



This paper is taken from

Identities and Citizenship Education: Controversy, crisis and challenges. Selected papers from the fifteenth Conference of the Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe Academic Network

London: CiCe 2013

Edited by Peter Cunningham
Technical Editor: Angela Kamara and published in London by CiCe,
ISBN 978-1-907675-20-1

Without explicit authorisation from CiCe (the copyright holder)

- only a single copy may be made by any individual or institution for the purposes of private study only
- multiple copies may be made only by
 - members of the CiCe Thematic Network Project or CiCe Association, or
 - a official of the European Commission
 - a member of the European parliament

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as
Ross, A. (2013) 'A History of the CiCe Academic Network – Part 2: Learning to Walk', in P. Cunningham (ed.)
Identities and Citizenship Education: Controversy, crisis and challenges. London: CiCe, pp. 442 – 452.

© CiCe 2013

CiCe
Institute for Policy Studies in Education
London Metropolitan University
166 – 220 Holloway Road
London N7 8DB
UK

This paper does not necessarily represent the views of the CiCe Network.



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Acknowledgements:

This is taken from the book that is a selection of papers given at the annual CiCe Conference indicated. The CiCe Steering Group and the editor would like to thank

- All those who contributed to the Conference
- The CiCe administrative team at London Metropolitan University
- London Metropolitan University, for financial and other support for the programme, conference and publication
- The Lifelong Learning Programme and the personnel of the Education and Culture DG of the European Commission for their support and encouragement.

A History of the CiCe Academic Network – Part 2: Learning to Walk

Alistair Ross

IPSE, 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. This paper traces the first four years of the Network's activities, from its first conference in London in 1999, through the three year initial phase and the Dissemination year of 2001-2. This paper uses unique archival evidence to trace the early stages of the Network.

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

(This is the second 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. A paper at the 2012 Conference in York (Ross, 2012) outlined the origins of the proposal to form the Network, and the initial proposal to the European Commission. Future papers will consider each of the various three-year stages of CiCe.)

Although the Steering Group and the three Age-Related groups had met, the London Conference was the first opportunity that most members of the network had of meeting in person. It had originally been scheduled to be held in February, but because of the delay in getting approval for the Network from the Commission, it was decided that May would be the first realistic opportunity for a meeting, and the pattern of May/early June annual conferences has persisted since then. Over ninety people attended, from 22 different countries: 34 papers were given, with 10 shorter presentations, leisurely spread over four days: each paper had 45 minutes for presentation and discussion, and there were only three parallel groups. There was also time for extensive discussions about the nature of the Network, and our possible joint activities.

At this time in the development of Thematic Network Projects (TNPs), there was little clear direction from the Commission, and few examples to follow, of what a Network should be doing, or what was expected of it. TNPs were expected to work at the 'meso-institutional level', DG XXII had set out that TNPs were not to be collections of individual academics (as found in curriculum development projects), neither were they to be a collection of academic institutions (as those who made Socrates Charter statements, or had formal Erasmus exchange agreements): Networks were to be something in between, a collection of academic departments or subject areas: The Networks collectively would be a tool for the 'collective mobilisation and reflection on the future of Higher Education' (Ruffio, 1998). CiCe was to be concerned with teaching and learning, rather than research (which was something other people did, in DG XXII's

eyes – or at least, something a different DG was responsible for), though this division was substantially modified in later years.

Reviewing the first year

So the discussion at the London conference was focussed on trying to devise what CiCe called ‘Network projects and activities’ and ‘Group projects’¹. The Network projects were intended to be activities that all members were expected to participate in, while Group activities were projects that a sub-set of the Network would engage in, supported by CiCe or seeking external finance. In this plan, Network Activities were largely structured around assembling banks of data for members to draw on: there was to be a collection of undergraduate and postgraduate modules from different institutions, that were described in a common format, that others could modify and adapt; a database on the various national curricula for pre-schools and schools that covered aspects of citizenship; and – most ambitiously – there would be a database of young people’s accounts of their identity, where individual members of the Network were expected to use an appropriate schedule and interview three children/young people a year, and add an account of each to the system. There were also to be databases of books and periodicals, and of teaching materials. The objective was to create a sense of identity for the Network itself through joint endeavour and construction, and to make a useful pool of resources that member institutions could draw on.

