Experiential Learning in European Studies: An EU Simulation Workshop

Recruiting Faculty and Students to an EU Simulation Program
By
Gretchen J. Van Dyke, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
The University of Scranton

The Consortium Secretariet
By
Edward G. DeClair, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
Lynchburg College

Financing an EU Simulation
By
Peter H. Loedel, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
West Chester University

Adding an Electronic Component to Face-to-Face Models
By
Janet E. Adamski, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Baylor University

Experiential Learning in European Studies: An EU Simulation Workshop

Workshop Contact Sheet

Chairperson
Gretchen J. Van Dyke, Ph.D.
The University of Scranton
E-mail: Vandykeg1@uofs.edu
Fax: (570) 941-6485   Telephone: (570) 941-4307
Department of Political Science
The University of Scranton
Scranton, PA 18510

Edward G. DeClair, Ph.D.
Lynchburg College
E-mail: declair_e@mail.lynchburg.edu
Fax: (804) 544-8487   Telephone: (804) 544-8481
International Relations Program
Lynchburg College
401 Carnegie Hall
Lynchburg, VA 24501

Peter H. Loedel, Ph.D.
West Chester University
E-mail: Ploedel@wcupa.edu
Fax: (610) 436-3170   Telephone: (610) 436-3435
Department of Political Science
West Chester University
207C Jones Hall
West Chester, PA 19383

Janet E. Adamski, Ph.D.
Baylor University
E-mail: Janet_Adamski@baylor.edu
Fax: (254) 710-3122   Telephone: (254) 710-6044
Department of Political Science
Baylor University
P.O. Box 97276
500 Speight
Waco, TX 76798

Recruiting Faculty and Students to an EU Simulation Program

The range of colleges and universities that have participated in the Mid-Atlantic European Union Simulation Consortium (MEUSC) is as diverse as that in many states and regions of the country. Yet, there is a common thread that runs through this group: these institutions primarily tend to be smaller ones in which the emphasis is placed on undergraduate teaching and a relatively low faculty-student ratio. When one understands the dynamics of this EU simulation program, it is not hard to see why these types of schools generally might be attracted to MEUSC. Nonetheless, only three schools (Gettysburg College, Millersville University, and Susquehanna University) brought students to the first MEUSC simulation in December 1993. Moreover, while at least eighteen schools have participated in at least one of seven simulations since, MEUSC is still trying to reach the goal of mirroring perfectly (one school, one country) today's EU membership. Numerous variables affect the recruitment of schools, and thus students, to this experiential learning exercise.

Recruiting the Faculty Advisor: Why Faculty Do/Do Not Choose to Participate

The institutions that participate in the MEUSC simulation program have done so because there is a faculty member with the capacity to fulfill the role of MEUSC faculty advisor. Such a person must be able to prepare students substantively to participate effectively in the various simulation meetings, and must have the institutional support (curricular and financial) to facilitate that institution's participation. The following are challenges to any institution's continued involvement in the MEUSC program:

* Faculty Changes & Personnel restraints (sabbaticals, administrative duties, departmental requirements, other professional requirements)
* Curriculum restraints (i.e., inability to fit the study of the EU into curricular offerings)
* Budgetary restraints (i.e., lack of institutional funding)
* Level of professional preparation and student preparation demand high degree of personal commitment, and the faculty member may not be able to justify such a time commitment.
* Tenure requirements in smaller institutions may demand that an individual faculty member place attention in other areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
* **Nevertheless**, the values of such experiential learning opportunities and the overwhelming positive reaction of students themselves tend to encourage faculty to join the MEUSC program and to return each year, if other factors are favorable.
* Moreover, MEUSC faculty have often identified the EU simulation program as an effective tool in bridging international and comparative political theory and reality for their students, and have noted the intellectual stimulation that the EU simulation program has brought to their own careers as teachers and scholars.

Recruiting the Students: Students' Attraction to EU-related Experiential Learning Exercises

Tell a group of students that a demanding, upper-division elective course includes a subsidized, three-day trip to Washington, D.C., and one will be pleasantly surprised by the

Mid-Atlantic European Union Simulation Consortium

Created in 1993 with three schools and only thirty-four students, the Mid-Atlantic European Union Simulation Consortium (MEUSC) now boasts a membership of fifteen colleges and universities that annually administers a conference for nearly 225 students. These students converge on Washington, D.C. every December to engage in an intense series of professional-level political briefings as well as participate in simulated meetings of the European Union's primary decision-making bodies.

