



Minutes of the EERA Council Meeting

Talbot Hotel Stillorgan, Merrion Room

27 August 2016, 09.00 – 17.00

28 August 2016, 09.00 – 13.00

Attendees:

Angelika Paseka, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Forschung und Entwicklung im Bildungswesen (OEFEB); **Angelika Wegscheider**, EERA Office; **Branislava Baranovic**, Zagreb Institute for Social Research, Croatia (ZISR); **Ciaran Sugrue**, LOC Dublin; **Conor Galvin**, LOC Dublin; **Daniela Preis**, EERA Office; **Delma Byrne**, Educational Studies Association of Ireland (ESAI); **Deniz Orucu**, Educational Administration Research and Development Association (EARDA); **Dragica Pavlović Babić**, Educational Research Association of Serbia (ERAS); **Eduardo Garcia-Jimenez**, Sociedad Espanola de Pedagogía (SEP); **Elaine Araujo**, Centro de Investigação, Difusão e Intervenção Educacional (CIDInE); **Eric Mangez**, EERJ Editor and Association Belge des Chercheurs en Education (ABC-Educ); **Erich Svecnik**, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Forschung und Entwicklung im Bildungswesen (OEFEB); **Gemma Moss**, British Educational Research Association (BERA); **George Head**, Scottish Educational Research Association (SERA); **Hannes Hell**, LOC Bolzen; **Helen Phtiaka**, Παιδαγωγική Εταιρεία Κύπρου - Cyprus Pedagogical Association (CPA); **Herbert Altrichter**, EERA Treasurer; **Isabelle Milli**, Swiss Society for Research in Education (SSRE); **Jani Ursin**, EERA Network Representative on Council; **Joanna Madalinska-Michalak**, Polskie Towarzystwo Pedagogiczne (PTP); **John Benedicto Krejsler**, Nordic Educational Research Association (NERA); **Karmen Trasberg**, Estonian Academic Research Association (EAPS); **Lucian Ion Ciolan**, Romania, University of Bucharest; **Maarten Simons**, EERJ Editor; **Marco Rieckmann**, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft (DGfE); **Maria P. Figueiredo**, EERA Secretary General; **Mariagrazia Riva**, Società Italiana di Pedagogia (SIPED); **Marit Honerod Hoveid**, EERA Secretary General; **Mette Juncker**, LOC Copenhagen; **Milosh M. Raykov**, Malta Educational Research Association; **Mustafa Yunus Eryaman**, Turkish Educational Research Association (EAB); **Nassira Hedjerassi**, Association des Enseignants et Chercheurs en Sciences de l'Education (AECSE); **Nikolai Gorbachev**, Belarus National Association "Innovation in Education" (BNA "IE"); **Olena Fimyar**, Ukraine, Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University (UERA); **Paulina Korsnakova**, Slovak Educational Research Society (SERS); **Pavel Zgaga**, The Slovenian Educational Research Association (SLODRE); **Petr Novotny**, Czech Educational Research Association (CERA); **Saneeya Qureshi**, Emerging Researchers' Group; **Satu Perälä-Littunen**, Finnish Educational Research Association (FERA); **Sofia Marques da Silva**, Sociedade Portuguesa de Ciências da Educação (SPCE); **Theo Wubbels**, EERA President

1 Apologies and Welcome of New Members

Monique Volman, Gonzalo Jover, Kairat Kurakbayev, Arcady Margolis and Anna Aleksanyan sent their apologies. Ana Cabral could also not attend, but was replaced by Elaine Araujo.

The agenda was approved and there were no questions or requests for amendments for the March Minutes.

2 Reports & Exculpations

2.1 of President

Theo Wubbels reported on his and Exec's activities in the last year as outlined in the Annotated Agenda. In addition there was a further item to report on: a Statement of the Executive Board on the Situation of Academics in Turkey. As Exec wanted to act as quickly as possible, only the two member associations from Turkey were consulted on the text, and not Council, which was also the reason for calling it Exec Statement instead of Council Statement. Council approved of this course of action and of the Statement itself. The statement was seen as being consistent with the one published in 2013 with respect to political situation and demonstrations during ECER 2013 in Istanbul.

Council exculpated the President.

2.2 of Secretary General

Marit Hoveid said that in addition to what Theo Wubbels had reported on the Exec/EERA work, she was especially in contact with the EERA Office, re-structuring the work there, with the new situation of employees etc. She pointed out that she worked on professional development schemes for staff. As her term of office ended, she thanked Council for the great cooperation, for the learning experience but also for the fun that it was working with EERA. She pointed out EERA had gained in reputation over the years and stressed the importance of EERA taking influence. She said she hoped that EERA would continue with that. Council exculpated the Secretary General.

Theo Wubbels thanked her for her dedication to EERA for such a long time, and wished her farewell.