The Group projects, on the other hand, were to be smaller activities, where just a few members would collaborate. The Network suggested two categories, teaching projects (to share materials and courses), and other project activities in support of teaching (requiring initial analysis and exploration) – both of these carefully emphasising teaching, rather than research, from some nervousness of the Commission’s watchful eye. But there were also, even at this early stage, many members who envisaged group projects that would use the Network as a structure to meet and assemble groups who would apply for external funding; they would become independent of the Network for the activity, but retain the links with the larger CiCe network for dissemination, development – and as a source of further partners in subsequent ventures. Thus a group had already emerged that was trying to bid for a programme of student-teacher exchanges with Canada, and another to bid to investigate young people’s European-ness. It was reported that an Hungarian - UK three-year project on competition and enterprise in young people had already received support from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the British Council.

In addition to the three Age-Related groups, the Steering Group also proposed to establish two new working parties, one on the curriculum, and the other on data management – all of these five groups being designed to support the Network projects. Data sharing and the use of electronic resources was for many members a rather new and challenging area. CiCe had already been able to secure the free use of a sophisticated data-sharing and data management system called Livelink, through the good offices of the University of North London. This enabled members to store and share a wide variety of documents on-line, and was to be the repository of the various Network project

¹ CiCe (2009) Notes of the Members’ Meeting held on Saturday 15 May 1999

databases. Several hands-on training sessions were set up during the conference, with Jan Maceneany, the CiCe Web Manager at the time. In the longer run, the system proved to be just a little too sophisticated for all members to regularly use the system, and it was gradually run down from 2002 – but at this stage in CiCe’s development, it was particularly useful to be able to say that the Network were using it, and the fact that CiCe had it received much favourable attention from the DG XXII team. The Erasmus team at the Commission in Brussels were also trying out the new media and communications system at this time. An elaborate ‘kiosk’, intended to bring together the Thematic Networks, was developed in 2008-9 at some considerable cost. This was to be a universal portal to all the various network’s activities and membership – there were about twenty networks at this time. The Network coordinators were somewhat confused, not really wishing to have a great deal of knowledge in what other networks were doing in their academic activities – there was little real synergy or interest between chemistry, history, architecture and water resources, for example. But we were all summoned to a four-day meeting in Dublin to have the new portal unveiled and explained in the summer of 1999. Unfortunately, the Commission had not ensured that the University’s firewalls were disabled, so no one was able to log on to the new system. Fortunately, the cultural programme was not affected, and there were extensive studies made of down-town Dublin pubs and eating houses: the electronic portal never resurfaced.

As has previously been described, in this early stage in the development of Networks, the Commission was requiring each Network, approved in principle for a three year period of funding, to make annual reports and an annual proposal for each of the three years. These had to be submitted in early March each year, for the year starting the following September. Thus CiCe’s claim for support for the year 1999-2000 was made before the first conference, and the accompanying report for 1998-1999 could only report on two meetings of the Steering Group and one of each of the three age-related groups. The scrutiny process of the Commission was long and detailed, and, as in the previous year, approval was not given for year two’s programme until early November 1999. This was really problematic, because without a firmly agreed income, it was difficult to maintain administrative staff contracts.

