A history of the CiCe Academic Network – part 1: Genesis

Alistair Ross
London Metropolitan University (UK)

Abstract

Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe – commonly abbreviated to CiCe – is one of the longest established Academic Networks in European higher education supported by the European Commission's Education and Culture Directorate. The CiCe Network formally began in September 1998. However, preparatory work began in the early summer of 1996. This paper uses unique archival evidence to trace the early stages of the Network, from its original idea in a meeting of three early members to the first round of formal meetings of the Executive and early working parties in the winter of 2008/9.

Keywords: *CiCe Network, history, European Academic Networks*

This is the first in a projected series of eight presentations that will trace the history and development of the Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CiCe) network: future papers will consider each of the various three-year stages of CiCe, with the aspiration of culminating in a paper on 'Cice 7' (2017-2020) at the 2019 Conference (the twentieth anniversary conference). The present author – who was the Network's Coordinator for the first ten years - proposes to present the first four papers, taking the story to 2008. As well as creating a record of the development of this specific Network, it is hoped that the series as a whole will provide a valuable commentary and reflection on the European Commission's support for Academic Networks within the Socrates/Life Long Learning frameworks.

The early beginnings of the Network are not well recorded - there were many faxes and e-mails now lost - and this opening chapter is necessarily based in part on personal recollections and a partial miscellany of paper records, and the original submission. Inevitably subjective, it is open to comment an emendation from others' memories and perspectives.

I had an interest in young people's understanding and learning of social and political issues since the mid 1970s, particularly in primary school aged children (up to age 11). In the 1980s, 'political education' – and indeed 'social education' – were seen by the UK government at the time as suspect, even subversive – the Prime Minister announced that 'society does not exist' (Thatcher 1987), and the school curriculum was moved towards a very traditional set of subjects. One of the very few exceptions to this was the area of economics and industry: the government suspected schools and universities of promoting an anti-industrial culture, and not teaching pupils about the 'realities' of economic life. This presented a loophole to some subversive academics – under the banner of 'Economic and Industrial Understanding' we were able to include curricular activities that included looking at hierarchies in workplaces, interviewing people about working

conditions, the distribution of incomes and wealth, and other unsavoury areas. The University of North London was one of a number of centres for such activities. Citizenship was also on the agenda as a cross-curricular theme, but had less government support.

In 1993 we began a slow process of making European links in this area: firstly with the University of Hannover, where Egbert Daum and his colleagues had been pursuing a similar agenda. With the help of two British Council-DAAD grants, we explored 'Children's views of the relationship between schooling, training and employment in the UK and Germany'. We interviewed 30 nine-year-old children in each country, and used a questionnaire with a larger group of 250. By 1995 we were beginning to discuss the idea of extending the study to more countries, though we found funding problematic, as most support at that stage was for bilateral contacts, rather than multilateral. An additional issue was that Egbert Daum moved to the University of Osnabruk, leaving Hans-Fred Rathenow and Werner Borsum as the funded partners at Hannover. Making a two-way project into a three-way project did not seem possible.

At this time the European Commission was beginning to stir – very cautiously – in the area of education. Education was a 'reserved area' – the prerogative of the national states rather than the Commission – but it was tacitly agreed that educational activities that supported on-going national activities that promoted European integration could be supported and encouraged (but not directed) by the Commission. There was already a higher education activity called the Erasmus programme (*EuRopean Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students*) that had begun in 1987 – amid considerable controversy. This was expanded first to include small scale multi-lateral projects that developed curriculum activities that had a European dimension, and a programme of individual teacher exchanges between schools and universities. DGXXII (as it was then known), responsible for Education, Training and Youth, began planning a more ambitious programme of Socrates activities in 1994/5, that now included an Erasmus higher education programme of more exchanges, more curriculum development programmes, and some observation and analysis activities.