2.3 of Treasurer Finances 2015

Herbert Altricher reported on the results of 2015, and he also asked the Budget Checkers Delma Byrne, Eric Mangez and Lucian Ion Ciolan to comment on them. The result was very positive, and therefore EERA is close to its aim of having one year's expenditures as reserve. Thanks to the safety reserve, Council now can even think about new projects to be financed. One idea was to put more money aside for ECER bursaries for Low GDP PhD students.

Eric Mangez welcomed the idea of having a reserve but also asked if an insurance could be considered instead. Angelika Wegscheider answered that for ECER 2016 an event cancellation insurance had been paid for, as this was a requirement from LOC. However, the conditions would foresee limited cases for an insurance to step in (60% of the event to be cancelled, cancellation only in case of major natural disasters etc.). Furthermore such an insurance would only cover the conference and not the other EERA activities. An insurance would therefore only be a supplement and not a substitute for a reserve.

Council exculpated the treasurer.

3 ECER 2016 Review

3.1 Feedback LOC

Ciaran Sugrue said he could limit his evaluation to the positive experience of ECER 2016, but that he also wanted to point to the fact of ECER being the sole major source of income for EERA. In some ways, he argued, the difference between what LOC receives per participant and what EERA would earn is too big. With universities being less and less able to give rooms or working hours for free, this working model would need to be rethought in the future. Academic staff is no longer available for doing the organisation in addition to their normal workload and with the necessary professionalism. For these tasks external professional support is needed.

One issue he highlighted was linked to the ERC social, which was planned for 300 given the registration numbers of 370 whereas only 170 attended the event.

The President thanked Ciaran and LOC for all the effort invested in making this conference a big success. He also thanked Ciaran for his forward-looking thoughts on the finances and organisation of conferences, but reminded him that EERA Office dedicates most of its work throughout the year to organising ECERs (e.g. managing registration, programme planning etc.) which must be reflected in EERA's share of the conference fees. Ciaran acknowledged this fact.

Council's feedback was that it was a wonderful conference, that LOC did a great job, and that the possibility to use Campus Accommodation was very positive. The students in their green shirts were very friendly and pro-active.

3.2 Feedback from NW meetings and ERC

Jani Ursin reported on the feedback given by the networks. The networks were happy with internal meetings and Network Dinners. The rooms in general were well received. From a scientific point of view: most sessions were of very good quality. The conference app worked better than last year, and the link convenors didn't mind about only having one reception and no Social on the Thursday. They appreciated the free evening and the opportunity to plan network activities then. The timing of the conference, in August, is a problem for some, but is better for others. Link Convenors thanked LOC and EERA Office for their work.

Some complained that the venue was so far from the city centre, and that therefore the transport was difficult at times, as buses were packed and no taxis available. Some found the opening hours of the cafeterias and the food variety problematic.

Maria Figueiredo highlighted the work that networks also put into the conference organization by reviewing and programming and then chairing sessions. She summed up that the change of the programme (central events at eleven instead of in the afternoon) went well, and that thanks to the office's new staff structure, there was more help on site for having the Short Notice sheets etc all organised by EERA. Even push notes for the app could be used for the first time.

For the first time she stated, EERA was confronted with requests for sign language translation. This raised the question how inclusion can be promoted in a practical way.

The overall feeling was: the conference was a great experience, a very welcoming place and people. Delma Byrne thanked LOC from UCD for their hard work.

Saneeya briefly reflected on the ERC which had about 300 participants and 175 presentations. The Roundtable on Monday morning on Ethics worked very well, thanks to LOC for organising the speakers. The overlap on Tuesday afternoon was no problem this year, as the keynote and the two central workshops attracted many people. Therefore this structure should be kept for ECER 2017. Saneeya Qureshi thanked Council and LOC for reviewing, mentoring etc. but also expressed the wish to have a closer cooperation with the national associations during the year.

The EERA Sessions were well attended, as were the Keynote Panel and the Moot. The committee for evaluating the proposals for EERA Sessions for Copenhagen is: Theo Wubbels, Isabelle Milli, Marco Rieckmann, Gemma Moss, Conor Galvin and Branislava Baranovic.

4 Upcoming ECERs

4.1 ECER 2017

Mette Juncker reported on the developments for ECER 2017. They have just recently moved into the new campus, and all rooms are very well equipped, even with loudspeakers and hearing loops.

The accommodation they have organised starts at 60 €, and many low budget airlines go to Copenhagen. The venue booklet will also show low budget options for lunch in the area, and Council said that the lunch offer this year, with its stations and the low price, could also be taken as an example. The closing times of Cafeterias were a bit of a problem this year, which may be avoided by advance negotiation. Also the printing facilities should be open most of the time.

