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Introduction

Overview

The International Conference of Europeanists is an annual event that brings together academics, policy professionals, students, and others with a research interest in the culture, history, society, and political economy of Europe. Multi-disciplinary and multi-national, the conference occurs in a different city each year and is intended to foster an exchange of information and ideas, as well as the continuing development of an international network of European Studies scholars and policy professionals.

A three-day event, the International Conference of Europeanists now regularly attracts 800-1000 attendees. In even-numbered years, the conference takes place in North America and, in odd-numbered years, it takes place in Europe. However, regardless of the location, the International Conference of Europeanists is an event rooted in collaboration and partnership. Every conference is organized in collaboration with local institutions, researchers, and policy professionals. The Council’s staff and governing Executive Committee work with members of the local intellectual community to ensure that the conference is both a site for international networking and an opportunity to showcase the work and achievements of local sponsors in the host city.

The chief organs of this collaborative work are the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) and Conference Program Committee, which work on behalf of the Council for European Studies (CES) to raise funds, establish partnerships, recruit volunteers, assemble the conference program, and organize special events. Working together with the staff and leadership of the Council, the members of these two Committees are the backbone of the conference organizing effort and the cause of its continuing popularity and success.

In addition to a foundation in collaboration, the conference is noted for the high quality of intellectual engagement which takes place during the event. Throughout its almost 35-year history, the International Conference of Europeanists has had a singular reputation for rigor and selectivity. This reputation is based on the fact that the conference is a highly competitive one. Between 30% and 45% of all proposals submitted are rejected each year, making the CES conference one of the most competitive gatherings of its kind.
A Brief History of the Conference

The International Conference of Europeanists has been a central feature of the CES program calendar since 1979. The first conference was held in Washington, D.C., March 29 - 31, 1979, and attracted six hundred attendees from both sides of the Atlantic. The theme of the first conference was “Institutional Change or Institutional Decay? Transitional Epochs in Europe,” and a keynote address was delivered by renowned sociologist Charles Tilly (then Director of the Center for Research on Social Organizations at the University of Michigan).

In its long history as the leading interdisciplinary conference for those who study European history, society, and politics, the International Conference of Europeanists has gone through many changes. The most obvious change has been its location. After being held in Washington, D.C. for a number of years, the conference moved in 1992 to Chicago, where it was held from 1992 to 2008.

In 2008, the Executive Committee, the Council’s chief governing body, departed radically from past practice. Hoping to attract more participants from Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, the Executive Committee voted to change the location of the conference from year to year. Specifically, they voted to move the conference back and forth between different host cities in North America and Europe. The purpose of this change was to ensure that would-be attendees could take advantage of lower travel costs by participating in a conference located closer to home.

The result of these salutary changes has been an unprecedented increase in the popularity of the CES conference. The first conference held under the new model occurred in Montreal in 2010 and attracted 700 presenters, half from North America and the other half from Europe or elsewhere. In 2011, the conference was held in Barcelona and attracted 750 presenters, 20% of whom were from North America and 80% of whom were from Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. And in 2012, the conference was held in Boston and attracted 800+ conference presenters, with 45% from North America and 55% from Europe, Asia, or elsewhere.
Looking Forward

In general, the trend toward growth and inclusion has been a boon for the conference. It has strengthened international research networks, increased interaction between different communities and generations of researchers, and reduced the average cost of attendance for many participants.

However, the rapid pace of growth has elicited some complaints from long-time attendees who contend that the conference is losing the intimacy and collegiality that was once its hallmark. In response to these complaints, and in an effort to maintain the conference’s highly competitive selection process, the CES Executive Committee voted in 2012 to restrict the size of the conference for the foreseeable future. The Europe conference has been capped at 1000 presenters and the North America conference at 800 presenters. And although the Executive Committee may revisit this issue in future, the presenters cap will definitely be in place for all CES conferences which are currently being planned: namely, the 2014, 2015, and 2016 conferences, which will take place in Washington, D.C., Paris, and Philadelphia, respectively.
Planning

Site & Venue Selection

The primary responsibility for selecting the host city for the International Conference of Europeanists falls to the Chair of the Council’s governing body, the Executive Committee.

Typically, the Chair (in consultation with the Council’s Director and other members of the Executive Committee) identifies the conference city by weighing factors such as size, cost, transportation access, fundraising capacity, and the potential for meaningful partnerships with local universities, research centers, NGOs, and governmental entities. However, to finalize the choice of a host city, the Chair must seek the formal approval of the Executive Committee.

The choice of the host city typically occurs 2-3 years before the conference is scheduled. Moreover, because the Council relies on local institutions to co-sponsor the International Conference of Europeanists, it is essential that the Council partner with prominent members of the local research community to advance its intellectual and fundraising goals. Thus, the selection of the host city may not be fully finalized until a Chair has been recruited to direct the efforts of the Local Organizing Committee. This individual should be a senior faculty member or administrator affiliated with a prominent local research or policy institution, and is recruited to act as the titular head of the Council’s local outreach and organizing effort.

Conference Size & Budgets

The projected size of the conference is typically a matter of policy, and is determined by the Executive Committee 2-3 years before the conference. Projections regarding the anticipated or “ideal” size of the conference are dictated by a mix of factors, including the expected size of the submission pool, the size of available venues, the cost of local goods and services, anticipated revenues, etc. However, once determined, this projected “ideal” conference size forms the basis for subsequent conference budgets and budgetary allocations, including funds allocated in support of committee meetings and travel.

As a practical matter, these financial determinations are largely
based on institutional capacity and historical norms. However, in the event that a conflict arises between a perceived committee need or other expense and an existing budgetary allocations, the Director of the Council is tasked with determining whether existing budgets should be revised or enforced. If further conflicts arise, the matter may be appealed to the Executive Committee, which may directly approve or reject proposed expenditures by vote of a simple majority.

**Recruiting Committee Chairs**

As required in the Council’s By-Laws, the responsibility for recruiting Chairpersons for the Local Organizing and Conference Program Committees falls to the Chair of the Executive Committee. He or she is responsible for recruiting (or causing to be recruited) the following:

**A Local Organizing Committee Chair**
- WHO: One (1) senior faculty member or administrator in the conference’s host city.
- WHEN: During site selection (approx. 3-4 years in advance)

**Two Conference Program Committee Co-Chairs**
- WHO: Two (2) faculty members or senior administrators with strong research backgrounds in European Studies.
- WHEN: November 1, two years before the conference

Neither the specific process for recruiting committee chairs nor the ultimate choice of whom to recruit is subject to direct approval by the Executive Committee. However, it is customary to solicit feedback from the Director and that member of the Executive Committee tasked with overseeing the Council’s meetings and conferences. Moreover, in the event that the conference will happen during the term of an incoming Executive Committee Chair, it is also customary to solicit the advice of that incoming Chair. Likewise, to help oversee the continuity and integrity of the process, an EC member is placed on every Program Committee to advise the co-chairs and act as a Council representative.
TIPS

1. Try to ensure that the Local Organizing Committee Chair is comfortable raising money and has a proven track-record as a fundraiser. Fundraising is the most important responsibility of the Local Organizing Committee.