The following "outline" details the tasks that the MEUSC Administrative Secretariat undertakes each year to facilitate, manage, and organize the annual conference. This process continues throughout the entire year. The Secretariat, now housed in the Lynchburg College International Relations Program, is the central administrative arm for the consortium. Managed by a single faculty member with the help of two student interns (chosen in a competitive process), the Secretariat is also dependent upon the volunteer spirit of the participating faculty and their respective institutions. Over the years, MEUSC has grown into more than merely the administrative arm of the annual conference; it has become an important resource for faculty interested in European Union Studies as well as an essential element in the professional development of its individual members.

Outline of Roles and Responsibilities for the
Secretariat of the Mid-Atlantic European Union Simulation Consortium

I. Secretariat Roles and Responsibilities
    A.   Simulation Planning and Logistics
        1.   Hotel
            a.   Planning
                (1)   Serve as Simulation contact person for hotel
                (2)   Reserve block of rooms
                (3)   Reserve necessary meeting rooms
                (4)   Plan banquet
                (5)   Reserve appropriate audio equipment
                (6)   Plan morning coffee breaks (Friday and Saturday)
                (7)   Arrange for copying services
            b.   Post-Simulation
                (1)   Pay bills
                      (a)   Audio equipment
                      (b)   Meeting Rooms
                      (c)   Coffee Breaks
                      (d)   Tips for wait staff and facilities manager
                (2)   Follow-up with hotel

2. Embassy
    a. Written contact with embassies
        (1) Post-simulation thank you letter
        (2) Possible site visits
        (3) Mid-spring reminder in writing
        (4) Late-summer/early fall confirmation
    b. Possible site visits

3. Restaurants
    a. Contact Restaurants
    b. Assign party groups to restaurants
    c. Make reservations
    d. Arrange menu
    e. Pay bill after meal

4. State Department
    a. Arrange Visit through Visitor Services
    b. Facilitate speaker contacts
    c. Work with Visitor Services
    d. Collect and forward security lists

5. Finnish Embassy Tele-Conference
    a. Remain in contact with the Finnish Embassy
    b. Facilitate the satellite tele-conference with Ed Morgan
    c. Cut check for the cost of this

6. EU Delegation
    a. Maintain contact
    b. Invite to Simulation
    c. Arrange Friday briefing for Commissioners at Delegation

7. Bus Transportation
    a. Make arrangements for Transportation
    b. Confirm arrangements prior to Simulation
    c. Pay bill

8. Monitor and facilitate timely publication of simulation materials
    a. Program
    b. Name tags
    c. Develop simulation handbook in consultation with Executive Committee
    d. Continue process of codifying faculty responsibilities

B. Administrative Responsibilities
1. Executive Committee Responsibilities
    a. Facilitate Communication
    b. Chair meetings
    c. Call meetings when necessary
    d. Prepare agenda in consultation with Executive Committee

2. Full Faculty Meetings
    a. Call Meetings when necessary
        (1) October -- during Commissioners' meeting
        (2) December -- during Simulation
    b. Prepare agenda in consultation with Executive Committee

3. Facilitate organization for October Commissioners' meeting
    a. Work with Faculty for Pre-Simulation Communication b/w students

          b.   Work with Commission Presidency to facilitate resolution draft
          c.   Post-October meeting resolution draft work

4.   Serve as EU Delegation contact person
          a.   Coordinate internship selection process
          b.   Keep Delegation informed of Simulation dates
          c.   Work to facilitate continued grant/financial assistance

5.   Work with Executive Committee to facilitate the "public relations" of the consortium
          a.   Consider additional ways to publicize simulation
          b.   Assist participating faculty with PR on their own campuses
          c.   Use simulation logo and stationary to write letters of recommendation/commendation for participating faculty

6.   Develop program to institutionalize the history of the simulation
          a.   Develop "by-laws" for the actual simulation consortium
          b.   Facilitate the acquisition of non-profit status

7.   Work with participating faculty to promote pedagogical as well as basic research related to shared interests and concerns

C.   Financial Responsibilities
    1.   Maintain financial records
    2.   Prepare annual budget
    3.   Manage grant monies
    4.   Process invoices
          a.   Membership
          b.   Bus transportation
          c.   Restaurants
          d.   Miscellaneous hotel bills

II.   Required Qualities of Person and School to be Selected
A.   Full, total commitment to the Simulation
    1.   Prior experience
    2.   Years of service to the organization
    3.   Commitment to the future
    4.   Record of administrative responsibilities

B.   Possible necessary and required school resources
    1.   Staff
    2.   Student workers
    3.   Internship possibilities
    4.   Secretarial assistance
    5.   Other evidence of institutional support
    6.   Letter of support from appropriate College Administrators
          a.   Vice-President for Academic Affairs/Dean/Provost
          b.   Department Chair

C.   Technological skills
    1.   E-mail proficiency
    2.   Web-site skills

D.   Knowledge and/or background in European Politics/Affairs
    1.   Comparative and or IR Specialty
    2.   Teaching Experience
    3.   Research Experience

Financing an EU Simulation? - Get ready to beg!

