Minutes of the
Network Seminar in Berlin
28 – 29 April, 2016

Venue: Jugendhotel berlincity
Crellestraße 22
10827 Berlin

Participants
Link Convenors: NW01 Hannu Heikkinen,NW02 Christof Nägele,NW03 Nienke Nieveen,NW04 Gottfried Biewer, NW05 Sofia Marques da Silva, NW06 Petra Grell, NW07 Yvonne Leeman, NW08 Venka Simovska, NW09 Martin Goy, NW10 M.L.White, NW12 Christoph Schindler, NW13 Paul Smeyers, NW14 Rocío García Carrión, NW15 Phillippe Masson, NW16 Ed Smeets, NW17 Helena Reibeiro de Castro, NW18 Antonio Calderón, NW19 Sofia Marques da Silva, NW20 Christian Quvang, NW22 Christine Teelken, NW23 Anna Tsatsaroni, NW24 Javier Diez Palomar, NW25 John I'Anson, NW26 Helene Ärlestig, NW27 Meinert Meyer, NW29 Catarina Almeida, NW30 Per Sund, NW31 Irina Usanova, NW32 Michael Göhlich, ERG Patricia Fidalgo, ERG Saneeya Qureshi
EERJ: Marteen Simons
Council: Petr Novotný, Lucian Ciolan
EXEC: Theo Wubbels, Marit Honerød Hoveid, Jani Ursin
Office: Angelika Wegscheider, Doretta Dow

Thursday, 28 April

1   Welcome and introductions

2   "Meet the EERJ"

Please find Marteen Simon's powerpoint presentation as pdf attached to the "Minutes" email

2.1   Discussion

Marteen stated that EERJ would like more collaboration with Networks and gave examples how networks could contribute e.g. by informing participants that EERJ exists in order to increase readership; informing of possibility to publish. He also underlined that EERJ welcomes special issues from networks, as this would be part of the identity of EERJ, even if sometimes special issues may not been seen as having the same academic ranking then open call issues.
It was suggested that a group of guest editors should always include different national backgrounds – similar to the 3 country rule for Symposia.
From May – February the journal received 167 submissions, 30 % if which were accepted. These numbers would still be on weak grounds, as the new submission system is not long enough in place.
Usually it would take 5-6 months from submission to being published. Criteria are the quality of a submission and if is speaks to the European audience. If this first check by lead editors is passed, papers are submitted to the reviewing process.
How the European dimension is to be interpreted would depend on the type of research, as for some it is more difficult than for others to address it. There is always an opportunity, for example, to make a comparison in the introduction or to try to reflect on European/regional embeddedness of research.

Asked if EERJ would try be listed in Social Science Index, Maarten said it would be better now to wait for a few years because if you do apply and do not get accepted you have to wait before applying again.

Venka Simovska pointed out that in Denmark the Ministry of Science and Research categorizes all journals with 2, 1 or 0 points. EERJ has 2 points and so is a good place to publish.

Asked why EERJ only publishes in English, Maarten underlines how difficult it would be to have multi-language journals.

Yvonne Leeman pointed to how NWs have been working hard on including new colleagues from not so well represented countries/research communities into the reviewers group and the network activities and inquired which steps EERJ is taking to proceed in a similar direction. Marteen said that the editorial board tries to go to sessions at ECER from different Networks. There would not be a specific policy on it in place but where papers come from would be widening up.

Maarten then also explained the structure of the MOOT. It was introduced as an open space for debate with 3 interventions, 10 minutes each.

3   Introduction to Working Groups on other EERA Publications

Jani Ursin briefly introduced to 4 working groups on the EERA publishing strategy.

- Working Group: Research Methods Book – how to make it different & European?

- Working Group: European Educational Research Review and & EERA Book Series

- Working Group: Network-related Publications – How to connect with other journals?

- Working Group: New formats of publication

Before the plenum went into Working Groups on potential other EERA publications, Patricia Fidalgo introduced to the ERG cooperation with EERJ and Studia Paedagogica, which both publish papers submitted to the Emerging Researchers Best Paper Award.