2. The second most important responsibility of the Local Organizing Committee Chair is recruitment. So, be sure to select someone who is well-respected by colleagues and can help recruit committee members, volunteers, and administrators in support of the conference.

3. Try to recruit Program Committee Co-Chairs who complement each and have varied perspectives. In other words, try to choose individuals with different disciplinary backgrounds, at different stages of their careers, and from different types of institutions.

4. When recruiting Conference Program Committee Co-Chairs, remember to mention that they enjoy the privilege of organizing one of the conference-wide plenary sessions. (The other is arranged by the CES Chair.)

Writing “The Call”

The official “Call for Papers” is written by the Co-Chairs of the Conference Program Committee and must be submitted to the Council’s Chair and Director no later than January 2nd of the year preceding the conference. (This deadline ensures that “the Call” will be published in preliminary conference program for the previous year’s conference.) Moreover, this “Call for Papers” must lay out a clear and engaging conference theme, while also conforming to the word limits and formatting guidelines set down by CES. (Note: The theme provides a coherent center for the conference, but is not intended to restrict the Program Committee from accepting excellent proposals on other topics.)

In order to compose a good “Call for Papers” notice, the Program Committee Co-Chairs must first determine the theme of the upcoming conference. This theme should be interesting, cross-disciplinary, and distinctly different from the conference themes chosen for other recent CES conferences. It should also engage with a topic or area of
Parts of “the Call”

Description of conference theme - This is drafted by the Program Committee co-chairs, and may be edited or sampled by CES staff to suit different promotional formats.

Proposal types & deadlines - This is boilerplate supplied by CES staff and occasionally tweaked to conform with changes in conference size and policy. It is largely static from year to year.

Official Issuers of “the Call” - The names of the issuers of the Call appear in a pyramid. The Chair of CES is listed first and the Program co-Chairs are listed on the line beneath. Both names and institutional affiliation (but not rank) are given.

Recent Conference Themes by Year

- **2013**: “Crisis and Contingency: States of (In)stability”
- **2012**: “A Europe of Diversities”
- **2011**: “The Causes, Consequences & Meaning of Transnationalization”
- **2010**: “Revenge of the European Model”
Europe is a zone of tremendous diversity. Migration within and to Europe has generated multicultural societies across the continent. Europe's citizens are ruled through an intricate maze of multi-level governance that ranges from the local level through pan-European and international legal structures and institutions. In the realm of political economy, corporations, industries, and states operate in distinct ways in different settings. While the former Eastern Europe has been reunited with the West, the backgrounds of these two regions have often dictated dissimilar trajectories into the contemporary era. Historians have focused on exploring not only distinct national paths to democratization, but also European countries' connection to former colonies or to minorities within their borders. For the Nineteenth Meeting of Europeanists, we are particularly interested in having participants reflect on and explore the variety of diversities within Europe: political, administrative, legal, geographic, economic, social, cultural, intellectual, and identitarian. How do these differences operate as sources of conflict, of exciting ideas, of growth, or of misunderstanding? To what extent does thinking about Europe's diversities enhance our understanding of Europe as a whole?

For the 2012 conference, the Council for European Studies (CES) welcomes proposals for panels, roundtables, book discussions and individual papers on the study of Europe broadly defined. We encourage proposals in the widest range of disciplines; in particular, we welcome panels that combine disciplines, nationalities, and generations. The Committee will accept only two submissions per person. Members may also participate in a maximum of two sessions.

We strongly encourage participants to submit their proposals as part of an organized panel. Full panel proposals will be given top priority in the selection process by the program committee. Participants may find it useful to connect with like-minded scholars through the growing number of CES networks, links to which can be found here: http://www.ces.columbia.edu/research/research.html

Proposals may be submitted from August 15 to October 1, 2011. Participants will be notified of the Committee's decisions by December 1, 2011. Information on how to submit will be posted on the CES website and disseminated through its newsletter. To subscribe to the CES newsletter visit: http://www.ces.columbia.edu/

John Bowen, Chair
Council for European Studies
Washington University, St. Louis

Jason Beckfield, Co-Chair,
CES Conference Program Committee
Harvard University

Erik Bleich, Co-Chair,
CES Conference Program Committee
Middlebury College
Call for Papers

Twentieth International Conference of Europeanists
Amsterdam, The Netherlands • June 25-27, 2013
Organized by the Council for European Studies (CES)

Crisis and Contingency: States of (In)stability

The current economic crisis of debt, the euro, and unemployment takes place in a framework of highly dynamic creative and destructive processes occurring at various levels: globalization, heightened nationalisms, continued migration, shifting cultures, rising inequality, concerns over security, climate change, sustainable development, etc.

All of these transform definitions of Europe: of its geographical boundaries; of what institutions are needed to structure and resolve issues of policy and democracy; and of how Europe can and might interact with other parts of the world, from North America to revolutionary North Africa to the new powerhouses in Asia and Latin America. The intellectual challenge of grappling with these changes in our world provides the foundations for an exciting meeting, held in one of the founding capitals of a global Europe.

The Council for European Studies (CES) invites proposals for panels, roundtables, book discussions, and individual papers on the study of Europe broadly defined. We encourage proposals in the widest range of disciplines and particularly welcome panels that combine disciplines, nationalities, and generations. Participants are permitted to present in a maximum of two sessions.

We strongly encourage participants to submit their proposals as part of an organized panel. Full panel proposals will be given top priority in the selection process by the Program Committee. Participants may find it useful to connect with like-minded scholars through the growing number of CES research networks, linked on the “Research” page of the CES website.

Proposals may be submitted from August 15 to October 8, 2012. Participants will be notified of the Committee’s decisions by December 10, 2012. Information on how to submit will be posted on the CES website and disseminated through its newsletter during the summer of 2012. To subscribe to the CES newsletter visit: http://www.councilforeuropeanstudies.com

John Bowen, Chair
Council for European Studies
Washington University in St. Louis

Peter Gourevitch, Co-Chair,
CES Conference Program Committee
University of California, San Diego

Sébastien Chauvin, Co-Chair,
CES Conference Program Committee
University of Amsterdam
Local Organizing Committee

Responsibilities & Perks

The chief responsibilities of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) are to represent CES and liaise with the local community in service of conference fundraising and volunteer recruitment. Specifically, and in order of importance, the LOC is charged with:

1. **Reception Fundraising**
   The LOC’s primary responsibility is to raise enough money (or gifts in kind) to fund and host two (2) receptions that are open to all conference attendees. Although the cost of these receptions varies from city to city and year to year, it is generally expected that the LOC will have to raise $40,000 to $50,000 to cover the costs of these events. Funds may also be raised for special events, grants, and smaller receptions, but such efforts may not take precedence over the funding of the two general receptions.

