstood to be by invitation only. She wondered if people might misunderstand "community" to mean socializing. Petros Pashiardis found the word "community" to be too vague and he personally would not understand the new name. Monica Carlsson suggested adding the word "research" to the name while Helena Ribeiro de Castro says we do not need to add it as it is already in the acronym EERA. Petra Grell explained that for the working group, the intent was indeed to be vague. They saw three options 1) to call the workshops Research Methodology Workshops and then only allow workshops on methodology 2) to have the name vague so all topics could be included or 3) link the name of the workshops to the ECER theme (this was discounted as being too long). They opted for the second option in order not to narrow the types of focus. There was a discussion on the pros and cons of EERA morning workshop (awakens interest) vs. EERA workshop (people may wonder why their research workshop is not called an EERA workshop), many people found EERA Workshop to be a good solution. Theo suggested tabling further discussion till next year and it was agreed to call them "EERA Workshops" for ECER 2018.

5.3 Experiences of submission & reviewing for ECER 2018

5.3.1 How to deal with author complaints regarding review result

Most complaints of this type are dealt with by Office; the authors are sent a standard email, which is ccd to LC to keep them updated. In certain cases, Office will contact the Link Convenor to be in touch with the author.

5.3.2 Discussion on what to do about reviewers who write inappropriate reviews

Maria said that the best way to deal with this problem is to contact the reviewer and alert her/him to the tone of the review. (there were two cases this year where this worked well). This method supports team work and also serves as preparation for next year's reviewing.

It is EERA policy to never change or delete a review. It was brought up, however, that in extreme cases there should be a way to keep a review from being sent to the author. Angelika suggested in extreme cases setting the status to "on hold" so that there is time to contact the reviewer but to please ONLY use this in extreme cases. She suggested an additional option of the link convenor leaving a message from the programme committee to the author in the review explaining/apologizing for the situation.

Jani summarized that the two steps in dealing with an unacceptable review are 1) talk to the reviewer and, if that doesn't work 2) contact office and NRC.

5.3.3 Question concerning Special Calls

Ann Quennerstedt asked how she can recognize in a submission which submissions are responding to the special call. Angelika suggested Office could set up a subtheme for their network called "special call".

Decision: Maria agreed that this would be an effective and easy solution.

5.3.4 Panel Discussions and the number of authors involved

Lisa Rosen reported that it is difficult for blind reviewers to review panel discussions as they cannot see how many people are involved.

Decision: The number of authors involved will be added to the submission form.

5.4   ECER Evaluation

5.4.1 Comments on ECER Evaluation

Session Return Slips (SRS): Paul Smeyers always fills in the SRS completely but he finds it embarrassing to judge the quality because the slips stay in the room and can be viewed by everyone. He also feels the information requested is not clear enough and asked if the questions on quality could be made clearer with, for example, more categories such as discussion, presentation. Nienke Nieven encourages her chairs to at least fill out how many people attended, they themselves can decide if they want to assess the quality. Petra Grell doesn't reject many submissions so that some submissions may just be OK-ish whereas the presentation may be brilliant and visa versa. Maria suggested that Link Convenors could expressly ask the chairs to be detailed in their comments.

Maria stressed that the information on the quality of the sessions is very important for the big networks. She also explained that the information on the SRS will be collated and sent to the networks before they write their reports so that the Link Convenors can react to and interpret this data for their report

5.4.2 Connection the evaluation to the mission

EERA wants to connect evaluation to the mission to make sure the mission is being accomplished. For next year the topic is "How is ECER engaging with the local research community?"

6   New Templates

A working group in council has evaluated previous funding reports and drafted an Report template in order to get reports that more directly speak to the funding guidelines.

7   News from EERA Council – Report form the President

7.1   Acknowledging contributions to EERA (changes to the General Regulations)

Until now EERA has made former presidents life members and there is a list of them on the EERA website. In the future, EERA will no longer make presidents life members and will extend the list on the website to include all EERA officers.

7.2   New Network Honorary Members

At the March 2018 meeting, Council approved 6 new Network Honorary Members, all are listed on the website.

7.3   Budget

Theo Wubbels informed LCs on the income sources of EERA and the structure of expenses, both showing the central role of ECER.

7.4   New forms of support for Networks, Emerging Researchers and Low GDPs (academic writing etc.)

Following discussions in council on how to further support Emerging and Low GDP researchers, EERA is working on offering an annual academic writing workshop which would be connected to national conferences.

7.5   FP9 missions

EERA has been active via EASSH in influencing the FP9 structure. Unlike FP8 the new funding period will no longer work with "challenges" but with "missions". EERA is now looking for missions which would benefit from educational research- this could be included in messages going to the European commission.

Examples of missions include, for example:
- 100% CO2 neutral cities
- plastic-free oceans

7.6   Active in statements and papers

EERA is becoming more and more active in either 1) announcing or 2) supporting statements and papers. Examples of recent (and future) activity can be found on the EERA website.