Financing an EU simulation can be the single biggest factor in determining whether you will be able to run the simulation. Depending on the type of simulation you run, your financing needs may vary. For example, if you run a multi-university, multi-day simulation held in an external locale (say Washington D.C.), your funding needs will be significant – probably in the range of $2,500-$5,000. This is the typical range of costs for members of MEUSC. However, if you run a simulation in your classroom, you may not need any funding – or at least money to cover a lunch for students involved in all-day Parliament session or Ministerial meeting.

Costs will also depend on the need for a hotel, transportation to and from the simulation, and meals (banquets, working dinners, lunches, etc.). Costs will, of course, vary depending on how many students are participating in the simulation.

From our experiences, the three most important and significant sources of financing are:

A. Internal sources

- Department Budgets (often the largest share of funding)
- Dean/College/School (Simulations are often a good "sell" in terms of public relations, student learning, senior seminars, etc.)
- University level funding (Presidential Initiatives, Faculty Development Grants, etc.)
  This funding may be short-term but often is useful in initiating the simulation in terms of release time to prepare a new course, educational materials (books, web-building, etc.)

B. Possible additional internal sources of funding used by MEUSC:

- Student Lab "fees" (Helps to defer the cost to the department. Even $50.00 per student can make or break your participation. Students are often used to lab fees for art or P.E. courses. Deans may then match student costs)
- Student/Alumni (special scholarships or accounts may be set up to help offset costs)

C. External sources:

- Foundations/Grants (FIPSE, NSF, ECSA, etc.)
- Private sponsors (European multinationals – probably difficult)
- EU Commission (They have been helpful for MEUSC)
- EU Centers (Maybe not with financing, but logistics, advice, hosting a simulation, etc.)

Adding an Electronic Component to Face-to-Face Models

Pluses

- This is a no or low cost addition to the simulation. Most schools have access to electronic research tools and email. Setting up a chatroom, often done by a college's tech department, is usual free.
- Students tend to be fairly high tech and are often very comfortable with this form of communication.
- Gives easy access to documents, treaties, press releases, European newspapers etc.
- Provides easy communication among participants within model institutions, party groups, country delegation, as well as with real counterparts.
- Allows immediate sharing of documents generated by the model's various groups.
- Professors who must grade students' efforts have a written record of participants' work. This record also allows faculty and other team members insights, prior to the face-to-face simulation, into who needs additional direction/help.
- Can extend the time horizon of negotiations. This means that participants can worked through multiple iterations of proposals/amendments that face-to-face only models do not allow.
- Makes model (and the pressure of the competition) seem "real" much earlier in the semester.
- Gives student participants (and faculty) a chance to know each other and get over first-timer jitters before the face-to-face portion begins.
- Gives students with underdeveloped parliamentary procedure skills a chance to operate in the more flexible environment of a chatroom/email.
- Shyer students tend to respond favorably to this form of communication, which helps them to get over any hesitation before the eventual face-to-face part of the simulation. This can get them more involved.
- Easier for faculty sponsors to monitor the direction participants are moving and potentially tweak the process toward another direction by the introduction of new information, questions etc.

Pitfalls to Avoid

- In the chatroom, need to have a facilitator to make sure that the conversation gets going, stays on track and remains at a high level (have seen an unmoderated chatroom degenerate into "gossipfest" about participants.) A student "chair"--perhaps each head delegate in turn--can play this role. For the first few meetings, however, it is often helpful to have a faculty member "facilitate" the online meeting.
- Need to coordinate communication in the chatroom(s) so that at least some of it occurs in "real time." With time zone differences, and multiple student obligations, need to work hard to coordinate online meeting times. This both better simulates the model (having all negotiators represented in the meeting) and avoids the frustration of some members working off-line on a draft/idea while others on-line have moved beyond that issue.
- Students cannot rely on the same non-verbal cues in an electronic meeting as in a face-to-face negotiation. This can lead to frustration and develops a different set of skills than those that will be necessary in later face-to-face sessions.
- The chatroom/email format does not give students practice in the use of parliamentary procedure.
- Credit for work/ideas is so obvious that students may engage in grandstanding for their professors, which can hinder true negotiation.