4.2 ECER 2018

Free University of Bolzano is a small university with only 3500 students, but they have a very good infrastructure. Everything is in walking distance, and there will be a guiding system across the city, Bolzano will “become” ECER 2018. They plan to recruit 120 student helpers. The cheapest accommodation can be offered at 12,50 Euro, with a good range of hotels, of which some may be a bit outside Bolzano, but still easily accessible. The best options for travelling to Bolzano will be via airports in Innsbruck, Venice or Verona (from where it takes about 2 hours by train) and via Munich (4 hours by train). The local culture is very diverse; the conference should integrate that in the programme, or in side events. The dates will be 3 – 7 September 2018.

“Processes and Structures of Inclusion and Exclusion: Resources for Educational Research?”

Discussion on the Theme:

The word Resource in the title led to confusion. This might be a deliberately vague word. For native speakers, Resource is fine as it is not only monetary, but can also mean immaterial “input”. A native speaker found that the first sentence of the title is more like an example and should therefore be at the end of the title. Segregation at schools et cetera should be addressed. The title could be simplified, but others found it important that the interplay of in- and exclusion is in the title. Over all, the theme is very good, it will only need some fine tuning now. Council suggests that the text is shortened a bit. If Council Members have further ideas on the wording of the theme, they can send them to Theo. Exec thanked SIPED, Edwin Keiner and Hannes Hell for their work so far.

4.3 ECER 2019

EERA Exec, Office and the University of Hamburg have started concrete discussion of budget etc. Ingrid Gogolin is the head of LOC. 2019 is the centenary of founding the university, therefore they are very interested in having ECER that year. The contract should be ready to get signed by the end of this year.

4.4 ECER 2020

Glasgow is still very interested in hosting ECER, and the dates for the academic year 2020 have not been set. That would leave some freedom with the dates, but also means that nothing can be guaranteed for the moment.

Council members were also invited to think about other options for next years, and were asked to contact the EERA Office if they want to know more before approaching their universities.

Armenia indicated interest in hosting ECER 2021.

4.5 General: should a second social be standard for ECER conferences?

As it had not been possible to accommodate for the social event 2016 within the conference budget it was originally planned to offer one or several self-paid events for delegates; this idea had to be given up during ECER preparation for various reasons. Different from previous conferences ECER 2016 did not offer a social event on Thursday evening.

Jani reported that the networks welcomed the opportunity to use the “free” Thursday to arrange a network activity. The difficulties of arranging one big social event for about 2000 people were acknowledged by council and the idea of smaller events in parallel should further be investigated. Others stated that previous social events often gave opportunity of looking into the culture of the country (typical dancing, special music etc.) and that it would be a pity to lose that. Maria stated that from the participant perspective, the get-together as a community is missing if no social event is offered. Meetings open for all can be seen as glue across networks. For 2017 the social event is again pencilled in as a self-paid event, for 2018 it could be taken into the conference budget again. So, strategic plans of how to deal with it would also be valid for 2019 and beyond.

The general feeling was: if there is only the welcome reception, then it should be upgraded a bit. If no big social can be offered, a number of smaller parallel ones should be considered as alternative. A strategic decision should include a participants’ perspective; the next participants’ evaluation should also include this question.

Evaluations

As EERA is in the favourable position of having things run smoothly from an organisational perspective, Maria suggested taking the opportunity to look into the quality and mission of the conference. There will not be a participants' evaluation this year, but the time should be used to look into a matrix for a future evaluation. A report is planned for March.

A focus would be the ECER mission and how it is different from other conferences. Also the tension of being inclusive (with respect to research communities not yet strongly linked to European discourses) and the question of quality should be addressed. Council suggested reconsidering the idea of having a participants' evaluation after ECER, in order to give a voice to the participants again. Exec will come back with a proposal for evaluation in March.

5 EERJ Editors' Report

Eric Mangez reminded council that the EERJ board had only met during ECER, therefore the documents related to their report were sent out that late. He invited council to consult the publishers' report.

Generally the Journal is doing well; there has been an increase of readership since the change to SAGE, the number of citations also increased. In the last year, 150 papers were submitted, and about one third was rejected. The new online submission system is well established and it works well. There is lots of material in the system, and also the open calls work well.

A Special Issue will soon be published and a new Special Call on the four European freedoms is in preparation.

The other activities of EERJ, the Moot during ECER and the Workshop during ERC, were also well received this year and can be seen as a success. The Moot triggered discussion starting with short interventions. The morning slot seems to have worked well. There were about 80 to 90 people in the audience. When it would be possible to make the interventions accessible in advance, via Twitter or on the website the event would be even more interesting.

The workshop during ERC was also very good, although it was not possible to address the last topic, "fake journals". It would have been good to inform the young researchers about their practices. EERJ will contribute to the next EERA Summer School, and perhaps the issue could be addressed there.