3.1   ERG papers published in EERJ and Studia Paedagogica

Patricia explained that after the conference, the ERG presenters are invited to submit their paper to the Best Paper Award. This gives ERGers an opportunity to publish. 5 papers are published in EERJ and since 2014 some more in Studia Paedagogica. First the best paper jury reviews the papers then they get reviewed again by EERJ and SP. These are high standards for the emerging researchers. The cooperation has proved to be successful.
Petr Novotny briefly introduced to Studia Paedagogica, a printed journal with two editions a year in English. It has traditionally a different market than EERJ.

Jani Ursin underlined that this would be a good example for how EERA can cooperate with more journals and invited networks to develop more ideas. This raised discussions as some networks had rather difficult experiences with suggesting potential cooperation. While money could be applied for, the procedures and conditions are complicated.

Christoph Nägele explained that after an EERA funding VETNET is running an open access, double blind journal (International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training) with 3 – 4 issues a year and the editorial board is international including Australia, Europe and the US. It is linked to the VETNET presentations.

Petra Grell asked what might be unique to publish in a digital world? She raised scepticism about the standard models of publishing and asked for models that would be more apt for the future.

Jani Ursin also alluded to the NW 17 e-book and concluded that a lot is going on with publications in the networks and that Council was willing to support more initiatives. When asked if funding would be available for allowing open access to articles/journals he pointed to the fact that one of the funding principles was that funds would not go to publishing houses.

4	Reports from Working Groups

4.1 Working Group: Research Methods Book – how to make it different & European?

Please see report in the appendix.

Discussion Working Group: Research Methods Book

After the report people reflected on how a Research Methods Book could get a distinct European notion. Marit pointed out that the cultural embeddedness and the awareness of research being culturally embedded would be distinct features; also the European phenomenological tradition would not necessarily be reflected in the anglo-literature used by professors and students. Another special feature/ problem to be addressed in a European Methods book was seen in the fact that "European" research often deals with two languages in the research process – as data is often gathered in one language and the research is in another.

Lucian summed up the steps taken by the council working group so far and said that a decision had been made to do an analysis from two perspectives:
1) what needs do PhD students have (summer school participants addressed with a questionnaire)
2) look at how emerging researchers are taught at European universities e.g. a questionnaire sent to professors: What areas do you teach? Could you share your syllabus?

Need to decide if the focus will be undergraduate or graduate. The aim is to try to put together the perspective of the educators and the needs of the students.

Sofia stressed that network link conveners may be asked to give the questionnaire to more students for a bigger sampling. The questionnaire could also be sent to the Emerging Researchers group.

Different ideas were mentioned, such as having a website with show cases accompanying the book, really targeting the post graduate students markets and needs, not making it a manual, but reflecting the complexity and the plurality of research and drawing on examples and problems specific within education research as opposed to social science/humanities in general

4.2 Working Group: European Educational Research Review and & EERA Book Series

Please see report in the appendix.

Discussion Working Group European Educational Research Review and & EERA Book Series

After the working group people felt it was important to see what journals are already there and not to copy what others are already doing. Paul Smeyers suggested that one really original idea would be focusing on a certain theme that has been investigated e.g. in America and then to investigate how this topic was dealt with in different countries and languages. However, this would need a strong orchestration, a lot of dedication and people would need to be writing on that theme in different languages.

4.3   Working Group: Network-related Publications – How to connect with other journals?

Please see the report in the appendix.

Discussion Network-related Publications – How to connect with other journals

The Working Group had suggested having full paper sessions so as to facilitate the publication after the conference and it would also raise the esteem of the conference.
Some networks already do full paper sessions and Angelika pointed to some of the technical issues that would cause if offered as a general option. The collection and sharing of the full papers would best not be done via office/conftool.

4.4   Working Group: New formats of publication

Please see report in the appendix.