The report on CiCe’s first full year, made in October 1999, highlighted some of the problems encountered in establishing the Thematic Network Project (TNP)²:

1. Many members hadn’t fully understood the nature and scope of the TNP;
2. The Steering Group had been decimated through illness – one had to retire, another broke a leg, three more had significant medical problems – and Cass Mitchell-Riddle was hospitalised for a lengthy period;
3. The contractual delays caused by the Commission’s processes made it difficult to secure employed staff on reasonable contracts;
4. Like all the TNPs, CiCe had a number of sleeping partners (in the report, this was described as ‘varying degrees of wakefulness’!);
5. There were cultural misunderstandings between different higher educational traditions;
6. There were also incompatibilities in these that frustrated joint teaching programmes;

² CiCe (1999): *Final Report Form: Transnational Cooperation Projects: CiCe Final Report for 1998-99*. London: University of North London. Part 2, p 15

7. CiCe had not been able to attract the planned external co-financing; and
8. The limitation of funding to three years made creating a permanent independent Network very difficult.

To address some of these issues several strategies were adopted. The creation of two new working groups opened up opportunities to counter the 'sleeping partners' to recruit another dozen members – efforts were made to bring in institutions not so far represented in our groups. The second response was to create banks of data that it was intended would be a resource for members, stressing the usefulness of the Network to members.

We were probably over-ambitious in the drive to create these directories of data. There was a fat booklet of individual members and their interests and contact details (on-line searchable databases were not an easy option at this time). This even went so far as to listing if a member could receive any attachments to their e-mail, which seems strange to record now. There were other data sets: of interviews with young people about their views of their identity; of courses in citizenship education; of teaching ideas; of potentially useful books and publications; and descriptions of various national policies and curriculum provision in schools. Livelink was used as the key mechanism both to upload all this data and to store the information, and members were able to save and retrieve the data directly (in theory – not everyone had access to sufficiently powerful computers at this time).

Getting under steam: year two, 1999-2000

The second year's programme (1999-2000) was finally approved, and a new working group started operation. The chair of Curriculum Group – Anne-Marie van den Dries was co-opted on to the Steering Group, to maintain the principle established with the Age-Related groups. The Data Group did not start till the end of the second year (below), because we had some difficulty in attracting volunteers. On the Steering Group, Tilman Allert was recruited in October 1999 to replace Egbert Daum, who had to drop out because of ill health.

All these groups became considerably more active in the second year, with not just more frequent meetings, but developing their own programmes of making policy proposals and suggestions, collecting and disseminating information, and linking directly with individual members. National coordinators also became more active, some arranging meetings at national level, others contacting and bringing in new institutions.

The first conference proceedings were published in book form in early 2000: *Young Citizens in Europe* was our first 'big and 'real' publication, 344 pages long, and with translations of the editorial and all abstracts into French and German. Editing the annual proceedings was, and remains, a substantial administrative task that generally lasts several months after the conference itself. The design of these proceedings was fixed for the next thirteen years, with subtle colour variations distinguishing each volume (although after 2005 we moved to CD format for the articles, only the abstracts and index remaining in print form).

New projects were also bid for, both from CiCe itself and from groups of CiCe members. CiCe applied for a EuroConference and a Research Training Network (both part of the Fifth Framework research competition); for Connect funding to link together with other European Commission projects on citizenship and to build up national networks that might link in to the CiCe grouping. These did not succeed, but were important in establishing cooperative links between members, testing out planning applications, and finding our way around the various European Commission institutions.

Some small collaborative ventures did materialise. A proposal to develop teacher education links between EU universities and Canadian Universities narrowly failed on its first application, but was successful the following year, and three years of successful exchanges followed (2000-2004). The links that were made in that programme were instrumental in the development of the citizED project, an inter-continental programme of teacher educators that continues to hold biennial conferences, and which launched the journal – under the guidance and editorship of Ian Davies from the University of York - that became *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, the journal of the CiCe Association. Another successful early joint venture was the bilateral programme to examine teachers' views of competition and creation in Hungary and the UK, supported by the Academy of Sciences in Hungary and the British Council in the UK. This in turn led to a larger project that also involved Slovenia.