Maarten Simons stated that it was also good to be at the Networks Seminar in April, as this allowed to work closer with the EERA Networks. One Network approached them to see if a Network Memorandum could be published there. The editors suggested that this could be done in a "News" or "EERA Related Section", which would then not be peer reviewed. Theo Wubbels recommended to also peer review these kind of contributions as the ranking of a journal becomes more difficult when it contains articles that were not peer reviewed.

EERJ invites the EERA Member associations to make the journal visible to their members, and Angelika Wegscheider once more pointed out that she was still missing many members' email lists, which is necessary for giving them access to the journal if an association cannot provide a login site, which would be the preferred option for all.

Theo Wubbels thanked the editors and congratulated them on the impressive content and figures. He acknowledged the time and effort they put into EERJ and pointed to the positive outcome.

6 ERG Report

Saneeya Qureshi reported briefly on the developments within the Emerging Researchers' Group, such as the discussion with another journal for publishing the Best Paper Applications. Some of the working procedures for bursary submission et cetera are being reworked currently. There will be further news in March.

7 Associations' Exchange (WORKING GROUPS)

WG 1: Pending

Working group 2

Paula Korsnakova, Eduardo García-Jiménez (Spain); Maria Grazia Riva (Italy); Olena Fimyar(Ukraine) and Denize Orucu EARDA (Turkey)

Ethics, role of researchers in the times of unrest and turmoil, and benefits of networking were the major topics shared and discussed by the group. The group welcomed EERA's commitment to uphold high academic and professional standards and related activities and promotion of the ethical guidelines development and use.

WG 3: WG short report –Dragica Pavlović Babić

The main topic in our discussion was how to ensure effective communication in the triangle of research community, teacher community and policy makers, or how to make research findings more visible outside of the research community. It seems that there is a pattern which is operational throughout different countries. In fact, it seems that, more or less developed research are not influential nor on the educational policy nor on the teacher practice. Still, edu policies are more intuitive ones, while the teaching practice is predominantly arranged by routine.

One of the proposals was to initiate researches relevant to the teaching practice and form research teams comprised of researchers and teachers, including researchers and teachers who are still in school (doctoral students). Another proposal was to initiate the greater emphasis on social sciences research methodology and research practice during initial teacher education.

When it comes to better communication between researchers and policy makers, the proposal was to initiate better connections in the planning of research projects, as well as to ensure greater representation of policy makers on edu research conferences (such as ECER), including open discussions and/or round table sessions.

WG 4: Pending

WG5: Pending

8 EERA Publications

8.1 European Research Method Book

Angelika Paseka and Sofia Marques da Silva reported on the developments with the European methods book. SAGE is very positive and does think there is a market for the book, as long as a new focus or approach can be found. A first plan for that is to show and discuss the different methods by cases, real research projects. Some networks already recommended different projects that could be used.

Networks will be invited to suggest case studies to the group of editors, which are Marit Hoveid, Angelika Paseka, Sofia Marques da Silva, and Lucian Ciolan. Paul Standish will act as an adviser.

8.2 European Educational Research Review

Based on suggestions by council and networks Exec has established an editorial team which met during ECER, some being linked in via skype.

The group consists of Sigrid Blömeke, Gabor Halasz, Kristiina Kumpulainen, Gonzalo Jover. Theo Wubbels attended the meeting in his function as EERA president.

Theo Wubbels reported that the group explored the aims/mission of the journal in terms of wanting to publish systematic reviews that have a special awareness of the context (nation, educational system, etc) and differential effects (age, subject matter, etc). This makes the focus different from already existing review journals. An inclusive approach towards different review methods is foreseen as long as these are systematic.

The next step will be to draft a mission statement for the journal.

EERA will then use this as a document for discussions/negotiations with the publisher. Theo also indicated that it would take 2 more years before a first issue would be published.

8.3 EERA Book Series

Jani Ursin reported on the idea of the EERA book series. A first group of editors had been built up, based on the suggestions coming in from networks and member associations.

The group of editors consist of Jani Ursin (in his function as Networks' representative), Theo Wubbels (in his function as EERA president), Helena Phtiaka, Venka Simovska, Aniko Zsolnai, Herbert Altrichter and Dennis Beach. Those who were available met during ECER 2016 and agreed that the books should not consist of loosely related articles, but should have a shared focus for all papers and be coherent.

Networks and Council will be contacted with ideas for the first set of books.

A first meeting with a potential publisher was very promising, said Jani, a contract could be agreed on within the next year.