Discussion New formats of publication

It was pointed out that some of the new forms of publications – like video – would be not only enrichment to research but be research in itself. Also, a merging of various forms of publishing was mentioned: journals adding videoabstracts, offering a youtube channel, etc.

Jani thanked everybody for the bringing forward that many ideas. He reminded that what is discussed in the network working groups would be brought to council and discussed there – just like it had been done the other way round as well.

He then called to a second round of working groups on

- Evaluation of the conference
- EERA and ethics
- New formats@ ECER

4.5   Working Group: Evaluation of the Conference

Please see report in the appendix.

Discussion Evaluation of the Conference

The reports from the Working Group put forward the question what kind of evaluation EERA would like to be done and what was already done. The agreement was that no typical consumer survey was aimed at. Delegates should be addresses with questions on how they participate in ECER (visit one network or more? Which role does the "European dimension" play for them? How do Emerging Researchers participate in ECER?)

Delegates would best be interviewed by volunteers. But for 2016 the working group will pass on a set of questions they would like to be addressed in an online questionnaire. Example Questions:

Did this conference inspire you? Did you meet potential collaborators? Did this conference help you finalize your paper for publication?

The current session return slips were seen as necessary only in parts – the session size and if there were no-shows would however be the most important information. The judging of the session quality should be taken out, so the conclusion and be substituted by a comments-box.

Decisions:
- Session Return slips without ranking of session quality
- No ranking in Conference App
- Working Group to develop questionnaire for the addressing delegates after wards

4.6   Working Group: EERA and ECER ethics

Please see report in the appendix.

Discussion EERA and ECER ethics

After the presentation of the Working Group results it was discussed to which extend networks/reviewers could rely or would need to rely on individuals and other institutions with respect to the question if research presented at ECER had been conducted in accordance to ethical guidelines and to which extend EERA could be held responsible.
As rules and regulations do not only differ from country to country but also from institution to institution, one suggestion was to include a sentence/check box stating " I followed the ethical guidelines of my institution" in the submission forms.
While there was agreement that a box confirming the adherence of ethical standards should be included – mainly to oblige to legal requirements, people also argued that this would not affect the ethical standards. It would be more meaningful to discuss ethical concerns in the networks .
Jani and Sofia highlighted to work of the council working group on ethical guidelines and pointed out that the topic will be addressed in an EERA Session and also during the Emerging Researchers Conference.

4.7   Working Group Brainstorming New ECER – Formats/Professional Development WS/ Handouts

Jani thanked NW 14 for submitting ideas in order to start the discussion on new ECER formats.

Posters
The interactive poster sessions 2015 received good feedback, so this model is extended to 2016 and beyond. Especially for emerging researchers they were seen as good starting point. Posters can be put with other posters or in a paper/poster mix into standard session rooms. For all other posters the General Poster Exhibition will still take place.
Someone suggested that poster could also virtually displayed on the website including the option to leave comments, as had been done in other conferences.
https://www.jyu.fi/edu/kasvatustieteen-paivat-2013/posterit/posterinayttely

Tuesday morning workshops:
Networks agreed that a limited number of "professional development Workshops" could be held Tuesday morning before the start of the (main) conference/in parallel to ERC. The first test run could be done during ECER 2017.

Network Meetings:
If possible they should take place in the lunch session – especially for those networks who more

run 3 or more parallel slots. But if you need longer meetings (and if there are enough rooms) they can take place in normal sessions

Handouts:
Handouts were only briefly discussed – some argued they should not be asked for (ECER going green), others argued there should be guidance for not bringing full papers. One way out could be an upload option to the conference app?

Video presentations:
Videos as submission format are featured for the first time in ECER 2016, videotaped statements from a non-participating symposium or round table presenter have been done in the past a couple of times, video interventions via skype are, while they may have happened occasionally, not supported be EERA or the LOC as they raise too many questions regarding registration or not/certificate of presentation or not and also raise the technical requirements for session rooms (loud speaker, micro, internet)

Pecha Kucha:
The ERG has had good experiences with Pecha Kucha, although not as a submission format as such. For 2017 some networks would want to pilot Pecha Kucha as a submission format, which allows for additional experiences to be collected.