2. **Volunteer recruitment**
   Because its members are affiliated with local universities and research institutions, the LOC is charged with helping to recruit graduate student volunteers to properly staff the conference. The number needed will vary based on the size of the conference, but typically it ranges between 65 and 100. Local graduate students may volunteer for one day in exchange for a waiver of their registration fees, allowing them to attend the other two days of the conference free of charge.

3. **Attracting exhibitors and advertisers**
   The LOC also works with CES staff to attract local sponsors, exhibitors, and advertisers. In many cases, such outreach serves the goal of reception fundraising. However, some types of fundraising (for example, money raised from book exhibits and program advertisements) are not applied to the reception fundraising total. Yet, ensuring that local advertisers have an opportunity to promote themselves to the population of conference attendees is part of the goal of properly showcasing the local community. Hence, fostering such engagement is in part an LOC responsibility.

In addition to these primary responsibilities, the LOC may be asked to assist with some administrative details, such as reserving venues and recommending local vendors. This is rarely the case in North America, where the conference typically happens at a hotel for which
the contract is negotiated independently by the CES staff, often years in advance. However, when the conference takes place on a university campus (as is usually the case in Europe) the LOC may be asked to liaise with the university regarding room reservations, catering, and other on-the-ground organizational details. If such assistance is needed, it is usually agreed upon between the CES Chair and a prospective LOC Chair prior to the recruitment of the full committee.

In exchange for taking on these essential tasks, members of the LOC receive several perquisites. Specifically, LOC members are guaranteed up to two (2) sessions or panels slots on the conference program. This is done under a system of expedited review known as “fast-tracking” which is available exclusively to members of the LOC, Conference Program Committee, and Executive Committee. LOC members are also officially acknowledged on the CES website, in the conference program, and in other CES materials. Lastly, members are treated to a dinner exclusively hosted for members of the LOC and the Conference Program Committee.

(Note: CES will in many cases raise funds independently of the LOC to fund things like travel grants and paper prizes. For this reason, the Council asks its LOC chair to submit a fundraising plan before beginning outreach. This plan ensures that CES will not reach out to potential funders already targeted by the LOC.)

---

**The skinny on “fast-tracking” proposals**

Fast-tracked proposals do not go before the full Conference Program Committee, but are instead administratively approved by CES staff.

To qualify for fast-tracking, a committee member must:

1) be a participant in the proposed session
2) submit the proposal via the CES proposal submission portal
3) have the proposal judged “sufficient and complete” by the Conference Program Committee co-chairs

If a committee member’s proposal is not judged “sufficient and complete,” it will sent back for revision and administratively accepted only after the needed changes are made.

No more than two (2) session proposals may be fast-tracked by a single committee member in a given year.
Recruiting LOC Members

The responsibility for recruiting members of the Local Organizing Committee falls jointly to the Chair of the LOC and the Chair of the CES Executive Committee, with the former typically taking the lead.

The number of LOC members varies from year to year, but is typically not less than six (6) and not more than twelve (12). Moreover, because Committee size has repercussions for budgeting and the proposal fast-tracking process, it is essential that the number of Committee members for a given year be set in advance through consultation with the Director. The Director is charged with keeping track of budgets and managing the overall size of the conference, and thus may ask Chairs to prune committees which become too large (that is, whose membership numbers and projected expenses exceed historic norms and/or budget expectations). To avoid such conflicts, the maximum number of committee members is typically set in advance of the start of recruitment.

Once the recruitment goal for a particular Committee is set, the principals (the LOC Chair and the CES Chair) are free to begin reaching out to colleagues. However, as with other committees, membership in the LOC is subject to certain restrictions. Specifically, in order to join the LOC a prospective member must be currently or recently affiliated with an institution or entity located in or near the host city.

Furthermore, since the primary purpose of the LOC is to raise money and attract sponsorships, it is also a good idea to recruit a mix of people well-connected to local government, foundations, research institutions, and businesses, and who thus may be well-positioned to argue for conference funding from a wide range of potential funders. Likewise, since volunteer recruitment is also a significant committee responsibility, thought should be given to how the membership of the Committee may advance the goal of recruiting a sufficient number of students volunteers.

Fundraising Plan

Once all or most committee members have been recruited, the LOC should begin drafting a “fundraising plan.” This plan, which is created by the LOC in consultation with the Council’s Director and Chair, should indicate fundraising goals, targets, strategy, and liaisons. For
example, if the LOC hopes to raise $5000 from each of five local universities, this should be indicated in the fundraising plan, along with a summary of what will be offered in exchange for university sponsorship, who will serve as the point-person, and the probable outreach timetable. These details may be subject to change later in the process, but a preliminary plan should be in place before beginning the outreach effort.

In determining fundraising targets, local costs and institutional capacities are, naturally, the chief determining factors. However, the past practices of other Local Organizing Committees may offer a guide to how conference funds may be raised and what negotiating structures and tactics are most effective. Those practices have varied, but in general successful Local Organizing Committees have done the following:

1) **Target many potential sponsors**
Successful LOCs usually identify a wide range of potential sponsors and funders. The most frequent sponsors are universities, but many others have also been targeted, including:

   a. embassies and consulates  
   b. institutions of local or regional government  
   c. foundations or research funding agencies  
   d. research institutes and centers  
   e. academic publishers and university presses  
   f. professional associations and disciplinary societies  
   g. local merchants and civic boosters  
   h. local academic departments

2) **Choose the right liaison**
Successful LOCs are careful to choose one person as the principal contact when reaching out to a possible funder, and to ensure that that person is well-placed to advocate on behalf of the committee. Such a person may be already affiliated with the sponsor or have useful contacts at the organization, but whatever the relationship, a consistent, highly regarded contact is the key to successful fundraising.

3) **Go in with a plan, gift level, and ask amount**
To improve the odds of success, the best LOCs plan ahead and go into every fundraising interaction with a plan and a specific donation amount in mind. The plan doesn’t need to be complicated, but it should allow the LOC’s liaison to clearly explain what a funder is being asked to do and what is being offered in exchange (i.e., the gift level and sponsorship plan). Moreover, the LOC should work out 2-3
possible levels and plans of sponsorship that would be suitable for each funder in advance of contacting them. This will allow the liaison to offer an alternative, if the funder seems uninterested in the initial plan. Most importantly, always have a specific number in mind when asking for money. That number should be on the high side of what is realistic to expect. Setting the ask amount too low will leave money on the table.

4) **Communication is the key**
LOC members should communicate regularly with one another and with the Council’s Director and staff. Without regular communication, promises made by LOC members often go unfulfilled by CES staff. Also, LOC members can frequently find themselves working at cross-purposes. This angers funders and undermines the entire conference organizing effort.