Open Access Journal

Herbert Altrichter reported that EERA has been contacted by a major publisher who suggested that EERA could pay a certain sum for allowing a given number of papers by EERA members to be published in an open access journal. The initial idea of Exec was that this could be of interest for some EERA member countries the universities of which do not yet have this kind of agreement. Member associations had been asked about their ideas on this topic via email but the answers have shown a very diverse picture. Exec has therefore concluded that in general a much more comprehensive approach both towards access to online resources in low GDP countries and to open access publishing is needed. As a consequence the publisher will be invited to discuss opportunities for a more comprehensive and forward-looking strategy? BERA reported they also had turned down a similar request as they felt it would mainly support the publisher rather than the authors.

8.4 General discussion on publications

Jani reported that the networks were encouraged to investigate publishing opportunities in their field and to work closely with existing journals. A first contract was agreed between the network on Health Education and the Emerald Journal "Health Education".

The editors of EERJ asked which impact these developments (open access publishing and NW publications) would have on the EERJ. Herbert Altrichter and Theo Wubbels explained that for each negotiation this would be re-considered. They felt that EERA being linked to a broader range of publications would also contribute to the general reputation of EERA and its flagship journal EERJ. They also felt it was good to see that ECER, EERA and the networks are important for publishers, and this might even lead to a higher visibility of EERJ, and therefore to more submissions. They encouraged EERJ to closely observe the developments re: open access publishing which may have an impact on EERJ (being – because of the wide membership of EERA- de facto an open access journal). Herbert Altrichter assured that EERA would also not want to infringe the good cooperation with SAGE, so proposals for new general education publications would also be put forward to SAGE once it is time to start serious negotiations.

9 Research Methods Book (WORKING GROUPS)

Angelika Paseka and Sofia Marques da Silva summed up actions taken so far and reported from the interviews done with participants during the summer school. They invited council members to develop ideas on the following four different areas. Working Groups were formed to feed back them.

Working group 1: strategies to involve network

- a. **Results**
- b. difficulties in involving networks

- c. particular attention to concepts (projects, but to consider other more individual research experiences)
- d. **We need to:**
 1. Find link persons from networks that can commit.
 2. Send a clear e-mail reminding the request to find projects.
 3. Clarifying the guidelines and criteria to find projects >> Do we want network based projects? Can they send projects that are originally writing in another language as national projects and then translate it?
 4. Include in the e-mail a timeline with the amount of work that is involved.
- e. **Important:** Jani call the attention to the fact that networks are being contacts to get involved in other publications, as the book series, and that might feel overwhelmed.

Working group 2: structure of the method-book

PENDING

Working group 3: European projects as cases

- **Governing by numbers. Shaping Education through Data.** Funded as part of the 'Eurocores' programme of the European Science Foundation (ESF) > national projects in Denmark, Finland, the UK (England and Scotland) and Sweden, co-ordinated by CES (Centre for Educational Sociology), Jenny Ozga.
- **ISI-TL: Impact of school inspection on teaching and learning**
Melanie Ehren (Univ. of London, co-ordinator), participants: Austria, Sweden, Ireland, CZ, Norway, Switzerland, UK.
- **GOETE.** The analysis focuses on parental educational aspirations and future plans for their children, the role of parents in decision-making in educational transitions and trajectories, parental participation in the school, and parental support with schoolwork. Case studies in 24 schools in Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, UK.
- **ISSPP: International Successful School Principalship Project.**
24 countries involved, longitudinal study, multiperspective case study (interviews, observations, surveys).

Working group 4: criteria for a good method book

- Include a meta text, explaining how the textbook works
- A part on writing and publishing
- Process of research should be focussed (research question in line with methods for data collection and analyses)
- Should be provoking
- Clear structure
- Invitation for further reading
- New dimension: how to choose the right method (as students mentioned)
- A book that communicates directly European contexts
- Interactive

10 EERA Summer School

10.1 Report Linz 2016

Herbert Altrichter reported on the first edition of the EERA summer school in Linz which, besides EERA and the local University, was also supported by the county of Oberösterreich. This was necessary and important to be able to conduct the school with the available funds from EERA and the local organizing university. In this case, the Johannes Kepler University (JKU) Linz collaborated with more local partners such as the Austrian Federal Institute for Educational Research and Development (BIFIE, Salzburg), and two Universities of Education in Upper Austria). More information on content and programme may be obtained under <http://www.eera-ecer.de/season-schools/programme-abstracts-and-biographies-of-tutors-and-lecturers/>

Council members who also acted as tutors in the summer school confirmed that the school was academically very successful and that students were very engaged students. With Saneeya Quareshi and George Head tutoring and lecturing at the school, the emerging researchers group was very present there as well, as was EERA, represented by Theo Wubbels, EERA's president and council members Sofia Marques da Silva and Angelika Paseka. Sofia Marques da Silva also enquired within the participants of the summer school what they would expect from a research methods book and what they would miss in existing ones. This also informed the working group and helped to frame the book idea.