Meanwhile, we began using the European bilateral contacts of our colleagues in North London. One of the most promising was with the University of Montpellier III (Paul Valery), with whom our European Studies department had been working for several years. We composed a brief statement of our activities and intentions – to add a French institution to a German-UK institutional link – which our colleagues took to Montpellier on a visit in early May 1996[1]. The Education Department there took the bait, and the head of department, Yveline Fumat, faxed us her interest[2]. She had carried out studies on the teaching of democratic socialisation and the world of work in primary education, and written several curriculum books in the area. She was able to visit London almost immediately, and we had a series of meetings on the 3rd and 4th of June that year: language was a major stumbling block (I spoke ancient schoolboy French, thirty-five years old, Yveline spoke rather less English), but a rapport was established, mutual areas

---

[1] Open letter, Alistair Ross and Merryn Hutchings, to the Education Department of the University of Montpellier III, 3 May 1996
[2] Fax, Yvelline Fumat to Ross, 29 May 1996

of interest identified, and an agreement made to meet with the Germans from Hannover in the autumn.

The Commission launched its enlarged Socrates programme in early 1996. The University of North London was very eager to make proposals, and we were under pressure to develop a curriculum development proposal with four or five members. However, we felt that this had some drawbacks – the teacher education programme in England was heavily regulated and had little room for anything that smacked of the European; it would inevitably be time-limited; and would be very product-orientated. We wanted something more flexible, and something buried in the Horizontal Measures section called 'Thematic Networks' seemed attractive – three years of funding to establish a network in a higher education curriculum area, in which the European dimensions could be scoped. Would this be a way forward?

Between October 2 and 4th that year we held a series of meetings – bilateral with the Germans (as the final DAAD-British Council exchange meeting), and trilateral with the French (aided by Yveline's bilingual sister, a long-standing UK resident). We agreed that a Thematic Network on children's understanding of social and economic issues, composed of the three of us, with a few other partners, would "exchange information and ideas about (1) children's understanding of work, economy, training; (2) how education programmes should/could respond [to this; and (3) I[nitial] T[eacher] E[ducation] implications"[3]. We would have meetings in the three countries and exchanges, organise a conference, and "employ people admin/ coordination/ translations – 1 full-time per country", and produce publications. We agreed that North London would seek other partners from Sweden, Malta and within the UK; Hannover and Osnabrück would talk with Netherlands partners and other German institutions, and that Montpellier would look to Greece and France. When we noticed that Networks were supposed to include at least one member from each member state – an impossibly challenging fifteen countries at that time – and that candidate states who had completed a Socrates agreement with the Union were also to be encouraged – we thought (mistakenly) that this was some error or misunderstanding on the Commission's part. Thematic Networks would be supported for three years, but each year would require a separate application for funding.

After the meeting I wrote to DGXXII for more details. Initial applications had to be in by the end of December, and a number of areas that were to be encouraged were listed: could other areas make applications (yes); would there be a similar list for 1997 applications (yes, but what was not yet known), what if we overlapped with other Networks (discuss this with them); was our proposed area possible (only if we focussed on the education of teachers in higher education who would be responsible for this, rather than the school students); and were they serious about including every EU member state (oh yes!).[4]

This last stipulation was to be a real challenge: bringing together so many partners from so many states, most of which we had no links with, on an area of the curriculum that

---

[3] Handwritten notes on back of Programme for meetings, 2 – 4 October, 1996
[4] Letter Ross to DGXXII, 8 Oct 1966; fax Ogden to Ross, 26 November 1996

barely had a name. It was clearly not possible within two months, so we decided to aim at a December 1997 application, if we could find the partners.

Communications in the autumn of 1996 were still largely by the postal services and fax. The World Wide Web had been launched as a free service by CERN just three and half years earlier: there were only about half a million websites across the globe. The first search engine, Yahoo, was less than two years old (and at times produced quite strange results). E-mail had been longer established, but still not widely used – it was not uncommon for an entire University faculty to share a single e-mail address. Attachments to e-mails were first introduced in 1993, and many university accounts could not handle them. Making a network was not going to be easy.