---

**Example plans, levels, and ask amounts**

The following are examples of possible sponsorship plans and ask amounts. These vary from year to year based on local conditions, but should be settled on before funders are approached to ensure relative uniformity in benefits accorded to sponsors contributing at a given level.

**Example 1**
- **Potential sponsor:** A large private university with two research institutes doing significant work within European Studies
- **Level:** Conference sponsor
- **Sponsorship plan:** A gift at this level accords the sponsor recognition in the conference program and on the CES website. Also, free advertising space in the CES conference program and a mini-symposium of three sponsored sessions featuring the work of university faculty from one or both research institutes.
- **Ask amount:** $5000

**Example 2**
- **Potential sponsor:** Local consulate
- **Level:** Travel grant sponsor
- **Sponsorship plan:** Sponsor receives recognition in the confer-
ence program and on the CES website. Also, free advertising space in the conference program, and a portion of funds to go to two conference travel grants for graduate students or junior faculty coming from the consulate’s home country.

**Ask amount:** $2500 *(CES contributes $500 in registration fee waivers, $1000 goes directly to the grantees, and $1500 supports receptions.)*

**Example 3**

**Potential sponsor:** Professional society in partnership with an academic press

**Level:** Mini-symposium sponsors

**Sponsorship plan:** Both sponsors receive recognition in the conference program and on the CES website. Free advertising and exhibit space is provided to the academic press. The opportunity to organize a mini-symposium within the CES conference is provided to the professional society (with proposals subject to Program Committee approval).

**Ask amount:** $3500 (combined)

**Example 4**

**Potential sponsor:** A local government office or agency

**Level:** Reception sponsor

**Sponsorship plan:** Sponsor receives recognition in the conference program and on the CES website. Also, a local representative of the office or agency is accorded the privilege of officially opening the CES conference by welcoming attendees at the start of the first plenary.

**Ask amount:** Complimentary use of a large reception venue

**Example 5**

**Potential sponsor:** Political science department at a local research university

**Level:** Mini-symposium sponsor

**Sponsorship plan:** Sponsor receives recognition in the conference program and on the CES website. Also, the department is guaranteed a two-session mini-symposium slot on the CES program to showcase the work of its faculty.

**Ask amount:** $2500
Recruiting Volunteers

In the 2-3 months directly preceding the conference, the LOC should turn its attention toward helping the CES staff recruit **non-presenting graduate students as volunteers**. Typically, the staff is able to recruit 25%-35% of the needed volunteers through general appeals sent out to local universities and those in neighboring regions. However, the task of recruiting the remaining 65%-75% of volunteers will fall largely to the Local Organizing Committee.

To recruit graduate student volunteers, LOC members should mobilize their networks. This means that in addition to reaching out to students in their departments, they should ask colleagues and local research institutes to promulgate the call as well. Graduate student volunteers receive a waiver of the conference registration in exchange for one day of service, and will also receive a free lunch during their volunteer day. The Council often also rewards volunteers with special membership discounts and other small perks.

Staff Support & Managing Money

Because the work of the Local Organizing Committee entails formal agreements with potential sponsors and takes place over a number of months, it is assumed that some staff support will be needed to meet the demands placed on the Committee. This support typically takes the form of recordkeeping and the sending of formal sponsor communications, like thank you letters and sponsorship agreements. The CES staff stands ready to assist with these tasks. The CES staff is also responsible for registering volunteers and updating the CES website and conference program to reflect the contributions of sponsors.

Money management for the conference is variously handled depending upon whether the conference is in Europe or North America. When the conference is in North America, all contributions are sent directly to the Council for European Studies. The Council records the contributions as donations and uses the money received to pay directly for receptions and other events as agreed upon with the Chair of the Local Organizing Committee. (Because CES is a 501 (c) (3) non-profit organization, contributions sent directly to CES are tax-deductible for U.S. donors.)
When the conference takes place in Europe, things are handled somewhat differently. Because donations from Europe to the United States entail both transfer and currency exchange fees, it makes little sense to send payments to the Council’s main office in New York. Therefore, instead of sending funds raised from European sponsors directly to the Council, a Europe-based LOC may arrange to have those funds managed by a partnering European institution. In such an event, the partnering European institution will both receive and dispense funds intended for the CES conference receptions and other special events and they will do this on behalf of the Council under the direction of the LOC Chair in consultation with the CES Director.

Given this arrangement, Local Organizing Committees tasked with raising funds for Europe-based conferences can face higher administrative demands than LOCs working on North American conferences. For this reason, European LOCs often arrange for a student assistant or other occasional administrative support person and pay for this help using a small portion of the funds raised for conference receptions. Providing the amount of money diverted to this purpose is not large and aids, rather than detracts from, the conference fundraising effort, the Council has no objection to this use of funds. Under no circumstances, however, should money raised in service of the CES conference and reception be used for any purpose not directly connected to these ends.

**Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

Below are answers to questions frequently asked by Local Organizing Committee members.

**Fundraising**

**Question:** Is the LOC restricted to fundraising for the receptions, or can it raise funds for other things, like conference travel grants, paper prizes, and special events?

**Answer:** No, the LOC is not restricted to raising funds for the receptions. LOC members may raise money for other purposes related to the conference. However, the LOC is required to prioritize reception fundraising. Money raised in excess of what is needed for the receptions may be used for grants and special events, providing that such
use does not contravene the sponsorship agreements arranged with funders.

**Question:** I would like to offer a potential funder several session slots on the conference program in exchange for a sizable donation. Can I do this?

**Answer:** Probably. However, in order to make sure that your pledge can be honored, you should first consult the CES Director.

**Question:** Why are there restrictions on how much space can be offered to potential funders? If it will bring in money, can’t the space be found?

**Answer:** Alas, no. There are clear limits on the size of the CES conference that can’t be overcome. These restrictions are imposed by the Executive Committee, by the number of session rooms that have been reserved, and by the limited time available (i.e., three days) for scheduling all sessions. To ensure that there is no double-booking (this has happened in the past and the results were not pretty!), the Director acts as the ultimate record-keeper and authority on what has been promised and to whom.

**Receptions**

**Question:** Why does the LOC have to raise money to cover receptions? Shouldn’t receptions be paid for out of the conference registration revenue?

**Answer:** The Council is committed to keeping registration costs low. Receptions are very expensive events and if they were paid for out of general conference revenue, the cost of registration would have to rise by $65 to $75. This would alienate attendees and restrict the attendance of independent scholars, the young, and those without access to generous professional development funding.

**Question:** I understand that the general receptions are open to all conference attendees. Does that mean that 800-900 registered attendees will be at each reception?

**Answer:** No. The historical norm is for one-third to one-half of conference registrants to attend each reception. Thus, the general rule of thumb is that a reception held during a conference with 800 regis-
Volunteers

Question: I know a graduate student who is presenting at the conference. Can she volunteer one day of service in exchange for a waiver of her registration fee?
Answer: No. Only non-presenting graduate students are eligible to volunteer in exchange for a registration fee waiver.