Friday, 29 April

5   Network Funding

Jani introduced to the 3 different streams of network funding and also said that the funding criteria are currently under review. He would also be looking for ways to better describe what is fundable, what not, so as to avoid the numbers of back and forth for applications. A list of funded projects will be put online.

5.1   Network Projects

These can be more or less anything, it is up to the networks to make suggestions. Projects could include seminars, e-books, data banks etc. It is important when applying for funding to show how this activity will benefit your Network and EERA. No co-funding is expected for these. There are more details on the website.
Important!: 1) Capacity Building (socialization of Emerging Researchers; Low GDP countries). At least 3 European countries should be involved.
Christine Teelken suggested that future guidelines should be clearer about what can be funded.
Venka asked if also seminars preparing for a project would be fundable. Jani said that funding related to seminars would rather cover the travel cost of keynote speakers, room rental, etc. Seminars should be open to participate in and not for closed group.
Within network projects no research time or translation costs would be covered.

5.2   Seasons Schools

Jani reminded everybody that the EERA Season Schools are Council-generated with a generic topic, last 5 days and are organised with a hosting institution cofounding the project. Network Season Schools are smaller, shorter (3 days) and focused on Network topics; they are also organised in cooperation with other partners contributing to it financially. Generally for the shorter network season schools, no participation fee should be asked for.
This raised questions as flights for speakers, accommodation and food would need to be paid for even if tutoring and lecturing was offered for free. Making no-fees as a condition limits the venues to regions were housing/food is cheap. Jani stressed that being sensitive on fees means being inclusive – participants from Low GDP countries need to have the chance to participate. Jani

concluded that the criteria would be brought to networks in August and then to council after the conference.

5.3 Discussion Network-related publications

The youngest funding scheme for network related publication was seen as seed money in order to start new or strengthen existing cooperation. There was critique that the application process was too complicated for what could then be gained in the end. More reciprocity was asked for between work invested and benefits gained.
One suggestion was to offer money as a sort of reward, a network social event or an additional free entry to ECER for the network.
Theo Wubbels pointed out that while Exec would take the decisions on the network funding, council would set the criteria.

Jani pointed to the fact that with the number of council meetings being reduced to two per year it would take a while until new criteria can be endorsed.

Anna Tsatsaroni then stressed that generally also networks need a say in the definition of the funding criteria.

Jani Ursin summed up the items on network funding with stressing how important capacity building is within any application, just as well as the European diversity (e.g. not just 3 Nordic countries, for example). Budgets should be made as detailed and transparent as possible, please also make financial contributions of other partners visible.
He advised networks to keep in mind that EERA does not fund research projects or things supporting your university, not translation costs will be covered.

Reworked funding criteria will be discussed with network and brought to council.

6 Induction of new convenors – "good practices" from the networks

The four working groups had used the discussion time not only for the exchange of good practices but also general exchange on how to govern a network.
Generally networks found that after the recommendations of appointing LC have put forward it was now time to put these in practice. People also reflected on what would be a good size of a reviewers group, a programme committee group.

Helpful for induction/General governance of network
- Clearer guidelines on the annual duties and the time frame linked to them (OFFICE)
- Skype meetings between link convenors/Convenors, sharing of documents
- Could there be a shadowing period? (as an official role? Un-officially by taking on some work the year before?)in some networks the "old" link conveners stay on as sort of back-up.
- Some network have a good experiences with deputy LCs/more than one LC
- Young researchers should be taken in as reviewers early
- Leaving once role would be facilitated if there was some formal acknowledgement/visibility of previous convenors.

Jani promised to compose a text on this which would be presented in August

7 News from EERA Council (Theo)

7.1 Minutes and Meetings

Theo explained that the minutes from the Council meetings are on the website but there is a time delay as they first have to be approved.
News: EERA has gone from 3 to 2 council meetings a year.