In summary, the summer school proved to be highly successful in an academic sense and was also linked to EERA strategic projects.

10.2 Decision on Venue 2018/19

Maria Figueiredo summed up the application process by stating four proposals had been sent in and council decided during the March meeting to further negotiate with two candidates. In the meantime one candidate had to withdraw their offer. So only the offer from University of Masaryk in Brno, was still valid. She invited Petr Novotny to present his ideas and the budget linked to the summer school. The financial contribution of Masaryk will mainly be in renting out rooms for free and offering organisational and academic support. On the condition that a financial plan in line with EERA funding regulations will be provided, Council accepted Brno as new venue for 2018 and 2019.

11 Office

11.1 Update

Angelika Wegscheider reported that office currently is working with 3 members of staff + 2 students helpers. (115 h/week) This was a response to the changes in staff and worked fine for the moment. But it would also need to be evaluated in line with the tasks ahead (e.g. restructuring archives, rethinking some tools for office work and reshaping responsibilities within office).

She also underlined that the extra help (5 instead of 4 EERA staff during ECER at the EERA helpdesk/back office) was extremely helpful as it enable office to better update delegates on late changes and also assured that staff members could take a pause.

11.2 EERA leaflet

Angelika Wegscheider presented the drafted version for the EERA leaflet and stated that the selection of photos and the layout still needed to be done. Council approved the structure and office will present a printable version in the next meeting.

12 Budget

12.1 2016

Herbert Altrichter introduced the budget overview for the first half of 2016, highlighting that the raise in office costs was related to the new office spaces. Expenditure and income is in line with expectations or more positive. Thus, no amendment of the financial plan for 2016 is necessary.

12.2 2017

When proposing the budget for 2017, the treasurer reminded council of decisions taken in previous meetings.

- A bigger reserve (*achieved*)
- New conference fees (also including credit card fees) (*achieved*)
- Investment in the EERA website (*achieved*)
- New office space (*achieved*)
- Tasks ahead: new booking structure

Differences in the budgets proposals for 2016 and 2017 were linked to reduced costs for council meetings (2 instead of 3) and lower costs for software. He pointed out that if strategic projects came up during the year there would be an option to accommodate for them.

For the ERG it was agreed to re-arrange the ERG budget allowing for up to now un-used funds to be redirected to the bursary scheme thus allowing for an extra 5.000 Euro for bursaries for ECER 2017. The treasurer confirmed that ERG will be compensated for this sum should this turn out to be necessary in future.

Council Members also suggested funding for cross network activities and Maria referred to the already existing funding options, and highlighted joint sessions and EERA sessions as existing for cross network collaboration. Rewording of funding criteria is already under way.

Council then discussed the ECER fees. As economic conditions are deteriorating in some countries ECER and members' local conferences may be in competition. Some researchers would have to decide to which conference they could go. Herbert Altrichter pointed out that Exec already responded to some of these issues by e.g. allowing lower fees for unemployed researchers.

It was argued that if more income was gained in future (in excess of the goals stated by the council, e.g. one year's reserve) this should be redirected towards the fees.

For 2017 the fees will stay as they are, but the fee level will be evaluated and re-discussed for ECER 2018.

12.3 Low GDP threshold, World Bank list

EERA currently takes countries with a GDP of lower than 26.000 USD per capita as low GDP. The source of data is the GDP list issued by the World Bank.

Theo Wubbels suggested lowering the threshold to 90 % of what it used to be, as the average GDP worldwide declined in the last year (for EU countries it declined to 87,6% of the previous year). This would mean that all countries which have been considered low GDP in the EERA definition for ECER 2016 would still be considered low GDP, but the group would not be extended. If EERA stays with the current threshold of 26.000, two more countries (Spain and Cyprus) would be considered low GDP. Since EERA income and spending is linked to the economic situation of member countries in various ways (e.g. through Low GDP reductions for conference and membership fees, attendance rates at ECER), the economic situation of generally reduced GDPs needs to be taken into consideration. While two more countries may not be an issue for a year, keeping the threshold may lead to longer term problems.

Council discussed this generally by questioning if the GDP would be a suitable indicator at all and if others could be used instead (general income of researchers e.g.).

Based on these countries' attendance numbers the treasurer estimated that allowing low GDP fees for two more countries would reduce the EERA income by 30.000 Euro. Others argued that maybe the expected loss could be balanced by higher participation numbers.

Gemma Moss proposed to

- agree in principle that the low GDP threshold has to be adjusted annually according to the general economic level (which is reflected by Theo's proposal for a low GDP level of 90% of 2015),
- but to keep the threshold for 2017 at 26.000 USD thereby including Cyprus and Spain into the list of low GDP countries.