So a paper outline for a network – 'Proposed European Thematic Network on Children's Understanding of Social and Economic Issues' was drawn up in November.[5] Written in what had been the dominant discourse of the Union up to that time, we suggested that a network was necessary because structural unemployment in the EU was associated with high levels of unemployment among families who had low levels of economic understanding, leading to the rise of an underclass and social exclusion. The network was to scope the extent of the lack of understanding among young people (up to age 13), and develop programmes of action for training teachers to compensate for this, and would be made up of academics from a range of disciplines. There would be interlocking studies of economic, social and possibly political understanding. We needed to demonstrate our potential European impact, why this was an opportune moment, and that we had members from all necessary countries: this would be the basis of the December 1997 bid: if we passed this stage, we would be invited to make a full proposal in early April 1998, with a view to launching the three-year Network, if successful, in September 1998. We asked for expressions of interest, for the paper to be circulated, and for comments and suggestions.

This was mailed out to a number of possible contacts and lists in January 1997.[6] But e-mail and the web were developing, and although we used paper/postal contacts a great deal through the early years (particularly as long documents could not reliably be attached to e-mails), we were using e-mail as much as we could from the beginning, and had a web-site operating from early May 1997. A Newsletter was started in April 1997[7], with irregular editions that year (No 2, June; No 3, October; No 3a, November; No 4, December; No 5, January 1998; No 6, March; No 7, June).

In April, we learned that there had been 476 first stage applications for Thematic Networks made in December 1996, of which a mere 28 had been supported by the Commission. The odds were against us.

---

[5] Letter Ross to Fumat, Daum, Tegtmeyer and Borsum, 11 November 1996
[6] Letter 'Proposal for a European Thematic Network', with six appendices and a Registration of interest form, to various addressees, 8 January 1997
[7] 'Proposed European Thematic Network: Children's Social and Economic Learning and Understanding: Newsletter of the Draft Planning Group', Issue 1, April 1997

But responses were coming back: not just expressions of interest and support, but suggestions and comments. Why limit ourselves to the younger children: shouldn't we include secondary? (This was immediately accepted, and we decided to work on a 0 -18 basis). Why not put more emphasis on the political, not just the economic and social? (Also accepted.) The current working title was too long and cumbersome: think of the citizenship agenda.

This latter point was timely. Citizenship, particularly the European dimension, was rapidly moving up the agenda at this time. Three critical academic works on citizenship had been published in the preceding five years, and these had particular relevance to the emerging conception of a European citizenship (European Union, 1992). Brubaker's *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (1992) had articulated the dualities of citizenship as being 'internally inclusive' and 'externally exclusive', and also shown citizenship as a mechanism for social closure, regulating state membership; Soysal's *Limits of Citizenship* (1994) showed a convergence towards post-nation membership and the deterritorialisation of a person's rights, an examination of citizenship and rights, as opposed to one of citizenship as status; and Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995) pinpointed how no single form of citizenship can be applied to diverse groups: different identity groups may require the differential provision of rights. Elections to the European Parliament, which had begun in 1979, were by now being noted as having a declining turnout, down from 63% in 1979 to 57% in 1994 (it has since fallen to 43% in 2009), leading to accusations that there was a 'democratic deficit' and that European Union institutions lacked legitimacy. The concept of European Citizenship itself had been introduced three years earlier, in 1993 (as part of the Maastricht treaty): "Citizenship of the Union is hereby established. Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall be additional to and not replace national citizenship" (Article 20: Treaty on the functioning of the European Union). So the suggestion to include a citizenship education focus was timely.

The search for sufficient members continued. The world wide web was in its infancy. The first CiCe website was developed by me, on my personal university web page – www2.unl.ac.uk/~hxjzrossa/network.html - learning how to use HTML and laboriously creating each page – but managing to do it frequently, so that all new ideas, responses and comments were added as soon as they arrived: it was a very frequently updated site, especially in the early months, and any prospective members began to use it to keep abreast of new proposals and suggestions. Each newsletter was also loaded on to the site – and these have been transferred from each reincarnation of the site to the next, and can still be found there today. Opening each site in turn, I found that most of them were only in Finnish. The only low-cost on-line translation service available was called babelfish: it would offer rather primitive translations between English, German and French (and I think Spanish) – but certainly not Finnish. But I managed to work out that the Finnish for 'Education' was something generally beginning *pedagogiikka* – so I trawled through each Finnish university site looking for words or links that began this way. (There was no such thing as 'search for these words on the website' available at that time). When I found what appeared to be the education department, however, it was sometimes possible to identify the academics' names – and their e-mail addresses. At that time, it was common for people to put their e-mail addresses in plain language on the web –