Question: I know that all regular conference registrants receive a complimentary membership in CES. Do volunteers receive a complimentary membership as well?
Answer: No. Graduate student volunteers do not receive complimentary memberships as a reward for service. However, the Council does commonly offer volunteers a substantial discount (as much as 65%) on the cost of a student membership in the wake of the conference. Moreover, this discount applies to multi-year memberships.

trans must be able to accommodate 300-400 people.

Question: Does the format of the receptions allow for speeches by local officials or university administrators?
Answer: Not really. Speeches have been allowed during past receptions and the results have been pretty uniformly bad. At the end of a long day, with food and drink near at hand, CES conference attendees have proven unwilling to listen to speeches...even very short ones.

Question: What is the usual format for CES conference receptions?
Answer: CES receptions are typically large, open events in which attendees mingle with colleagues and serve themselves from buffet tables. Alcoholic drinks are available and in most situations require the use of drink tickets.

Question: When do the receptions occur?
Answer: The two large receptions typically occur on the first and second nights of the three-day CES conference. receptions appear in the program after plenary events, beginning around 8:00 PM and ending around 9:30.
Conference Program Committee

Responsibilities & Perks

The chief responsibility of the Conference Program Committee (usually just called the Program Committee) is to assemble the bulk of the CES conference program. This sounds simple enough, but given the size and scope of a contemporary CES conference, it can be a complex and challenging task. Nonetheless the process may be broken down, broadly speaking, into the following three stages:

1. Grading proposals
The first step in assembling the conference program is the evaluation of conference proposals. This takes place during a 3-4 week window in October and early November, and requires Program Committee members to read and grade hundreds of paper, session, and mini-symposium proposals. Three to four committee members assess each proposal and these assessments are then averaged and ranked.

2. Assembling the program
Once all proposals have been graded by four reviewers, and those grades have been averaged and ranked, the Program Committee convenes for a 1-2 day meeting in early November. During this meeting, the Committee decides which proposals to accept and which to reject, assembles panels from accepted paper proposals, and identifies potential chairs and discussants. In the wake of the meeting, Committee members finalize any outstanding details that may have been left undetermined at the end of the programming meeting. The preliminary conference program is then assembled by CES staff and proposal submitters are notified of the status of their proposals.

3. Accommodating changes
The preliminary conference program is published at the start of January and marks the beginning of the third and final stage of the Program Committee’s work. During this time, the Council receives a flurry of cancellations, substitutions, and scheduling requests which may affect the conference program as established at the Committee’s November programming meeting. These changes require the Committee to occasionally rebalance portions of the program or recruit replacement chairs/discussants.

As one can see from this three-stage description, the over-
whelming majority of the Program Committee’s work is done in the six weeks between October 1 and November 15. Thus, unlike the Local Organizing Committee, whose work may extend over many months, the Program Committee faces a demanding, but relatively short timetable.

In exchange for taking on these essential tasks, members of the Program Committee receive several perquisites. Specifically, members are guaranteed up to two (2) sessions or panel slots on the conference program. This is done under a system of expedited review known as “fast-tracking” which is available exclusively to members of the LOC, Conference Program Committee, and Executive Committee. Program Committee members are also officially acknowledged on the CES website, in the conference program, and in other CES materials. Last, but not least, members are treated to a dinner, exclusively hosted for members of the Local Organizing Committee and Conference Program Committee.

Recruiting Program Committee Members

The responsibility for recruiting members of the Conference Program Committee falls jointly to the Program Committee Co-Chairs and the Chair of the CES Executive Committee, with the former typically taking the lead.

The number of Program Committee members has varied in recent years, however, as of June 2013 the Executive Committee voted to fix the number of committee members at six (6) individuals, including the co-chairs and EC committee representative. (This cap has been instituted to contain the cost of the Program Committee meeting, which has been risen precipitously in recent years.)

Starting in February or March of the year preceding the conference, the principals (the Program Committee Co-Chairs and the CES Chair) are free to begin recruiting Committee members. However, as with other committees, membership in the Program Committee is subject to certain restrictions. Specifically, in order to join the Conference Program Committee a prospective member must have a demonstrated research interest in some aspect of European history, society, politics, or economy, and thus be reasonably well-positioned to assess the research-based proposals of others.

Furthermore, since the Conference Program Committee must
assess hundreds of proposals from a wide range of disciplines and areas of interest, the Council strongly advises that committee members be recruited with an eye toward intellectual, regional, institutional, and gender diversity. Proposals are not assigned for review based on a committee member’s area of expertise. However, when assessing a proposal in an unfamiliar area or discipline, committee members often consult their colleagues with expertise in that area. Furthermore, since Program Committee members will be required to recruit chairs and discussants for created paper panels, they should also be persons with reasonably strong professional networks and connections.

Proposal Submission & Review

The Council for European Studies welcomes proposals for papers, sessions, and mini-symposia. The submission period begins in mid-August, when the submission portal is officially opened, and continues through the submission deadline, which is typically set in early to mid-October. Since the eventual scheduling of all conference sessions

The skinny on “fast-tracking” proposals

Fast-tracked proposals do not go before the full Conference Program Committee, but are instead administratively approved by CES staff.

To qualify for fast-tracking, a committee member must:

1) be a participant in the proposed session
2) submit the proposal via the CES proposal submission portal
3) have the proposal judged “sufficient and complete” by the Conference Program Committee Co-Chairs

If a committee member’s proposal is not judged “sufficient and complete,” it will sent back for revision and administratively accepted only after the needed changes are made.

No more than two (2) session proposals may be fast-tracked by a single person in a given year.

is done electronically, all proposals must be submitted via the submis-
sion portal to be eligible for inclusion in the conference program. This includes proposals from CES Committee members and officers.

Once the submission deadline passes, CES staff close the submission portal and begin assigning proposals to Program Committee members for review. All proposal are assigned randomly for review by four (4) committee members or outside reviewers. The finalizing of review assignments typically takes several days and so may be done on a rolling basis to allow Program Committee members to begin the review process before all assignments are complete. The review period varies in duration from year-to-year, but is usually set at 3-4 weeks and occurs from early October to the first week in November.

When entering the review site, each Program Committee member will find his or her assigned proposals listed at the left in a navigation pane. At the top of the main window will be listed the the titles, authors, and abstracts for each proposal. Below the proposal is a ratings screen where each proposal may be graded on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Reviewers are also provided with a space to add comments, notes or recommendations (this is optional). In order to minimize the number of debatable proposals, the Council generally asks reviewers to avoid grade compression by making sure that distinctions between the different grades are maintained. Generally, this means urging Committee members to use the number “3” sparingly (and not as a catchall category for anything that is not excellent). A rough guide to understanding the proposal rating system is provided below:

- **5** – Outstanding, a must-have
- **4** – Very good, would like to see
- **3** – Could be good, could be iffy
- **2** – Probably not strong enough compared to others
- **1** – Definitely not

To calibrate his or her system for grading proposals, a reviewer may wish to read a few test proposals before assigning any grades. However, this is not necessary. If a reviewer wishes to reconsider a grade previously given, this is easily done. Just click on the proposal title in the navigation pane and change the grade accordingly.