The Steering group also decided early in the second year to try to launch a book series, and a proposal for what was originally to be a ten-volume series, based on a mixture of chapters based on the best papers presented at the conference and specially commissioned pieces by members was drawn up. This was taken around several major academic publishing houses and discussed with them: by the beginning of year three an agreement was reached with Trentham Press to publish an eight-volume series, *European Issues in Children's Identity and Citizenship*. Elizabeth Näsman and Alistair Ross were deputed to edit the first volume, an eleven chapter book that came out in 2002 (*Children's Understanding in the new Europe*). Contributions from the Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland and the United Kingdom ensured that it – and subsequent volumes – had a pan-European approach. The original intention was to have published ten books by the end of 2003: in the end, we produced an eight volume series by 2008.

Meanwhile we were building up the administrative base at the University of North London. Cass Mitchell-Riddle, who had been brought in as the Networks' Administrator from the early stages of the initial bid, built up an impressive array of communications systems and devices to meet all our needs, and to keep up with the Commission's requirements. There were in the first two years a number of administrative assistants who worked alongside Cass, but it was hard to maintain continuity for people on temporary contracts. Gradually, administrative backup – particularly critical at certain moments in the year, such as the annual conference, the dates around annual reports and bidding deadlines – was drawn from the Institute of Policy Studies in Education unit at North London. This Institute had a number of full-time professional administrators with skills in managing research project activities, and were thus both well-placed and very competent in providing efficient and skilled support to Cass at key moments.

The second conference was planned for Athens in May 2000. The administrative team, led by the redoubtable Cass Mitchell-Riddle, had to plan this conference as the first that would be away from the home base in London. Although the Steering Group had been to Athens for a meeting (in 1999), we did all the planning for this conference at a distance, with no preliminary meeting. Although the conference itself was a great success (below), the administrative issues that had to be sorted out in the two days were legion, and the conference's success was due to a great deal of luck as elements at the conference site at the University of Athens such as rooms, equipment, technical support and even the conference dinner were negotiated, and the transport links between our hotels in the Plaka area and the conference venue were tested and explained to arriving delegates. In future conferences there was always an advance party, sent some months in advance, that sorted out all the conference details on site.

Athens was a success. There were a hundred delegates, forty-seven papers, and the beginning of a tradition for conferences was established. The pattern developed of group meetings in the two days before the conference proper started, which allowed for a great deal of inter-group exchange and liaison. The Conference dinner became a fixture, but so did a tradition of large groups of delegates meeting in the evening and setting off in search of a restaurant that could accommodate them all – central Athens in May being an ideal location to start such a convention.

Forward Planning: to CiCe 2 and beyond...

By the beginning of the third year, in September 2000, the Network was not only more self-assured, but also more confident in its dealings with the European Commission and the Department for Education and Culture. The way in which the Education and Culture Department managed the Thematic Networks has already been mentioned in this account. Maria-Esmeralda Almeida Teixeira was the Principal Administrator at the European Commission responsible for the Thematic Networks from the time of the first call for Network proposals in 1966. She had taken this over at a point after the Erasmus programme, of which the Networks were part, had been devised – by another key administrator, Ettore Deodato. The relationship between most of the Network Coordinators and Almeida Teixeira was rather formal, if not strained: she appeared (to us) to have a rather mechanistic view of the role and functioning of the Networks, for example in the insistence that we should not be interested or involved in any form of research, or in the promotion of the on-line Networks 'kiosk' or portal referred to above. A review of Thematic Networks by a Norwegian group at this time was critical of the overall vision:

While the TNP action has created useful fora for academics to ventilate their ideas, there have been no prospects of efficiently implementing these, not even procedures for assessing their suitability. From the start, the TNP has been open to any project idea, but at the same time the action has become increasingly partitioned along the lines of traditional disciplines, thereby hardly stimulating innovation where Europe needs it most. Instead, the action could have been more focused towards questions like "Where does Europe stand with respect to interdisciplinary studies?" Sharpening the focus could have contributed both

towards perceiving the objectives of the action and achieving usable results.
(Birkeland, I. and de Smedt, K. 2002)