spam was still just a proprietary name for American tinned meat, and all e-mail was serious! So I prepared a standard short e-mail, explaining I was trying to set up a network, and looking for some essential Finnish university members: if they were interested, I'd send more details. This appeal was simply sent off to every e-mail address that was in the vicinity of *pedagogiikka* on the Finnish websites. But this scattergun approach produced results, and within a week I was in correspondence with four or five new Finnish colleagues. (Immediately after exhausting the Finnish university websites I turned my attention to Belgium, using the same technique – after several hours I realised that I had not changed the e-mail appeal, and was asking Belgian strangers if they would become Finnish members: perhaps this was the invention of spam. I sent off explanatory and apologetic e-mails; it was really *Belgian* members that I needed … and I got three).

Table 1: Growth of the Network: number of institutions involved
(numbers in brackets are numbers of individuals)

Country	Oct 1996	Jan 1997	April 1997	June 1997	Oct 1997	Dec 1997	Jan 1998	Mar 1998	Sept 1998
Austria			1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2	2
Belgium				2 (2)	2 (3)	2 (3)	3 (4)	3	3
Denmark		1	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	8 (9)	8 (9)	9	9
Finland				1 (1)	1 (3)	3 (5)	3 (5)	3	3
France	1	1	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (4)	6 (10)	6 (10)	4	4
Germany	2	2	2 (3)	3 (4)	3 (4)	6 (10)	7 (11)	5	5
Greece		1	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	4 (4)	4 (4)	4	4
Ireland			1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3 (3)	3 (3)	2	2
Italy				2 (2)	2 (2)	3 (4)	4 (5)	3	3
Luxembourg				1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2	2
Netherlands		1	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	4 (4)	4 (4)	2	2
Portugal						4 (8)	4 (8)	4	4
Spain			2 (2)	2 (3)	2 (3)	2 (4)	6 (11)	3	3
Sweden		3	3 (5)	3 (6)	4 (8)	6 (11)	6 (11)	6	6
UK	1	2	4 (6)	6 (8)	8 (11)	8 (14)	8 (14)	9	9
Norway		1	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	5 (7)	5 (7)	4	4
Iceland					1 (1)	3 (4)	3 (4)	2	2
Cyprus			1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1	1
Czech R					1 (1)	3 (3)	4 (4)	4	4
Estonia							2 (2)	2	**
Hungary						2 (2)	4 (4)	3	3
Malta			1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1	**
Poland						2 (3)	4 (5)	4	4
Romania						2 (2)	5 (5)	5	5
Slovakia						2 (2)	2 (2)	2	2
Slovenia						1 (1)	1 (1)	2	**
Total (insts)	4	12	22	34	38	84	99	91	86

** these 3 countries disallowed: not in Socrates on the start date

EU members   EEA members   Candidate countries 1997

A significant step in terms of the support given by the University of North London was that in September 1997 I was able to persuade the Dean of Humanities that it would be worthwhile giving me some administrative support in putting the Network together. Cass Mitchell-Riddle was a faculty research administrator, and I had worked with her for some years: she was now seconded on a part-time basis of a couple of days a week at this point. She was invaluable in maintaining the contacts we established, keeping detailed records of institutions and commitments, and in supporting the details of the application.

And thus we grew: the Table 1 shows just how long it took.