When the review period closes, CES staff compile and average all the ratings received for each proposal. This average rating is then used to rank all proposals in that category (i.e., paper proposals are...
ranked against one another, etc.). This information is then packaged as an easily accessible reference to support the Conference Program Committee’s deliberations at the programming meeting. This information packet typically includes combined review scores for each proposal and reviewers comments or notes, as well as digital files containing the full abstracts for every conference proposal submitted.

The Programming Meeting

After all proposal grades have been received, averaged, adjusted, and ranked, the Conference Program Committee meets to formally assemble the conference program. This meeting typically takes place in the same city and venue as the conference itself, and gives Committee members a chance to acquaint themselves with the conference site, hotel(s), and with each other. The cost of travel and accommodations is paid for by the Council for European Studies.

At the Programming Meeting, committee members will be supported and advised by at least one member of the Council’s staff. This staff member is on hand to act as a process adviser, and retains full authority over committee procedure. Having a staff member on hand to oversee procedure is done to ensure that the program creation process is standardized, follows best practices, and proceeds in the same way every year. Furthermore, Committee members are strongly advised to bring a laptop computer to the Programming Meeting (if they have one). CES staff will provide a variety of reference materials at the Programming Meeting. However, a full print-out of all proposal abstracts would require 1,000 pages, and so that information is usually provided digitally.

During the meeting itself, committee members will be following an agenda prepared for them in advance by the Council’s staff. That agenda may be adjusted with the Director’s concurrence, but typically looks something like the following:

Part I: Automatic Acceptances / Rejections

1. Vote on the automatic acceptance of the most highly ranked session proposals

   Committee Members will agree on a cut-off point for the most highly ranked session proposals. The status of the remaining session proposals will be determined through deliberation later in the meeting.
2. Vote on the automatic acceptance of the most highly ranked paper proposals

Committee Members will agree on a cut-off point for the most highly ranked paper proposals. The status of the remaining papers will be determined through deliberation later in the meeting.

Part II: Session Proposal Deliberations
1. Accept and Reject Mini-Symposia proposals

Mini-symposia proposals usually make up a very small portion of all proposals and have a very high acceptance rate. This means that little advantage is gained from establishing an automatic acceptance cut-off based on proposal rankings. So, the first step in formal Committee deliberations will be to review all mini-symposia proposals and determine which should be accepted, rejected, or accepted pending modification.

2. Accept and reject the remaining session proposals

Working together as a group, the Program Committee goes one-by-one through the remaining sessions proposals (i.e., those not automatically accepted earlier in the meeting). These proposals will then be discussed and a decision is made to accept or reject based on a number of factors, such as: proposal quality, thematic diversity, regional and institutional diversity, relevance to the conference theme, conceptual innovation, the renown of the participants, etc. Session proposals are accepted from the most highly ranked downward until all available slots are filled.

Part III: Composing Paper Panels
(Note: Items one and two are done more or less simultaneously.)
1. Assemble panels from already accepted paper proposals

Beginning at the top of the list of automatically accepted paper proposals, the Program Committee will look for papers of common theme to assemble paper panels. Each paper panel must have 4-5 papers and a cogent, relevant and (hopefully) engaging title.

2. Accept and reject remaining paper proposals

As part of the process of composing paper panels, the Program
Committee typically will pull from the list of automatically accepted paper proposals. When there are not enough already accepted papers on a given theme to fully compose a particular paper panel, Committee members may consult the list of paper proposals which have not been accepted. Typically moving from the most highly ranked to the least highly ranked of these proposals, they should selectively accept papers for the purposes of rounding out existing paper panels.

3. Identify Suitable Chairs and Discussants for Paper Panels

In order for a paper panel to be finalized it must have both a Chair and a Discussant. Therefore, Program Committee members must identify suitable chairs and discussants for created paper panel during the process of composing those panels. These chairs and discussants can be selected from the list of volunteers, from the list of already approved conference participants, or may be someone unconnected with that year’s conference. Either way, for a chair or discussant assignment to be finalized, a member of the Program Committee must write to that person and ask if he or she will serve in this capacity. If the prospective chair or discussant consents, he or she is added to the panel.


In an effort to accept as many promising paper proposals as possible, the Programming Meeting often ends with a review of all remaining paper proposals. Committee members who feel that a particularly promising proposal has been left off the schedule are encouraged to say so and an effort is then made to find space on the program. Such “saved” paper proposals will be accepted without prejudice. All remaining paper proposals will be rejected.

Issuing Acceptances and Rejections

After the Program Committee’s decisions have been confirmed and recorded by CES staff, the acceptance and rejection letters are sent out via e-mail in early December. Letters are drafted by CES staff and sent for edits and approval to the Program Committee Co-Chairs. Acceptance letters include important information about registration and other aspects of the conference while rejection letters aim to encourage
future participation in the Council and its conferences. The letters are sent via the conference proposal submission system and include specific references to the proposal being accepted/rejected.

Despite this process, it is not unusual for submitters to claim that they have received no notice regarding the status of their proposal. The reason for this is not always clear, but it is typically an oversight or the result of overly restrictive spam filters. Whatever the cause, the Council actively encourages session organizers and chairs to check-in with colleagues on their panels to make sure that they are aware of the status of their proposals. The Council also encourages those who have not received an email regarding the status of their proposals to contact the Council directly.

**Sample acceptance letter**

Dear Colleague,

We are pleased to inform you that your proposal, “Adding to Diversity? – Which Difference does the European Parliament make in the External Relations of the European Union?,” has been accepted and will be featured on the program of the Twentieth International Conference of Europeanists, to be held in Amsterdam from June 25 to June 27, 2013. The work you propose to share promises to be both stimulating and informative, and it is our pleasure to invite you to be part of the Council for European Studies’ 2013 conference.

This year’s selection process was unusually challenging. For yet another year, the Council for European Studies received well over 1,300 conference submissions, many of exceptionally high quality. We received proposals from scholars around the world, at every stage of professional development and covering a wide range of fascinating topics in European Studies. Indeed, this year’s pool was so competitive that the Program Committee voted to increase the number of panels significantly, so that a greater number could be accommodated. Nonetheless, even with that increase, the CES Conference Committee was able to accept only about 60% of the papers proposed.
We are pleased to say that yours was among those chosen for presentation. And, now that you know the status of your proposal, we encourage you to take advantage of the Council’s early-bird registration rates and register for the conference. All presenters must register by May 15, 2013 to be included in the conference program. Any participants who have not registered by that date will be removed from the program. Registration takes only a few minutes and can be done on-line directly through the CES website: http://bit.ly/sc49ZB

Also, we encourage you to reserve your rooms as soon as possible. This year’s conference hotels and information about each, including special room rates for CES conference attendees, are listed on the Council’s website. The number of rooms is limited, so early reservations are advised.