7.2 EERA Sessions

There is a panel who peer reviews the EERA sessions (the sessions which belong to no network).

7.3 Theme ECER 2017 and future ECERs

The theme for ECER 2017 in Copenhagen is: Reforming Education and the Imperative of Constant Change: Ambivalent Roles of Policy in Educational Research.
What does it mean? The text explaining this will soon be on the website.

Future ECERS:
2018 – Bolzano, Italy
2019 – under discussion Hamburg, Germany
2020 – open

7.4 EERA Summer School offers

There are 4 offers for the next Summer School, 2 of which will be further negotiated: Czech Republic and Coimbra. The other two offers had been too subject specific in their themes.

7.5 Council-approved honorary Members

There are 6 council-approved honorary members.
- Vivienne Collinson, Maureen Killeavy & Ene-Silvia Sarv; NW 01, Continuing Professional Development: Learning for Individuals, Leaders, and Organisations
- Pekka Kämäräinen; NW 02, Vocational Education and Training (VETNET)
- Barbara Zamorski; Network 22, Research in Higher Education
- Brian Hudson; NW 27, Didactics - Learning and Teaching

7.6 New candidate members

There are two new candidate members: Ukraine and Russia. Candidate members come from universities setting up associations. Candidates participate in council meetings but have no voting rights and pay no fees.

7.7 EERA External Relationships

Theo Wubbels explained that EERA is participating in other associations like
- Initiative for Science in Europe
- EASSH (European Alliance for the Social Sciences and Humanities)

Both are active in getting funding and trying to get the phrase "educational research" into every paper the European Commission puts out.

He also reminded NW on EERAs commitment to WERA and pointed out that many IRNs (International Research Networks) would overlap with EERA Networks and informed that the next WERA president and Vicepresident would be close to EERA: Ingrid Gogolin (former EERA President) and Yunus Eryaman is the new VP.

7.8 Poster Jury ECER 2016 and Poster Procedure

- Eduardo Jimenez (AIDIPE)
- Milosh Raikov (Malta Educational Research Association)

- Karmen Trasberg (EAPS)

The poster nomination from your Network must be at the EERA Help Desk by Wednesday, 17:00.

7.9 Discussion Council News

Someone asked how the keynote decisions are made on council and how networks would be involved in it.
Jani explained that there is a committee on Council which includes Jani (NW rep) and one person from LOC. He stated feeling to rather represent himself there than the NWs, but opening the discussions would be difficult as suggestions are confidential and a not too big group should be working on this.

8   Reminders from Office (Angelika)

Angelika gave a short overview on the room situation in Dublin (some very big, some very small rooms, 3 buildings) and introduced to the timeline for session planning.

8.1   Discussion
Annual Reports

The timing for the Annual Reports was questions. Angelika explained that 15 November is the deadline in order to have things online before the Call for Papers for the next ECER.
Office will sent out reminders to submit the reports briefly after the conference from now on.

ECER going green
Per Sund reminded the group of the green ECER. Plastics should be avoided, in the best case organic food offered and he suggested to charge 2 euros extra for a printed programme

Angelika replied that "going green" came in late for last year's and this year conference planning (after the contract). Nevertheless some attempts have been taken. EERA office works on getting "going green" into the conference planning process much earlier.

8.2   Reminders

Jani reminded
- on poster award (procedure for nomination and this year's jury, (see also section 7.8 in the minutes)
- on the procedure for Nomination of Honorary Membership, see http://www.eera-ecer.de/networks/honorary-members/
- that in General regulations 'Election and mandate of link convenors' section was updated
- that free entries for Networks to ECERs requires networks to complete their tasks including the network report
- networks to nominate potential editors for EERR & EERA Book Series
- that the next deadline for Network Funding is May 27 2016
- Future ECERs will take place
    o Copenhagen, 21.–25.8.2017
    o Bolzano, 3.–7.9.2018
- Link Convenors' meetings during ECER 2016 will take place
    - August 23 at 10.30–12.00 (venue TBA)
    - August 26 at 12.30–13.30 (venue TBA)

Appendix

Report: Working Group: Research Methods Book – how to make it different & European?