7.7   New Senior Mentor and Council Members

Satu Perälä-Littunen is the Emerging Researchers Group new Senior Mentor. Saneeya Qureshi explained that the senior mentor supports the ERG link convenor and co-convenors. The senior mentor takes the lead on mentoring emerging researchers as they begin to review submissions and judge the papers for the Best Paper Award and attends the EERA Summer School.

The 4 new Council members are Russia, Romania, Malta, Armenia. Countries with no associations can have their university become a candidate member and have 4 years to establish their national association and make their formal application for membership. All countries which have signed the cultural treaty of

Europe and cultural convention are eligible for becoming members of EERA and EERA has contacts to all but 4 -5 of those.

7.8   Fees and what the money pays for

At the last Network Seminar the group requested information on ECER fees and what the money pays for. Theo presented the fees of several different conferences (BERA, EARLI,EECERA) in comparison to ECER fees and concluded that considering the length of ECER, the fees are lower than for the other conferences.

For an overview of how the money is spent, please see PPT slides 57 and 58.

7.9   Videos

7.10   Media and communication: videos, website reformulation.

8   Reminders and Updates

8.1   Report from new publications

EERA is since a while working on three different strands of publications – a review Journal, a book series and the methods books.
Sofia Marques da Silva reported that the group working on the research book is sending chapters to the publishers, the first 5 got positive feedback, all in all 12 – 13 chapters are more or less finished by now.
Theo reported on the Review Journal. A full proposal was sent to a publisher, after 9 months of negotiation this broke down, EERA is now talking to another publisher. Jani reported on the EERA Book Series that Dennis Beach is leading the development, he has received 5 proposals. 3 have been reviewed and received revisions. The contract is being negotiated and they hope for a publication date in the near future. Jani reported that while the book *series* was accepted, the books themselves need to be re-submitted and accepted. Petros Pashiardis asked if there is a contract between EERA and a publishing house, Jani explained that there will be two contracts, one with a publishing house and one with the managing editor.

8.2   Poster award (procedure for nomination and this year's jury)

Best Poster Award Timeline
- The network Link Convenor is responsible for nominating the best poster(s) from their network (1 - 5 poster submissions in the Network = one candidate; more than 5 poster submissions in the Network = two candidates)
- Please provide Office (Doretta) with the Poster ID number and the name of the author(s) of the nominated poster(s) from your Network by Wednesday, 5 September 17:00. (You can send an email (dow@eera.eu) or drop by the EERA Desk)
- This year's Council Best Poster Jury members are: Joanna Madalińska-Michalak, Svitlana Shchudlo, Jana Poláchová Vašťatková, Kadir Beycioglu and Wilfried Admiraal
- Each nominated poster will be evaluated by two sets of two Jury Members (with the exception that Wilfried will evaluate the posters alone)
- The Jury will inform us at the EERA Desk of their choice for the Best Paper Award by Thursday, 6 September at 17:30. We will inform the winner(s) by email Thursday evening.
- The winner(s) will be formally announced during the Closing Ceremony on Friday, 7 September, 17:10 - 17:30.

8.3   Free entries for Networks to ECER 2018

Networks with less than 100 submissions will be eligible for one free entry, networks with more than 100 will be eligible for two. If you have not already done so, please inform Office (dow@eera.eu) who should receive the free entry/entries for your network.

8.4 NW 27 internal rules

Florence Ligozat reported that her network looked at the EERA regulations and amended them for NW27. Their additions do not conflict with the EERA regulations, as they only added what they need specifically for their network. If you are interested, you can see it on NW27 page on the EERA website under NW27 Internal Guidance Rules (http://www.eera-ecer.de/networks/didactics/).

8.5 Update history page with past Link Convenors

Angelika noted that Office has the data on who the previous link convenors were from the ECER printed programmes.

8.6 Chairs for sessions

Jani asked Link Convenors to ensure as best as possible to have chairpersons for each session and to please send chairs reminders before the conference of how important their chairing is for the success of the conference.

8.7 Network Funding – new deadline 15 May

Jani explained that there are two calls and two deadlines a year. The decision on who will receive funding is made at the EXEC meeting in June. Typically applicants are not accepted immediately- their applications are usually returned with requests for revisions. The second call may happen in autumn, usually around mid-October, IF there is any money left in the annual budget.

8.8 Future ECERs

8.8.1 Hamburg, 2.– 6. September.2019

9 Link Convenors' Meetings during ECER 2018

9.1 September 4 at 10.30–12.00 (F6)

9.2 September 7 at 12.15–13.15 (F6)

10 AOB

Maria encouraged all Link Convenors to check out the Hosting a EERA Summer School and to see if their university would like to take this on.

Please find the Network Seminar PowerPoint in the NW Seminar 2018Dropbox
https://tinyurl.com/EERA-NWSeminar18-Dropbox