Herbert Altrichter pointed out that agreement to this proposal would include that all items of the proposed budget for 2017 will be reduced by 5%, so as still to work within the suggested budget proposal.

Council agreed to these proposals and decided to discuss this topic in more detail on the basis of the participation numbers of different GDP groups in August 2017 for ECER 2018. Council is invited to develop other ideas to accommodate for different economic strengths of countries based on reliable data sources.

13 Ethics / Ethical codex

13.1 Inclusion in Website/ tick box in submission form

In order to raise the awareness of delegates regarding ethical issues in the research process link convenors suggested in their seminar in April to include a tick box stating "I have followed the ethical guideline of my institution". The wording was discussed during the Network meeting during ECER and although the idea was reinforced the wording was felt as unsatisfactory. Council agreed and decided that the text should read "I have followed the relevant ethical guidelines" in order to leave open whether they refer to national, institutional or associational guidelines.

13.2 Report Working Group

George Head reported on the EERA Session on research ethics which had a good attendance and was a good session. This shows that there is an interest for the topic. The working group should therefore continue on a long-term basis. Elsevier showed interest in having blog publications on the issue. While doing the survey the group has asked for volunteers for interviews, and the group would like to follow this up. Also there will be a one page proposal for a Special Issue of EERJ. Alison Taylor, Paul Standish and Pavel Zgaga will be involved in that. More research via the member associations could be done. A second EERA Session for Copenhagen could be prepared, and for the March meeting an overview of achievements and further steps will be prepared. A book could be the end point for this working group.

14 Network Issues

14.1 Funding Criteria

The networks had expressed their concerns as the funding instruments were not transparent and clear enough. Exec has therefore reworked the guidelines and clarified the criteria. Jani asked Council to accept the new wording of the guidelines and make them part of the General Regulations.

14.2 Network Meetings & Seminar Report

Jani Ursin reported that there was no new network in preparation. During the last seminar and meetings networks had discussed the funding criteria, which lead to the reshaping of them as mentioned above. They also discussed the induction of new link convenors after agreeing on new guidelines for appointing convenors and link convenors. Following this, a number of new link convenors were selected this year.

Reviewing ECER 2016 the link convenors liked the new format of Video Presentation. Some networks would like to try Pecha Kucha as a new format for ECER presentations, and George Head reported that SERA works with them at their conference, and that this works well, especially for students. SERA introduced Pecha Kucha as a format of submission. In the first year they were grouped in special sessions, but SERA might also try out mixed sessions focused around similar topics in the next conference. Council agreed to go for a pilot for that for ECER 2017.

Also ECER 2017 will open the Tuesday morning slot for Workshops (up to 5 in total) organised by networks thereby answering the repeated request to offer capacity building workshops as these do not fit to the peer reviewed session programme.

Networks also reported that some networks have Emerging Researchers in the group of convenors, which would also be a way to engage with ERG.

Isabelle Milli reported on difficulties with the structure of the EERA Networks, which did not seem coherent to her, specifically the existence of subject focused networks (Mathematics Education, Research on Arts Education, et cetera) when there is a network on Didactics. Jani and Maria replied that there had been efforts a few years ago to change or sharpen the structure of EERA Networks. Networks had to prove that they had their own area and that they are successful each year with creating their programme for ECER. The structure seems to make sense from that perspective and it is positive to see that the collaboration between networks is getting better and better. Thanks to this collaboration, the networks feel stronger in their independence. The joint sessions are a big success, as they allow a very broad discussion with very different approaches.

Maria suggested that Council could approach networks in order to create EERA Sessions that deepen the collaboration between Networks. Isabelle and Maria agreed to organise one that deals with the relationship between Didactics and specific subject teaching and learning.

Branislava Baranovic asked about the possibility of applying for a new network on Gender Issues, and Nassira Hedjerassi also showed interest. They were asked to develop a proposal, which would then first go to the networks, and after their approval, to Council.

14.3 Honorary Members

Council accepted Alexander Botte, Ludger Deitmer, Sabine Manning & Martin Mulder as new honorary members

15 General Regulations

15.1 Emerging Researchers

The new General Regulations will be developed with the new Link Convenor Saneeya Qureshi and will be tabled in March.

15.2 Ethics

At EERA's website at the moment the following text can be read:

EERA is committed to upholding high academic and professional standards.
EERA expects all of its member associations to develop a formal code of academic conduct.

In the previous council meeting it was decided not to ask member associations to have a formal code of academic conduct but to have a policy around this issue. Theo presented the new text to replace the existing one on the website and Council suggested some changes to the wording:

EERA is committed to upholding high academic and professional standards. EERA expects all of its member associations to promote ethical educational research by their association members.

The proposal for changing collecting codes of conduct of national associations to collecting policies on promotion of ethical educational research was approved, as was the change in the request of a description of such policy for all member associations and new associations wanting to join EERA.