This year the Council is also pleased to offer a Conference Travel Grant to support trans-Atlantic travel for junior faculty and graduate students already planning on attending the conference. To determine if you’re eligible and to apply, visit http://councilforeuropeanstudies.org/grants-and-awards/conference-travel-grants. Applications must be received by January 7, 2013, so apply today!

For more information on registration and reservations, please visit the Council’s website http://www.councilforeuropeanstudies.org. If you have any questions or scheduling requests, contact us at ces@columbia.edu.

Once again, thank you for your submission, and congratulations on being accepted for the 2013 conference program. We look forward to seeing you in Amsterdam in June!

Best wishes,
Peter Gourevitch and Sébastien Chauvin
Co-Chairs, CES Conference Program Committee
Sample rejection letter

Dear Colleague,

The selection process for the Twentieth International Conference of Europeanists was highly competitive. And although the Program Committee was deeply impressed by your proposal, “<<title>>,” and thanks you for your submission, we regret that we are unable to offer you a place on this year’s conference program.

This year’s selection process was unusually challenging. For yet another year, the Council for European Studies received well over 1,300 conference submissions, many of exceptionally high quality. We received proposals from scholars around the world, at every stage of professional development and covering a wide range of fascinating topics in European Studies. Indeed, this year’s pool was so competitive that the Program Committee voted to increase the number of panels significantly, so that a greater number could be accommodated. Nonetheless, even with that increase, the CES Conference Committee was able to accept only about sixty percent of the papers proposed.

Needless to say, the task of choosing which proposals to feature was a daunting one which required the Committee to consider not only the absolute quality of each proposal, but also a variety of other factors, such as the spread of topics and disciplines, geographic distribution, etc.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to consider your submission. We regret that we are not able to offer you a place on the 2013 conference program, but we hope you will still consider joining us at the CES conference in Amsterdam in June.

Best wishes,
Peter Gourevitch and Sébastien Chauvin
Co-Chairs, CES Conference Program Committee
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Below are answers to questions frequently asked by Conference Program Committee members.

Review Process

**Question:** Can you make sure that I only receive proposals to review which are in my discipline or closely related to my research interests?
**Answer:** Sadly, no. All proposals are assigned randomly for review.

**Question:** Why aren’t proposals assigned for review based upon the discipline or research interests of the reviewer?
**Answer:** There are a number of reasons, but the frank truth is that it isn’t feasible. The Council is an interdisciplinary organization and encourages interdisciplinary proposals. So it is often not possible to define a particular proposal as strictly a “history” or “anthropology” proposal. Even more importantly, the distribution of proposals from different disciplines and areas of interest is not even. If we were to try to assign by area of expertise, some reviewers would have to read a great many proposals and others very few.

**Question:** When rating proposals, should I aim for a particular percentage of 1s, 2s, 3s and so forth?
**Answer:** No. Just follow the qualitative rating scale as described. Each proposal is reviewed by four people and those grades are then weighted and averaged. This helps balance the overall proposal grade and ensure that the ultimate “rank” of the proposal is a fair one.

**Question:** Why do I need to submit all my reviews 5-6 days before the programming meeting?
**Answer:** There is a lot of preparation that needs to be done behind the scenes in order to properly supply reference materials for the Program Committee meeting. Proposal ratings have to be weighted, statistically adjusted, and ranked; supporting materials have to be prepared, and CES staff have to double-check that all proposals have been properly reviewed and rated. It takes several days to get all that done, and this is why we need all reviewers to submit their reviews well in advance of the programming meeting.
**Programming**

**Question:** How do we know where to set the automatic cut-off point when voting to automatically accept or rejection proposals based on ranking?

**Answer:** The cut-off point varies from year to year and is set by weighing the overall size of the conference against the pool of available proposals. For example, if the Program Committee has a pool of 500 paper proposals, but only 35 paper panel session slots, it is likely to set the cut-off at a point which will allow it to automatically accept roughly one-half to two-thirds of the total papers needed. This places the cut-off between 70 and 115 papers from the top of the rankings list.

**Question:** There is a lot to do during the programming meeting. Can the Committee break-up and work separately to make things move faster?

**Answer:** Alas, no. The only element of the Committee’s work which can be divided or delegated is the recruitment of chairs and discussants. Once the Program Committee has created several paper panels, it is perfectly feasible to create a sub-committee tasked with identifying suitable chairs and discussants. However, even this task is usually best done with input from the entire committee because it can call on the professional networks of all involved.

**Question:** How are the special conference-wide plenary sessions organized?

**Answer:** There are conference-wide plenary sessions at the CES conference. One is organized by the CES Chair and the other is organized by the Program Committee Co-Chairs. The privilege of organizing a conference plenary session is a perk of office reserved for these individuals.

**General**

**Question:** As a Committee member, do I still have to pay registration fees for the conference?

**Answer:** Yes. Everyone, even the CES Chair, pays registration fees.
Administrative Matters

The Submissions Process

The Council for European Studies welcomes proposals for papers, sessions, and mini-symposia. The submission period for conference proposals begins in mid-August, when the submission portal is officially opened, and continues through the submission deadline, which is typically set in early to mid-October. Since eventual scheduling of the conference is electronically, all proposals must be submitted via the submission portal to be eligible for inclusion in the conference program. This includes all proposals from CES Committee members and officers.

Proposals received from members of the Executive Committee, Local Organizing Committee, and Program Committee, as well as a quota of proposals received from the Council’s Research Networks, are entitled to “fast-track” status. A fast-tracked proposal does not go before the full Conference Program Committee, but is instead administratively approved by CES staff. To qualify for fast-tracking, the proposal must be submitted via the CES proposal submission portal and must be judged “sufficient and complete” by the Program Committee co-Chairs. If a fast-track eligible proposal is not judged “sufficient and complete,” it will be sent back for revision and administratively accepted only after the needed changes are made. (NB: Committee members may choose not to take advantage of their fast-track privileges in a given conference year, but they may not transfer those privileges to another person or persons.)

Once the submission deadline passes, CES staff close the submission portal and begin assigning proposals to Program Committee members for review. All proposal are assigned randomly and reviewed by 3-4 committee members. The finalizing of review assignments typically takes 2-4 days and so may be done on a rolling basis to allow Program Committee members to begin the review process. The review period varies in duration from year-to-year, but is usually set at 3-4 weeks and occurs from early October to the first week in November.

When the review period closes, CES staff compile and average all proposal ratings received. This information is then packaged as an easily accessible reference to support the Conference Program Committees deliberations. This information packet typically includes combined
review scores for each proposal, reviewers comments or notes, as well as digital files containing the full abstracts for every conference proposal submitted.