The first wave of Thematic Networks began work in the September before our outline bid was due, and DGXXII organised a conference of the coordinators in Dublin in October. It seemed that it might be useful to attend this in order to get a sense of how successful network applications had been organised, and what they were proposing to do – and to meet the Commission officials who were responsible for managing the programme. At this point in the development of the Socrates programme, the DG itself undertook most of the selection process, and were directly involved in shaping and directing the programme. They had a Technical Assistance Office (TAO), which dealt with the processes of budget checking, membership checks, and so on; but M E Almeida Teixeira led a small team of officials who coordinated working with the Networks. After some correspondence, I secured an invitation to the conference, and was able to make many useful contacts. Much of the official meeting was devoted to matters of budgetary control – what expenditure was legitimate, the proportions of budget that the Commission would offer support for, and so on. Bt this stage we had already nearly achieved our minimum participant target, of at least one institution per member state and the EEA states (Norway and Iceland), but one most useful piece of information gathered was that it would help to also include institutions from candidate countries - of which there were about nine that it would be possibly to include in Socrates programmes from September 1998. (It was also with some relief that we were told not to bother trying to include Liechtenstein, an EEA country with no higher education institutions; and we could justify leaving out one or two member states in an application – the example we were given was that a Network on deep-sea fishing need not include Luxembourg!). More information was gathered, largely in the bar, on how to organise and present committees and working parties, and how to present a budget that included some 'contribution' from the Network members.

It was at this time that we also arrived at a new name for the Network. Hitherto it had mutated from the already long 'Children's Social and Economic Leaning and Understanding' (CSELU?) to 'Children's Social and Economic Leaning and Understanding within a European Identity' (CSELUWEI?). In November 1997 the Newsletter[8] circulated first a suggestion from Peter Eklundh (from Lund University in Sweden) for Children's Understanding and Learning of Citizenship, in the local, regional, national and European Context, and then as shorter alternative – Children and Citizenship in Europe. By December we had largely agreed on the present compromise – Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe, which gave the usable and generally

---

[8] CiCe Newsletter 4: December 1997

pronounceable (though not always the same way) CICE. (There was a short lived attempt to pander to the Commission's love of classical allusions with CIRCE – but we remembered what Circe got up to in the Odyssey, and dropped the idea.) A makeshift logo was introduced in January, with a lower-case i and e between the upper-case C and C.

The initial proposal went off to Brussels just before Christmas 1997. We had members in all 15 EU states, 2 from the EEA members, and 9 of the candidate countries. We stressed that this was an interdisciplinary network, quite different to the existing networks; and that our concern was with how university students were educated about our subject matter. We suggested we would develop shared modules using open and distant learning techniques, and have an annual conference and probably some working parties.[9]

We were told that it would take about eight weeks to shortlist the preliminary applications. This would leave little more than four weeks to complete the final Proposal, so we used the wait to gather details about members' interests and intentions, so that we could present a more detailed work programme if we were shortlisted. The Dublin consensus had been that it was more important to present plausible plans, with names and dates that could later be modified, than to be too imprecise. We'd also be warned about not including 'sleeping members', present in name only, so we started trying to develop a programme that would include activity from as many institutions as possible. We also prepared members to get the Letters of Intention we would need from each Principal, Rector or Director.

At the end of February 1998 we heard that we had been shortlisted.[10] Cass Mitchell-Riddle and I moved into full-time mode for the next five weeks. We faxed every member the Newsletter – the post took too long – together with draft letters on intent, and detailed instructions on how to calculate salary costs. We suggested how many days should be committed. A structure began to emerge.

A Steering Group would advise and support the Coordinator (me). It seemed sensible and politic to make the membership diverse and representative, so there would be a member from the four countries with populations of 60 million plus, and one from Spain. As there was still doubt over whether the Candidate states would be included, we confined the Steering Group membership to EU countries, and took on three smaller states, from those that appeared most active in our discussions.

Alistair Ross	UK	North London	Coordinator/Chair
Egbert Daum	DE	Osnabruck	
Yveline Fumat	FR	Montpellier 3	
Emilio Lastrucci	IT	Rome La Sapienza	
Magarita Limon	ES	U Autonoma Madrid	
Elisabet Nasman	SE	Linkopping	
Panayota Papoullia-Tzelpi	GR	Patras	
Soren Hegstrup	DK	Hindholm	

---

[9] CiCe Newsletter 5: January 1998
[10] CiCe Newsletter 6: March 1998

Three working parties were created – one for the 0-5 age range, one 6 – 11, and one 12 – 18. Each had four members – this time we drew on the Candidate countries as well as the EU members – and was selected from the most active discussants and volunteers, but again with an awareness of the need to create some geographical balance. A Steering Group member was to chair each of these. We also appointed National Coordinators (some of who doubled up as working group members), and were thus able to give defined roles to about 45 of our 84 members.

