A) Network Membership Eligibility Requirements

There are no set eligibility requirements for membership. Membership requests can be addressed to the network’s Secretary or handled directly through the CES website and includes a subscription to the network’s jiscmail. A membership list is jointly kept by the Secretary (see board membership roles below) and the CES. However, the board reserves the right to deny or cancel membership to prospective or existing members on the basis of offensive or discriminatory behavior. Any expulsion decision may then be appealed to the Executive Committee of the CES.

B) Board Membership

1. There should be two Co-Chairs, one Secretary, one Communications Officer, one Senior Network Advisor, and four ordinary board members, for a total of nine individuals who hold formal positions of authority in the governance of the network. All these persons are expected to contribute to the activities of the network (see below) in various ways. Although not required, every effort should be made to ensure that at least two members of this group are from the U.S. and at least two members are from Europe (for more on the mix of board membership see point 4).

2. Co-Chairs will be selected by the board to serve staggered two-year terms. Whenever possible, the Co-Chairs are to be selected from among the existing members of the board and by common consensus of the entire board. The Co-Chairs may serve up to two consecutive, two-year terms. New Co-Chairs should be nominated six months before a departing Co-Chair’s end of term and will start their own term at the next annual CES conference. When nominating Co-Chairs, the board should ensure some continuity and change in leadership, for example by not inaugurating two new Co-Chairs at the same time.

3. All other members of the board also serve two-year terms, renewable once. When a new member is selected, membership of the board begins at the next annual CES conference. This is to ensure that the board can guarantee a degree of continuity as well as the smooth running of the network up to and through the conclusion of activities pertaining to CES conferences. When discussing potential candidates for office, the board must ensure that all vital network functions and board roles can be fulfilled. The names of all board members and their terms of office will be noted and published on the network’s CES website.

4. Six months prior to the end of each board member’s term of office, the Board will invite new members to replace the outgoing ones. New officers and board members should be invited to join on the basis of their research profiles and potential to contribute to the activities of the network. The board should include members of different ranks, genders, and nationalities. The should ensure that both European and transatlantic scholarship as well as various relevant thematic specialties and disciplines are represented within the network. The composition of the network and its board aims to be interdisciplinary.
C) Roles and Duties of Board Members

1. The Co-Chairs are responsible for ensuring that all vital network functions – meetings, conference preparation and panel selection, PhD workshop, paper prize initiative, member liaison, board renewal, liaison with other networks, representation to research community – are carried out. It is their responsibility to organize and chair board meetings to discuss the allocation of such tasks with board members, who are expected to partake voluntarily in various network activities. The Co-Chairs also represent the board vis-à-vis the CES administration and executive, and will write an annual report for the CES, with the input and feedback from the rest of the board.

2. The Secretary is the first contact for membership requests and keeps an updated list of members in an excel file. S/he also oversees the jiscmail listserv of the network and communicates key network news to members and the CES administration. The Secretary reports any issues raised by members to the board and, hence, fulfils a liaison function with members in that respect. S/he is also responsible for writing the minutes of board meetings, in rotation with the Communications Officer, but can share this task with other participants if unable to attend a meeting.

3. The Communications Officer is in charge, jointly with the Secretary, of communicating key network news to members. In this context, s/he is especially engaged in the initiation and maintenance of an up-to-date social media presence for the network. Additionally, the Communications Officer is responsible for the organization and promotion of the annual PhD paper prize (see below). S/he is also responsible for writing the minutes of board meetings, in rotation with the Secretary, but can share this task with other participants if unable to attend a meeting.

4. The Senior Network Advisor with significant past experience of other academic networks and board memberships should assist the Co-Chairs in their work, strengthening their representational functions and decision-making. Advice may be needed, for example, about how to best create links to other networks, draw in different people, gain the support of well-known scholars for semi-plenaries, ensure good continuity and change in the board, liaise with journals for the paper prize, organize successful PhD workshops, and gain funding for events.

5. Ordinary board members are expected to contribute to any of the here mentioned activities of the network – PhD workshops, paper prize, program committee, liaison with other networks, organization of semi-plenaries and other events, etc. – depending on their interests. Board members are normally expected to attend the annual conferences and board meetings.

D) Board Meetings

1. The board should meet quarterly, and more often if required. These meetings usually take the form of skype teleconferences, which relevant board members will attend, depending on the activity being planned and discussed, to ensure the smooth functioning of the network. The board also holds an annual general meeting (AGM) on the last evening after the annual CES conference, which all board members must attend.