In the first few years under Maria-Esmeralda Almeida Teixeira the Networks had an uncertain future. Funded for a three-year term (but having to report and re-apply each of these years), we were initially told that after this support we would have to be self-supporting if we wished to continue: the Commission would move on to give new Networks start-up funding. This policy changed soon after CiCe began (in 1998-9: our first year, the Network policy's second year). It was announced that it would be possible to apply for a fourth year's funding, in the final year of a three-year term, for a dissemination project. It would also be technically possible to apply for a further three years – but strictly for an entirely new programme of activities and outcomes. Networks must complete the activities and outcomes they had set out in their initial applications by the end of the third year, or they would not be able to re-apply. And they certainly could not reapply to keep on carrying out the same activities as before!

This meant that the CiCe Steering Group was, by the end of year two (the summer of 2000), actively planning a Dissemination year to run from September 2001, and seriously considering how to frame a 'CiCe 2' programme that would run three years from September 2002 to August 2005. We had now fully grasped the timetabling logic of applications for the Network programme: essentially, any serious discussions with members had to be held at the May conference 16 months before the new phase was to start, so that Steering Group discussions of the programme to put to the members had to be held at the October and January meetings before this (23 months and 20 months before). Then the detailed application and documentation collection could be carried out in the September to December period (12 to 9 months), so that the application could be submitted in early March of the year of the start date. This, of course, made the notion of a 'Dissemination Year' nonsensical – before the application was submitted, one would have to be well into the process of preparing any application for a *subsequent* programme.

Which was where the Steering Group found itself in the summer of 2000, with the Athens conference just behind us. We were about to enter our third and 'final' year; we had to submit a Dissemination year bid in six months time, and were planning ahead to a full three years programme to start after this.

In late May 2000, just after Athens, the Steering Group unveiled initial plans for both the Dissemination year and CiCe2. 2001-02 was to take the findings of the first three years work into a 'concise publication' to be distributed through regional and national conferences, culminating in a European conference in May 2002, in a programme involving as many as possible CiCe members, who would stay together – and expand – in the Network. The CiCe 2 programme was to expand the network to all EU countries, including the candidate states that would join during this phase (we still had no Latvian, Lithuanian or Slovakian members), and to take on a six point plan of new activities – forming an independent European Association; developing a European MA in Citizenship Education; creating a database of materials and readings; developing readers for students; preparing a book on pedagogy in higher education; and continuing to hold annual conferences. We also suggested we might develop parallel networks in the

Commenius (schools) and Grundtvig (adult education) network programmes under the Commission's Erasmus umbrella³. This programme, however, was to be modified and changed as the third year developed.

The third year: They flew to Bruges

The Data Group took time to establish, and its first meeting was not held until July 2000. Sarantis Chelmis (GR), Merryn Hutchings (UK), Soren Hegstrup (DK) elected Riitta Korhonen (FI as their chair), and set about a review of Livelink and ways to encourage members to make more use of it. Riitta also joined the Steering Group as chair of the Data Group.

There were, over the first three years, other changes to the Steering Group – which was essentially a part nominated group, part self-selected. Margarita Limon stepped down in June 2000, after two years service, and Yveline Fumat retired in August 2001. In January 2000, as part of a drive to include members from the candidate countries, Akos Gocsal was added to the team, followed in July of that year by Marta Fulöp⁴.

A new version of the catalogue of members was produced at the beginning of the year – the last version in print, as an electronic database was already under construction.

Our third annual conference was planned for Bruges, in Belgium. Under Cass Mitchell-Riddle's organising eye, we had begun to develop a more sophisticated conference planning programme. Cass and the coordinator (the present author) went to KATHO, the host organisation, in the early autumn to reconnoitre hotels and conference sites. Bruges was a conference noted for the high degree of involvement of the local civic and academic authorities: we opened the conference in the Provincial Hall in the centre of the town, with an address from Leo Tindemans, a former Prime Minister and leading European statesman, had an address from professor Jan Kerkhofs, on the European Values Survey, and then a reception with the Provincial Governor. On another day, we were given a reception by the Mayor of Torhout, the town outside Bruges where KATHO is located. Attendance rose to 85 delegates, with 49 papers presented. Also memorable, to all the group members, was the magnificent pre-conference catering organised as a final examination performance by the local catering college students.