15.3 Induction of new link convenors

Maria reported that the induction will be mainly the responsibility of the existing Link Convenor, with support from the NRC and EERA Office. A text for the General Regulations was discussed with the convenors on Tuesday and networks reacted to it favourably with the exception of preferring to have only one "Link Convenor" as the person through which communication is channelled. A wording will be put forward in March. Maria added that the current regulations don't include guidance on internal structure of NWs, so networks will still be diverse in their way of dividing tasks and responsibilities.

15.4 Elections

The timing for the election process needed to be re-scheduled due to the new structure of having two instead of three Council meetings a year. Elections will from now on be held in spring. Also it was agreed that it should be the nomination committee who counts the ballots.

The nomination and election procedure:
See Constitution §6, sections (6) and (9)

An election committee for every Officer consisting of three Council members is appointed by Council at the August/September meeting, two years before the end of term. One committee member is elected to be the chair of the committee.

The election committee calls for nominations from Council members no later than three months after the August/September meeting.

Eligibility for Officers' elections is as follows:

- Any member of one of the educational research associations that are members of EERA may be nominated;
- Any member of Council (including office holders and co-opted members) may put forward a nomination;
- Only representatives of EERA member associations are eligible to vote (Officers and co-opted members are not eligible to vote).

Candidates who have the support of at least two Council members and accept the nomination can be nominated.

Nominations require the following:

- The names of the two members of Council who are putting forward the nomination
- A statement of no more than 300 words in support of the nomination (indicating e.g. what the person will bring to the job, relevant experience and skills)
- A statement by the nominated person agreeing to accept the nomination

The election committee produces a list with the names and presentations of all nominees. One month prior to the Spring Council meeting this list is sent to each member of Council.

The election will take place by secret ballot at the Spring Council meeting. Candidates are elected on the basis of simple majority voting.

Accredited representatives of member associations who are present are entitled to vote: either representatives of national associations by the Annual Nomination form or Council members designated by associations by proxy vote.

If there are more than two candidates, votes should be taken as single transferable votes.

The result is declared at the meeting by the President after the Election Committee collects and counts the votes.

16 Elections

16.1 Election Treasurer

18 ballot sheets were distributed, 18 were collected, 17 were Yes, 0 No and one abstain. Herbert Altrichter was elected for a second term for being treasurer.

16.2 Election Committee President

Satu Perälä-Littunen agreed to be the president of the Election Committee for next year's election of the new president. Eduardo Jimenez, Marco Rieckmann and Dragica Dragica Pavlović Babić will be members of the Committee.

17 Member Issues

17.1 Armenia: application full membership (tbc)

As Anna Aleksanian was unable to attend this meeting, the application was postponed to the meeting in March. Their candidate membership ends after four years of candidateship on 31.12.2016, but Armenian representatives may send their application in the course of 2017.

Lucian Ion Ciolan reported on the process for Romania's association; there will be a third meeting in October, and then the request for being allowed to have 'Romanian' in the title of the association can go to the authorities. He thinks that the proposal for the full membership can be tabled in March.

17.2 Member presentations:

Russia

As Arcady Margolis was unable to attend, his presentation on a Russian association was postponed to a later meeting.

NERA, Nordic Educational Research Association

John Benedicto Krejsler presented NERA and the specific situation of the Nordic countries with both their language similarities and language differences and a history of changing leadership amongst them. He contested some of the common assumptions like Nordic countries being strong in welfare and pointed out that e.g. the gap between low and high income is widening considerably.

NERA includes Iceland, Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. English is accepted as a conference language for the NERA conferences. John also explained that the membership to NERA was linked and included to the conference registration. Lower numbers at the annual NERA conference therefore mean lower numbers in membership fees for NERA, which raises the question of the relationship of EERA and NERA. Could EERA be a danger to NERA?

NERA, he pointed out, is the only transnational association within EERA. FERA, the Finnish educational research association, and SWERA, the Swedish association which was founded not too long ago, are active in partly the same geographic region. He assumes that in a while also a separate Danish association might be built up.

18 External Relationships

No news to report on, as there were no meetings since the President's annual report.

19 Next Meetings

17 and 18 March 2017, both days until 17:00, Berlin

20 AOB

Council discussed that the change to two meetings per year should be evaluated on a regular basis, as there is a risk that Exec and Council would lose connection. Participation on the second day decreased. John Benedicto Krejsler noted that meetings should not take place Saturday and Sunday for the sake of family-friendliness.

Paula Korsnakova pointed out that also online-meetings should be investigated, especially for ad hoc in between meetings and decisions. Office will look into this.

A working group for new ideas on the structure was created: John B. Krejsler, Paula Korsnakova and Maria Figueiredo.