2. All issues decided in skype meetings will be circulated to the board for comments, and these comments will then be considered by the members of the board responsible for the activity.

3. An agenda will be circulated by email and posted in the shared Dropbox folder in advance of any meeting. Action points should, to the extent it proves possible, be addressed. It is the responsibility of the Co-Chairs to set this agenda and run these meetings.
4. The board should have a standing invitation for suggestions from the membership on the Research Portal (or future website). Suggestions will be listed as items for discussion on the agenda.

5. Normally, decision-making in the board is consensual and follows open discussion of views. If consensus cannot be reached, a two-third majority after deliberation is sufficient for a decision.

6. Board meeting minutes will be posted in the shared Dropbox folder. In case of important decisions, such as the selection or nomination of new members, the minutes must be approved explicitly by all board members. A reasonable deadline for approval (normally two weeks) should be given to ensure both time to reflect and swift progress with network activities. If a board member is unable to participate or complete an assigned task, this task can be delegated to another participant.

E) PhD Workshop

1. A PhD workshop should regularly be organized (at least bi-annually) under the auspices of the network. Responsibility for the workshop will rotate among all members of the board and should preferably involve at least two board members who will be identified for this task at each annual conference for the following year’s workshop. If available, board members should further be involved as faculty in such workshops. The workshop should preferably take place at the annual CES conference venue, preceding the conference. Organization work usually starts about a year before the next CES conference.

2. The CES should be asked to promote the call for papers in the CES newsletter and on its web site. In the past, the Executive Committee has also granted financial support to the workshop, and should be applied to for funds in the future as well.

3. The participants of the workshop should be encouraged to submit their papers for consideration to the network’s annual paper prize initiative.

F) Program Committee

1. An Annual Program Committee will be established to assess the quality and suitability of panels and individual paper submissions for the CES annual conference, the International Conference for Europeans. This committee will include two to three board members. Membership of the Annual Program Committee will rotate. The preliminary outcome of this selection process should be circulated to other board members for comments, and these comments should be taken into account by the Annual Program Committee in finalizing the selection.

2. The criteria to be used for assessing the panel proposals are:
   
   a) relevance to the remit of the network
   b) relevance to the conference theme
   c) coherence and quality of panels (including sufficient number of papers per panel)
   d) good senior-junior balance
   e) mix of nationalities/continents and affiliations
   f) range of topics and approaches among panels and abstracts
While proposals should be attractive from the vantage point of all six criteria, the criteria for evaluation should be considered in this order (from a to f). Criterion “a” is not merely preferential, but a necessary condition for all proposals. Proposals that do not fall within the remit of the network should be recommended for submission to another relevant network or without association to a thematic network.

G) PhD Paper Prize Initiative

1. An annual PhD Paper Prize Initiative is organized in collaboration with the journal, Comparative European Politics (CEP). This lies within the responsibility of a designated paper prize delegate, to be nominated from within the board. This post is usually assigned to the Communications Officer, when other network-related activities permit.

2. All PhD students and those who have recently defended their doctoral thesis (in the twelve preceding months) may submit papers for consideration to the annual PhD Paper Prize Initiative. Discretion is left to the board as to eligibility of the papers submitted by other early career scholars.

3. To be eligible for the PhD Paper Prize, all submissions must address the network’s core areas of interest and must be suitable for publication in the journal Comparative European Politics.

4. A jury will be established to assess the papers. This jury will include two members from the board and two from CEP (whether on the network board or not). Ideally, each jury member should read every paper and then review and rank their first three choices. If too many eligible papers are submitted, the jury should decide on another procedure by consensus, together with the network’s Co-Chairs.

5. A call for papers will be circulated in autumn every year. Papers should be received by December to be eligible for the prize to be awarded in the same academic year. The winner and runners-up will be announced in spring of that academic year and officially celebrated at the annual general meeting (AGM) at the CES conference.

6. Swift publication in CEP is to be ensured by close liaison with editors. A guaranteed slot for the paper prize winner in each year’s journal schedule should be the objective of both the network and the journal.

H) Aspiration to Regular Exchange

The network also aspires to encourage and support research and teaching ideas amongst the membership between conferences. Suitable media for this sharing of ideas should be explored and established to this effect. The Communications Officer is responsible for the pursuit of this aspiration, time-and capability allowing. Other board members should support this work where they can.