Over the final year there were about 60 member institutions directly involved in activities. The various working groups finalised their reports, that were to be incorporated into the dissemination report, and preparations for the year of dissemination were finalised.

At the end of this third year, we were able to report to the Commission

We have now firmly established a large Network from a very rudimentary organisational base. THE Steering Group has mapped out a programme for

³ CiCe Newsletter 18, May 2002, pp 7-8

⁴ Details from CiCe (2001) *Preparing Professionals in Education for Issues of Citizenship and Identity in Europe*, London [The Dissemination Year Report]

generating an open dialogue, and we feel that the Network has developed a generally agreed broad consensus as a multidisciplinary group of Higher Education practitioners, and is well able to examine areas of common interest from a wide range of viewpoints. (CiCe 2001, p 22)

The same Final Report was able to say that each of the original six objectives had been completed, with very few minor modifications.

Following the completion of the first three-year phase of the TNP project, our Steering Group has drawn up a set of findings and recommendations that are to be the basis of our Dissemination Report. (CiCe 2001, p 23)

A year of Dissemination, a year of preparation

At the beginning of the year, new member institutions joined the Network, from Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia. For the first time, we had in membership representatives from all the member states, all the candidate states with dates to join in the coming years, and the EEC states of Norway and Iceland. We were still lacking Liechtenstein and Turkey.

The centrepiece of the Dissemination year was to be the preparation and dissemination of the prospective review *Preparing Professionals in Education for Issues of Citizenship and Identity in Europe*. This had the more explanatory (and longer subtitle) *Planning university and college provision for educating professionals who will develop citizenship education across Europe: findings, recommendations and invitation to participate*. As has been explained, this had been completely prepared in the 2000-2001 year, so went to press the week the Dissemination year began in October 2001. A substantial 80 page booklet, it was the distillation of work by all 48 members of the Networks groups and national coordinators. It included sections on

- the changing role of citizenship education, particularly in the European context and the role of higher education;
- the nature of the education courses required for those who were to work with children and young people, divided into three age-related sections (pre-school, primary school, secondary school);
- the nature of citizenship within Europe;
- network communication issues;
- a catalogue of countries, describing citizenship in the national curriculum, higher education for those professionals who were to work with children and young people, and changes in these (and details of National Coordinator's contacts);
- the CiCe network's committee membership and organisation; and
- conclusions and recommendation.

This last section, though brief, had three targets. To the Commission, it suggested that a Network would continue to be needed; that an MA should be developed; that good practice needed documentation and used to prepare guidelines. Universities and colleges were directed to review their course provision (and to join the Network!). At each national level, we suggested coordination on the impact of education on social inclusion, diversity and citizenship.

This document was in English: it was reproduced in a much condensed form in all the European Union languages and these were disseminated within each country. Many national organisers developed national conferences and programmes to support these publications.

The book series developed, albeit at a slower pace than had been originally envisaged in the first flush of enthusiasm. In the dissemination year, the first two books were published: *Children's Understanding in the new Europe* (above), and *Young People's Understanding of economic issues in Europe* (edited by Merryn Hutchings, Márta Fülöp and Anne-Marie Van den dries). This second volume was to be the first in a trilogy within the series, to be followed by political education (this was compiled during the Dissemination year) and on social education (in the planning stage).