Each member had to be committed to a defined number of days in the first year, and we had to know and report the cost of this in ecus (European Currency Units – the fictional currency that preceded the Euro). We then had to estimate costs of travel to meetings and the conference, and estimate subsistence costs when people got there, and present these as clear budget sums: we asked for 135,000 ecus for 1998-9. This was a massive exercise of bluff, bluster and back-of-envelope calculations, translated into self confident and assured statements: the rationale we adopted was that if the Commission presented a box to be filled, it was critical that we filled it confidently than left it as a question mark or a blank. Again following advice from the Dublin meeting, targets were set in a way that appeared clear and definitive, but which we could be reasonably confident could be not just achieved, but exceeded.

Having drawn up a complete programme and budget, with names, dates and ECUs, we now needed to get Letters of Intent from the participating institutions – hard originals, no copies – so another fax operation began on 19th March: draft explanations, budgets and requests to everyone, and letters sent back to London by courier. About eight institutions dropped out at this stage: misunderstanding, difficulties with the University administrations, and career movements variously were given as the reasons. By the 26th we had most letters and agreements back, and started telephoning the outstanding members … by the 30th everything was in place, the final documents were printed in triplicate and signed by North London's Vice Chancellor, who was assuming ultimate responsibility for the Network, its finances and its delivery. That evening it was couriered to DGXXII, and the wait began.

We had been told that we should expect a response by July. July came and went: DGXXII explained that all EU ministers had to agree to the Commission's selection proposals, and that their agenda was long. August came and went too. The proposal was to start work on September 1st … and still we waited.

Meanwhile, the future of university education in Europe was being quietly discussed elsewhere. In mid 1988 the French Minister of Higher Education, Claude Allègre, had spoken to his UK equivalent, Tessa Blackstone: in her words "in despair about the French higher education system, which he believed to be un-reformable from within" he proposed that the two, with the higher education ministers for Germany and Italy, should mark the 800th anniversary of the foundation of the Sorbonne with a declaration of "plans for the greater integration of their HE systems on the Anglo Saxon model": and thus, the Bologna Declaration of June 1999 (Blackstone, quoted in Reisz, 2012). This initiative was to influence greatly the direction of the Commission's Thematic Networks over the next decade.

Finally, in late September a fax arrived from Brussels: we had been selected. E-mails were despatched to all, except those still reliant on faxes, who heard this way.[11] The Steering Group were told to choose a date to come to London for their first meeting, and dates and locations were selected and announced to the Working Parties for their first meetings. It was not until the second week in October that the Commission announced the budget we would get – almost everything we had asked for: Estonia, Malta and Slovenia had not joined the Socrates programme in time, and their contributions would therefore not be funded for 1998/1999.

Cass Mitchell-Riddle and I set about establishing a Central Coordination Unit at the University of North London. We secured use of an office, and were given necessary equipment by the University, and appointed a full time administrative assistant, Gordon D'Avilar from January 1999. By March he was joined by Jan McEneany, a part-time web-site manager.

The Steering Group met in London on 11th and 12th December 1998. This was the first time we had met as a group – and for some, the first time we had met any of the other members. Our discussions covered plans for a research programme, that would try to get each member to track the social understanding of a number of young people over several years; the potential work of the age-related working groups; and plans for an initial conference, to be held in mid May 1999. Our proposal document had suggested a January/February conference, but the late notification from Brussels made this impossible, and CiCe has met in the mid May to early June period ever since.

The 'age-related working parties' met next: their members included many of those who would take on leadership roles later in CiCe's development. The 7-11 group met in Bruges/Torhout in mid January: Panayota (Titi) Papoulia Tzelpi chairing a group that included Hugo Verkest, Hana Kantorkova, Beata Krzywosz-Rynkiewicz and Maria de Lurdes Pimenta (from Belgium, the Czech republic, Poland and Portugal). At this stage we had not established even the rudimentaries of planning: we had not agreed arrival times and locations, and Titi and I were waiting at Bruges station until Hugo and his team had searched the town and decided we must be there (none of us had mobile phones in those days). Towards the end of the meeting, Hugo and his KATHO associates remembered that their college had an international coordinator: they contacted her and Anne-Marie van den Dries arrived on the Sunday, dressed down Hugo and colleagues for not having included her in the loop, and took me off for dinner to give me a deal of advice about how the Commission worked. Anne-Marie became a valuable and long standing member of the Steering Group the following year.