WG – METHODS BOOK

Core WG from Council: Sofia,, Marit, Lucian (+Angelika, Herbert)
At NW meeting: Heiku, Yvonne Nievke, ML, Ed, Antonio

 "There is something about being an educational researcher in Europe"

Possible aim for this methods book:
COMBINING DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO EDUCATION RESEARCH AND SEE
EDUCATRION FROM A E EUROPEAN perspective (Whatever that is)

It entails seeing RESEARCH AS AN INTEGRATED PROCESS (we do not need another manual)

Justifying the need for such a methods book:
- THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS THAT ARE NOT THERE in the ordinary methods book, visible in regular textbooks, in the manuals, in Handbooks (such as the hidden aspects of research)
- Most handbooks on methods are for Social Sciences, and do not address ed. research specifically
- Translation: tension between the country data and the interpretation done with the support of anglo saxonic references, or translation of the research into another language (taking into account what is lost in translation)
- Also a need to reclaim part of the tradition many researchers who do come from the Anglo saxon background embed their research in - more interpretative (hermeneutics/phenomenology)
- conciliating it with new contexts

Pursuing an European Perspective:
There are some educational phenomena that need different venues to be accounted.
How do we debate? How do we give room for the argument in our research?
The need to know better the cultural embeddedness of educational research/our contexts (comissive spaces)
Diversities in approaches to educational research
Different rationalities and traditions which educational research are embedded in

Format:
How do we organise a coherent book?
Website accompanying such a book is necessary
Problem based research (solve cases)
Cases: integrated vision of research (process, results and metareflection)
That the concept of the whole book is multimodal
That a discussion of approaches to research could be discussed based on different cases (multimodal)

Important references:
Pedagogic cases from physical education (mention by António Canderón)
e-book (Nienke) See: http://international.slo.nl/publications/edr/
Katrin Niglas (Tallin University (map of the terrain)

STEPS:
Collection of data as a background for this book:
To be followed up by: Lucien, Sofia, Angelika and Marit.

- Research on PhD students aims mainly to identify needs of a junior researcher (what they would like to find in such a book / what they didn't find in other books on this topic?) – to understand what is missing.

- Research on professors / syllabuses aims mainly to map out the educational research field: how is shaped / conceived by academics, what is / are the narratives behind, how the terrain / territory is defined?

Subjects	Methods	Obs.
PhD students (summer school and others)	online questionnaire (surveymonkey)	sample of min 70 (participants to summer school) + scale up with other PhD & Emerging Research Group?
PhD students (summer school and others)	focus groups	2 FGs to be organized during summer school in Linz piloting on Sofia's PhDs in Porto
Professors of educational research from EERA network	small online questionnaire & documents analysis (syllabus / curricula)	to decide level (Bachelor / Masters / PhD) to see how to deal with non-english documents would website search be a solution? (to what extent these syllabuses are available online?)

1. syllabuses: how those are shaping the field? Do we organise the syllabus accordingly with pressures (publishing; teach techniques)
2. Questionnaires to teachers
   a. To understand their rationality when teaching research methodologies and how they construct and relate with the syllabuses
   b. How do we construct these syllabuses, dealing with different type of constrains (need to publish, most of the time in different languages, and not to loose our schools of thought based on, for example, phenomenological and hermeneutical approach?
   c. How do we teach is a narrative, embedded in a context

REF: A collaborative report from the WG

Report: Working Group: European Educational Research Review and & EERA Book Series

EERA convenors meeting
28 April 2016 Group work on publishing
Group 2: Rocío (Garcia Carrion), Paul, John, Michael, Theo, Venka
The Educational Research Review Journal & EERA Book Series
Journal
We discussed around the following questions:

- Definition of review journal
- Why one more Journal? What is the added value
- Arguments for and against
- Ideas and suggestions
- Considerations concerning sustainability and the burden of expectations from networks