Much of the year was spent on preparing the application and programme for CiCe2, our second three-year phase. This will be covered in chapter three of this series: at this stage, we decided to separate out the plan to create a joint MA programme from the main CiCe Network programme, making a separate application under the Erasmus Curriculum Development scheme to support this. The New Network would have at its core the production of some 23 specialist short reports – 16 on thematic subjects, three on guidelines for the professional training needs of those who would work with young people of different ages (picking up from the Age Related Groups), and four focussing on guidelines for the quality and delivery of higher education courses (at undergraduate, postgraduate, research and professional levels). This last set was a response to the development of the Bologna process, of harmonising higher education provision across Europe. An agreement had been reached that all European Universities would move to a standard programme of three year undergraduate, two year masters and three year research degrees, and that there would be transparent commonalities across all revision. The Thematic Networks were enlisted to help support what was known as the 'Tuning Process' (getting all country systems into harmony?), and we were determined to play our part in this.

Setting up so many working groups was also a strategy to increase participation by members. Each working party – which generally only met over the course of twelve months - had three or four members, and the principle was established of selecting the group to represent different interests – different regions of Europe, different disciplines, different approaches – and, wherever possible, to bring in new people for each group. The working group programme alone thus created opportunities for 76 different individuals: the MA programme offered more. It this became possible to include a greater proportion of the membership in active roles, funded to attend meetings and the conferences while the group was working, and the MA programme offered opportunities for more people.

But dissemination was the principal activity of the year. As well as our main conference in Budapest (below), seven other national/regional conferences were held in Belgium, Finland, France, Hungary, Sweden, Poland and the UK. About 250 people attended these, mostly from the country in question. The Hungarian conference, held in Pecs, also produced a book of proceedings. The major report was made widely available, and

summaries were prepared in a number of languages and distributed locally: in Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Icelandic, Italian, Norwegian, Polish and Swedish.

During this 2001-2002 year the senior management of the unit in the Department of Education and Culture in the Commission responsible for the Networks changed, and Ettore Deodato returned to take charge. Perhaps because of his earlier commitment to the concept of the Networks, he provided a marked contrast to his predecessor. He attended meetings of the networks, he brought together small groups of coordinators to work on joint programmes or to advise him, and he was active in debate and encouragement for Networking activities. He appeared particularly interested in the CiCe network, although other coordinators claimed he was equally interested in their activities. While under Almeida Tiexeira most of the planning decisions and advice came from the Technical Assistance Office (TAO) attached to the Department – who had a limited and subordinate role, particularly when compared to the Executive Agency that replaced TAO in 2006 – when Deodato took over, he was clearly more active in directing and managing TAO to meet the policy ends of promoting and supporting the Networks. Deodato, for example, clearly read the proposals of the successful Networks, and much of their final reports: he was not only able to discuss these in detail with the respective coordinators and their steering groups, but also made it his business to ensure that the TAO and the Commission was supportive and flexible.

Ettore Deotao from the Commission came to speak at our fourth conference, which was held in May 2002 in Budapest: our first conference to be held in a candidate country. Ettore was able to tell us that our proposals for CiCe 2 – the three year programme to 2005 – had been approved. The conference was a success for other reasons as well: attendance rose to 88, and there were 40 papers. The conference concluded with a dinner on a boat that took us up and down the Danube as night fell.

The new CiCe that was to emerge after this conference, and to launch itself into phase two, was stronger, more vibrant and more cohesive than before. Over the four years members had not only come to know each other well, but had established good working relationships, and a routine had been arrived at: an annual cycle of events, culminating in the conference in the early summer, but more importantly a sense of common endeavour and respect, constantly evolving as projects developed and took off. The new programme now offered a parallel MA development programme as well as the 'traditional' CiCe set of activities, and these activities had been greatly extended by the development of the new working groups.

References

- Birkeland, I. and de Smedt, K. (2002) *Thematic Networks in Higher Education: A Norwegian Perspective* <http://folk.uib.no/hfosm/papers/tnpass2002.html>
- CiCe (2001) *Final Report Form: CiCe: Erasmus Thematic Networks (1998-2001)* London
- Ruffio, P., J. Butler and B. van Dam (1998) *The SOCRATES Thematic Networks: A tool for collective mobilisation and reflection on the future of Higher Education*. Brussels: Report to the European Commission