The working group for younger children, to the age of seven, was chaired by Soren Hegstrup: he hosted the first meeting in Kobenhaven in late January. Kristin Dyrfjord, Nico Kneip, Blanca Moll and Marja-Kristiina Lerkannen were the members, from Iceland, Luxembourg, Spain and Finland respectively. They discussed at length how to observe and collect data from younger children.[12] The secondary-age group was chaired by Margarita Limon: she hosted the initial meeting in Madrid of Ian Davies, Marta

---

[11] CiCe Newsletter 8: September 1998
[12] CiCe Newsletter 11, p 2 (March 1999)

Fulop, Rudolf Raubik and Edgar Krull (UK, Hungary, Austria and Estonia: a German member had resigned before we could begin work). They started devising guidelines for questioning young people about identities.[13]

Plans for their activities were established, and ways that they could relate to the conference worked out. Meanwhile, we were having to work on the proposal for funding for the second year of activities, which had to be submitted to the Commission by the end of March 1999: it was strange to have to plan a second year of activities that built on a first year's work that had barely begun – as well as frustrating to have to recollect and recheck all the information and costings from each partner institution. All this was still collected and submitted on paper: DGXXII staff in Brussels then manually re-entered all our data on to their spreadsheets for checking and evaluation. A detailed catalogue of members and their interests was compiled and printed, and circulated to all members.

DGXXII also summoned the Network coordinators to the first annual briefing meting in Brussels in late January. As with the Dublin meeting in 1997, there was considerable stress on meeting the Commission's requirements in terms of procedures and communications. The team at DGXXII also unfolded their own proposals for the development of the Networks, including establishing a web-based data set of all our members, meetings and activities – a 'kiosk', it was described as – that would enable us to exchange with members of other Networks. This the coordinators found rather strange: when we met as coordinators, we had a great deal to discuss together about the ways and fancies of the commission, but we could not understand why members of say, the history network would have much interest in the activities of the chemistry network. Nevertheless, the Commission put quite considerable resources into creating the kiosk, into which we would all be expected to enter all our activities, members and contacts. Fortunately, the technology let them down, so we were relieved of the task.

One important message that we were given at this meeting was that we were not to be in any way involved in research. There was a strong message that research belonged to different Directorate, and that the Networks were to focus on the teaching elements of University activities. Many coordinators believed that at the higher education level all teaching needed to be given in a research-rich environment. We each made short presentations of our Network's activities: when I mentioned a CiCe research strand, I was taken aside afterwards and spoken to: this was not to continue. It was not until 2003-4 that the Department (by then the Department of Education and Culture) agreed that research and teaching were essentially linked, and that we should encourage and facilitate research activities, even though we could not be funded to conduct research

The CiCe launch conference process proceeded. We invited proposals for papers and symposia, with an early March deadline, and the Steering Group met for a second time in Athens at the end of that month. A four day conference was planned, to be held in London, with the Steering Group and working groups holding meetings in the days before this, and a National Coordinator's meeting during the conference. Proposals were

---

[13] CiCe Newsletter 11, p 2 (March 1999)

received for over forty papers and more for shorter presentations, and the Athens meeting reviewed each of these and devised a programme based on the papers selected.[14] The stage was set for our first conference.

References

Brubaker, R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge MA: University of Harvard Press

European Union (1992) *Treaty on European Union.* Brussels: European Commission. [signed 1992, came into effect 1993]

Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Reisz, M. (2012) Bologna's 'elitist' origins. Time Higher Education (29 March 2012)

Soysal, Y. (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Post-national Membership in Europe.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Thatcher, M. (1987) Interview, in *Woman's Own*, p 10

---

[14] CiCe Newsletter 12, p 1 (April 1999)