Specific points mentioned:

- Language criteria in the editorial policy: reviews need to include primary papers in more than one language
- European dimensions – different from the existing similar Journals
- What is a review journal (state of the art in the literature on a selected topic, or area)
- Produce at least one special issue per year in another language (not English) to send a signal of language diversity
- Thematic interdisciplinary reviews, including conceptual and methodological – the networks can contribute here
- Nationalities published and ratios to endorse diversity rates
- Offer language support before submissions
- One issue per year focusing on review of example educational research in Poland… (is it viable in longer term). It is in English but the reviews build on primary studies in Polish
- What is it that we are looking for? Visibility of EERA? High quality Journal.
- Informal links with Journals are also possible… (Paul).
- EU funded projects have sufficient critical mass for a journal
- Argument for such a Journal – funding to show what can educational research do (multidisciplinary rather than mono, social and humanities based)
- Who read reviews? Researchers go for primary studies (but funders and policy makers)
- Specific audiences – policy makers, student…)
- Load on the networks – is it too much? It would need a strong commitment from the networks for a number of years to ensure that the Journal would have impact
- ECER link – special session focused on reviewing a topic.

Summary – positive idea but it needs a lot of commitment from networks (some doubts about how realistic it is)

Main benefits include:

- wider scope of types of reviews;
- wider scope of languages included in the reviews;
- strengthening the case for educational research and funding in Europe

Book series
- Why is it a good idea? Each of us can approach a published what would the identity be?
- Response: European added value (in terms of research profile, contexts and languages)
- It is one series with different content focus (emerging from Networks)
- Four volumes in the first year (requirement by the publishers)
- Thematic edited books from single networks as well as across networks (e.g. children's rights and ethics as enacted in different context)
- There should be EERA council funding to meet and work on such books once approved as a volume is the series
- There should be clear criteria for volumes in this series

Report: Working Group: Network-related Publications – How to connect with other journals?

Brief report on workgroup 3 (ECER, 28th april 2016)
Principled discussion: (attending: ERG: Patricia, Shaneeya, Anna nw 23, Christof: nw2, Petr Nvotny, council member, Martin: nw16, Christine nw22)
Generally, involvement of the networks (and the EERA) in publication options is important, but not a goal by itself. Visibility should ideally be improved by quality of our research.
We briefly discussed previous experiences of networks with encouragement of publication options. These experiences were quite broad, particularly the ERG is active (best paper award, meet the editor, approach authors directly).
We ended up with three practical suggestions:
- advanced paper sessions (distributing the full paper in advance, will make more advanced and elaborate discussions possible). Not for the whole network, but start with a few sessions.
- meet the editor sessions (invite one or more editors to give a presentation, followed by a more informal sessions)
- symposia/good papers: attend promising sessions and address potential authors directly.

workgroup
previous experience: (quite large: 23 every other year, a special issue)
visibility is important, but then in terms of quality, not as a goal by itself.
why the logo?
advanced papers? full papers
use examples of good practice
inform readers were papers come from
agree on importance
conference as platform for communication, not part of research
eera has higher expectations, want to be part of scientific process?
dialogue with european policies?
Some kind of acknowledgement in the right places, if you receive funding you should mention, ...
ERG best paper, 500 Euro, free entrance for next year, come back, agreements with journals,
combined initiative with WERA, interactive meeting, conversation,
*meet the editors meeting nw23,13 session (e.g. Education Inquiry)
*approach symposia/authors actively
*advanced paper sessions

Report: Working Group: New formats of publication

EERA Network Seminar 2016, Working Group: New Formats of Publication

The group shared experiences with new formats, discussed specific challenges and tried to generate some new ideas and perspectives.

General outcome
- Strategy: It might be better, to facilitate/support small projects of innovative publications instead of a "big solution" (which usually tends to fail)
- Necessity to respect different cultures, and no intend to set general rules or criteria for Europe. Need to be aware of power.