At the Conference Programming Meeting, the Program Committee uses this information to make all decisions regarding acceptance and rejection of proposals into the conference program. They also create paper panels from the individual papers that have been accepted for inclusion in the program and begin the process of assigning discussants and chairs to such those panels.

In the 2-3 weeks that following the Conference Programming Meeting, the Program Committee finalizes chair and discussant assignments by reaching out to potential chairs and discussants. Once the bulk of this work is done, but no later than December 10th, the Council’s staff notifies all submitters of their proposal’s status and begins scheduling conference sessions in coordination the Program Committee Co-Chairs.

Submission Guidelines

Conference proposals must be received by the submission deadline or they will not be considered for inclusion in the program. Proposals are accepted for mini-symposia, sessions, and individual papers from any interested individuals. Proposals need not come from CES members to be considered. In all cases, abstracts should be no longer than 250 words. Specific guidelines for the three different types of conference proposal are provided below:

Papers
Those interested in proposing a specific paper to be delivered during the conference should submit a paper proposal. When submitting a paper proposal, please be prepared to provide a title, abstract, and basic author information (i.e., name, email, rank, institution, role).

Sessions
Those interested in proposing 3-5 papers on a related theme or any type of panel discussion should submit a session proposal. Session proposals come in three different types: panel, book panel, and roundtable. Of these three types, the most common is the panel, which requires 3-5 papers, a Chair, and a Discussant. Roundtables and book panels require 4-6 participants and a designated Chair. Session organizers should be
prepared to provide both session and paper abstracts when submitting session proposals, as well as basic information for all participants (i.e., name, email, rank, institution, role). The Conference Program Committee reserves the right to accept session proposals in whole or in part, and to request modifications to promising proposals to ensure that they meet relevant standards and guidelines.

**Symposia**
Those interested in proposing 2-4 sessions on a common theme should submit a symposium proposal. To do so, please be prepared to provide an abstract for the symposium, as well as basic abstract and participant information for the papers and panels which will make up the symposium, including designated Chairs and Discussants. Organizers are encouraged to make use of more than one session type (i.e., panel, roundtable, book discussion) when composing their proposals so as to provide variation in format over the course of the symposium. The Conference Program Committee reserves the right to accept symposium proposals in whole or in part, and to request modifications to promising proposals to ensure that they meet relevant standards and guidelines.

**Registration Fees and Forms**

All conference attendees are required to register and pay a registration fee based on their academic status:

**Early-bird Rates:**
- Student/Retired - $175
- Assistant Professor/Instructor/PhD - $225
- Full / Associate Processor - $275

**Regular Rates:**
- Student/Retired - $225
- Assistant Professor/Instructor/PhD - $275
- Full / Associate Processor - $325

Registration includes full access to all three days of the conference, including plenary sessions and receptions, as well as a complimentary one year’s membership in the Council. Attendees may not partially register for selective days of the conference, and since receptions are not paid for by conference registration funds, they may not reduce their
registration fee by foregoing receptions and other networking events. The conference registration form is available on the Council’s website and requires name, address, e-mail, institutional affiliation, position/title, and payment information. Attendees may pay via check, credit card, or PayPal. Day-of registrants may pay via cash, credit card, or PayPal. All checks must be received at least three weeks prior to the start of the conference.

The only people who do not pay a registration fee are graduate student volunteers and Conference Travel Grant winners, whose fee is waived as a part of their award. Graduate student volunteers do not pay a fee in exchange for one full day’s service at the conference in various capacities. They are then free to attend the other two days of the conference at no cost.

Hotel Contracts

There are two types of hotel contracts which may be negotiated as part of the conference organizing process. The first type is most common in North American conferences and assumes that all or most of the conference experience will take place within the hotel. This type of contract requires the Council to negotiate rates for venue space and catering costs, as well as discounts on room reservations. This type of hotel contract is typically negotiated three (3) years in advance of the conference.

The second type of hotel contract is simpler and assumes that the conference will take place at another venue, usually a university, located nearby. This type of hotel contract only requires Council staff to negotiate room reservation rates and terms, and is typically arranged two (2) years in advance of the conference.

In either case, the CES Director is ultimately responsible for negotiating hotel contracts. This is frequently done in consultation with members of the Local Organizing Committee or CES Executive Committee. However, the long lead-time needed for hotel contracts effectively requires that this aspect of conference organizing be handled exclusively or almost exclusively by the CES Director and staff.
Marketing and Publicity

The International Conference of Europeanists is actively promoted within the Council’s website, social media sites, and publications, as well as circulated to those individuals and organizations who subscribe to the Council’s email and publicity lists. The Call is also posted on a large number of relevant listservs and academic websites, such as H-Net, roughly three times from the beginning of the submission period through the submission deadline (and, if relevant, the submission deadline extension period).

The design and creation of conference materials is handled exclusively by the Council’s staff, who are obliged to create a number of different marketing instruments in the course of promoting the conference and informing attendees. These promotional instruments typically reflect a unified plan and include special offers to advertisers and exhibitors. The overarching goal when promoting the conference is to create a unified brand for the event and to reach to a mix of new and traditional constituencies.

Surveys

Two surveys are sent to conference attendees: one directly prior to the conference and one just after. The Pre-Conference Survey serves to estimate attendance for the post-plenary receptions and any other special or unusual events happening during the conference. The Pre-Conference Survey also helps the Council find more volunteers for the conference and other Council programs.

The Post-Conference Survey assesses each participant’s experience at the conference. This survey is longer and more involved, asking questions about where participants heard about the conference, how long they attended, and how satisfied with their conference experience.

The information collected from both the pre- and post-conference surveys is provided to the Executive Committee in the period directly following the conference. The Executive Committee then uses this information to set policy and goals for future CES conferences.
Model Organizing Calendar - 2013 Conference

August 15, 2012
Conference portal open for submissions.

October 1, 2012
Early-bird conference registration opens. Rates discounted $50.

October 8, 2012 (extended to October 15, 2012)
Submission deadline. Conference portal closes.

October 26, 2012
Deadline for submission of Program Committee reviews.

November 2-3, 2012
Programming Meeting takes place in Amsterdam.

December 10, 2012
Deadline for sending acceptance/rejection notices to submitters

January 21, 2013
Preliminary conference program released online. Conference travel grant winners announced.

February 2, 2013
Deadline for room reservations for RHO Hotel.

March 18, 2013
Early-bird registration closes. Regular rates apply.

March 26, 2013
Deadline for room reservations for NH Caransa, NH City Centre, and Ibis Amsterdam Centre.

May 13, 2013
Registration deadline for conference presenters/participants. Those not registered by this date will be removed from the program.

May 20, 2013
Print program goes to the printer.

June 1, 2013
Council stops refunding registration fees and accepting checks in payment of registration fees. Credit card, Paypal, cash and wire transfers still accepted.