I) Amendments

1. Amendments to the constitution can be suggested by any board member and should be discussed in the board subsequently.
2. Amendments must be approved by all board members in consensus if possible, if necessary a two-thirds majority will suffice. If appropriate, members should be consulted on these amendments to enable bottom-up involvement, but urgent and administrative decisions can also be taken by the board.

3. The core of the network’s remit – European Integration and the Global Political Economy – is to be maintained. Other amendments to and updates of the remit can be decided upon by the board in consensus, or by two-thirds majority vote. The board may also involve the membership for consultation with regard to any changes of the remit.

**J) Remit**

The CES Network on European Integration and Global Political Economy came into operation in 2011. It partly replaces the former Globalization Network.

1. The remit of the network should be reviewed on a five-year basis, and if necessary revised. While the key interest in European Integration within the context of Global Political Economy and/or European Integration and the Global Political Economy is to be maintained as a constitutional core, the specific foci of the network within this broad realm may be considered for revision in light of current political, socio-economic or research developments. For example, the 2011 focus on “post-crisis and the Lisbon Treaty” might have to be revised when a new Treaty comes into effect.

2. Any revision should be discussed at the relevant AGM (2016, 2021, 2026, and so on). At the AGM immediately preceding the remit review AGM, an invitation to discuss the remit should be made (2015, 2020, 2025, and so on). This invitation should also be published via jiscmail to reach members who cannot attend the conference. Proposals for revision can be made by members of the board. Members of the network can also submit proposals for updates and revisions to the board at least two months ahead of the AGM for revising the remit, to allow the board enough time to decide on such proposals and amend the remit accordingly where such proposals are endorsed.

3. In order to stimulate exchange with the wider membership, the Co-Chairs and the board might organize special events during the conference year in which the review of the remit is due. This could include, for example, semi-plenaries or roundtables with a variety of scholars and perspectives from within the network who would discuss stakes, achievements, current developments and future directions with regard to “European Integration and the Global Political Economy.”

4. It is the collective responsibility of the Co-Chairs to synthesize and/or field proposals for revisions and to prepare a draft revised version of the remit for member consultation and board approval. A new remit must be approved by all board members and endorsed by the CES to take effect.

5. The current network remit can be found in the appendix.
Appendix

Remit of the CES Network on European Integration and the Global Political Economy as of 2011:

“The mission of this network is to illuminate contemporary developments in European integration as related to the global political economy. Hence, the network will for the foreseeable future focus on the period since the passage of the Lisbon Treaty and the onset of the economic crisis, which has been characterized by intensified pressures from globalization.

The challenges posed by the global economic crisis of 2008 have not least become apparent in the Economic and Monetary Union, the frailties of which have been revealed by the sovereign debt crisis in particular. The post-crisis era needs to address these (among other) weaknesses to ensure that European integration can be pursued, and it has to do so within the confines of the Lisbon Treaty, which essentially adopted provisions that were part of the Constitutional Treaty, but without popular legitimacy. This has added to the problems of economic reform those related to governance legitimacy, as evidenced by popular dissatisfaction with pro-European elites’ decisions to provide financial support to weak economies, and as reflected in recent elections across the European Union.

At the same time, the EU has formulated a new political strategy coined the EU2020 strategy – that replaces the Lisbon strategy launched in 2000 – which impacts policy reform across the EU, aiming to maintain its competitiveness in an increasingly challenging global order. This, combined with the Europe-wide pledge of budgetary austerity in response to the euro-crisis, ensures significant change across policy sectors in coming years.

The network thus aims to analyze what “post-crisis” European integration comprises in a wide range of key policy areas related to the EU2020 strategy as well as to European economic reform more generally. It will thus investigate both the form and the content of policy-making in areas such as economic policy and competitiveness, financial regulation, internal market, employment and labor market policy, research and development policy, climate change and energy policy, education policy and social policy, including health care and pensions.

The network has a dual focus. It will in particular analyze the extent to which the EU impacts (directly or indirectly) on-going reform dynamics in a post-crisis context (supporting them or conversely, pushing in the opposite direction), focusing on the ideational and strategic influence of the EU on key actors, and how they impact countries with differing institutional legacies and contexts. It also focuses on governance and decision-making through the Lisbon Treaty in the above areas, and how these relate to issues of popular legitimacy in the EU. In this regard, the network also explores the inherent contradictions and changing power relations of European integration.”