Main Idea "Umbrella"
- Question: How could EERA support a process that helps readers to find publications and research materials?
- **Main Idea: EERA (website) becomes a sort of umbrella** for (finding) publications. Networks and members publish wherever they want/prefer, but they inform EERA what and where to find, so that EERA can link/push forward to every single paper. And link back.
- Need to clarify: What is the main target?: (1) helping to find publications, (2) visibility, (3) linking European publications within networks or cross-disciplinary
- Question: Maybe not only focus on publications, but also on research data accessibility
- Challenges: Sustainability, future lasting, different channels
- Challenges: Balancing: short-term and long-term interests

Mixed topics
- Question/Challenge: What is a book? Probably it is more than a sum of articles. If so, what will get lost, if all papers are individually published in databases in the future? What is EERAs perspective on this?
- Experience: Double-blind-peer-review does not always increase the quality.
- Experience: "Open access" – in some countries this way of publication it is well accepted, in other countries it is suspicious.
- Idea: European Commission publishes in 16 languages, what if EERA starts to publish each paper at least in two or three languages. It is challenging no doubt.
- Question/Idea: Researchgate.net and other platforms are ways to publish, is it possible to include some of it?

Ideas on Video
- Experience: Video abstracts for publications in Online Journals (One known Spanish journal, and one known Norwegian journal). Enriches the paper, but authors are not always keen to do so.
- Idea: A YouTube Channel for each Network. A way of knowledge building of a Network. Maybe sessions form ECER could be presented there as well.
- Experience: Differences! Video in Art Education is not enrichment, it can be a form of research

9   Report: Working Group: Evaluation of the Conference

We decided about the following forms of evaluation during ECER.
We make a distinction between session level, network level and conference level
Paperslip in the rooms for information about: how many people were present; whether presenters showed up; quality of the room and of the technical assistance. We delete the questions on the quality of the session, the discussion etc.

Networkmeeting for an indication on the quality of the program and the presentations, the possibility to meet people doing the same kind of research, quality of the discussions etc. within a network

Survey We don't want a consumer survey. We want information about , the background of the visitors such as the amount of people that stick to a network , the amount of people that attend several networks, the amount of regular attenders (Are you a regular visitor?), the amount of phd-students and of former attenders of the emergent researchers conference. And we want to know the answers on questions such as: - Was the conference inspiring for yoy?; Did you meet others with the same research interest?; Do you expect the conference to influence publishing about your research?

(Venka Simovska is willing to review the draft survey)

Report: Working Group: EERA and ECER ethics

```
EERA WG on Ethics
"The ethics group start working last year on a questionnaire that included open
and ended questions. The questionnaire was distributed among EERA council
representatives of national associations that disseminated it among national
members along with EERA dissemination. 500 respondents answer the questionnaire,
from 40 european countries and also other countries were involved outside
Europe. The questionnaire tried to collect respondents (academics/researchers)
perceptions on ethics reviews and ethics boards. 4 open questions were also part
of the questionnaire. Two are already analysed in their content. Results were
presented in EERA Council in March. Other indicatives will follow this first
task: in ECER that will take place in Dublin we will be organising a EERA
session in which among other results will be presented; a special issue at EERJ
is under discussion as well.

WG in ethics discussion at Networks meeting in april
The discussion was started as by asking about the relevance of EERA to produce a
document  with ethical guidelines. In general there were two different
positions. One positions in which non satisfaction with national ethic boards or
with the non existence of an ethic chart consider that it would be useful to
have guidelines at EERA level. Several examples were given and it was clear the
need for help at EERA level as un umbrella organisation. The second position was
that EERA do not have to interfere in national ethic guidelines either need to
provide any document. Concerning the possibility to include ethic concerns into
the reviewing process for ECER the discussion was also very controversial and
the overall conclusion is that is very difficult to evaluate if ethical
procedures were follow and was concluded by some that research in education and
education makes no sense with ethic, putting at individual level the
responsibility.
```