A Future Enhancement

If schools involved have access to teleconferencing/distance learning equipment, schedule some face-to-face (but long-distance) meetings. By teleconferencing, students have the opportunity to practice negotiation and parliamentary procedure skills, at little or no cost and with less disruption of personal and professional obligations. Unfortunately, these resources are not yet as common as is an electronic communication infrastructure. Many schools are currently considering investing in this capital equipment. It is worthwhile to lobby your administration, alerting those involved in planning to this potential use.

Home Pages for the Institutions of the European Union

Parliament	www.europarl.eu.int/home/default_en.htm
Council	http://ue.eu.int/en/summ.htm
Commission	http://europa.eu.int/comm/index_en.htm
Court of Justice	http://curia.eu.int/en/index.htm
Court of Auditors	http://www.eca.eu.int/
Economic and Socal Committee	http://www.esc.eu.int/
Committee of Regions	http://www.cor.eu.int/
European Ombudsman	http://www.euro_ombudsman.eu.int/
European Central Bank	http://www.ecb.int/
European Investment Fund	http://eif.eu.int/
European Investment Bank	http://eib.eu.int/
Agencies	http://www.europa.eu.int/agencies/carte_en.htm
US Delegation of the European Commission	http://www.eurunion.org

Home Pages for the Party Groups of the European Parliament

European Peoples Party (Christian Democrats) & European Democrats
> http://epp-ed.europarl.eu.int/Group/en/politicalposition.asp

Party of European Socialists
> http://www.europarl.eu.int/pes/

European Liberal Democrats and Reform Party
> http://eld.europarl.eu.int/

Greens & European Free Alliance
> http://www.europarl.eu.int/greens-efa/group/default_en.htm

Confederal Group of the European United Left & Nordic Green Left
> http://www.europarl.eu.int/gue/

Union for a Europe of Nations
> http://www.europarl.eu.int/uen/

Technical Group of Independent Deputies
> http://www.europarl.eu.int/tdi/index.htm

Europe of Democracies and Diversities
> http://www.europarl.eu.int/edd/

Other Helpful Sites

Official Journal	www.europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/oj/index.html
Eur-Op	http://eur-op.eu.int/general/en/index.htm
Eurostat	http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/
Europa	http://europa.eu
Community Research & Development Information Service	http://www.cordis.lu/en/home.html

SECTION OF A SAMPLE RESOLUTION

Mid-Atlantic European Union Simulation
30 November-2 December 2000
Draft Resolution from the Commission

Enlargement of the European Union

PREAMBLE

1. WHEREAS the goal of the European Union (EU) is to promote a stronger and wider Union, to espouse economic and social cohesion, and, in accordance with Agenda 2000, to promote the accession of the Central and Eastern European Countries, hereafter collectively known as the CEEC, and the Republic of Cyprus;

2. WHEREAS the EU has consistently recognized the need to guarantee stability throughout Europe, specifically in the former Communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe;

3. WHEREAS various EU governing bodies have recognized that further enlargement obligates a reform of EU institutions, specifically the Commission, the Parliament, the Council of the European Union (hereafter known as the Council of Ministers), and the European Council; a reevaluation of elements of the European Central Bank (ECB) and the European Court of Justice (ECJ); and the re-evaluation and re-allocation of assistance funds with regard to social and economic problems;

4. WHEREAS the range of pre-accession documents confirm that variations exist among the CEEC, Cyprus, and Western Europe, specifically in the areas of functioning market economies, stability of domestic institutions, and respect for human rights, and that these differences have been considered in determining each applicant country's alignment with the Copenhagen criteria;

5. WHEREAS Article O of the Treaty of European Union (TEU) states that any European country may apply to become a Member of the Union. The Commission has evaluated each CEEC and Cyprus according to the dictates of Agenda 2000 and approved them as candidates for accession;

6. WHEREAS the Amsterdam Treaty recognizes that any European country may apply for membership upon acceptance of the principles embodied in Article F, which expands upon the TEU to introduce respect for the principles upon which the Union has been founded. Acceptance of the entire TEU shall be a pre-requisite for any country's initial application for membership;

7. WHEREAS Article F of the TEU confirms liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law as the founding principles of the EU.

APPLICANT COUNTRIES

1. WHEREAS the EU's Environmental Action Programs have underscored the EU's concern for the environment, each individual country is obliged to make significant progress towards compliance with the standards set forth in Agenda 2000;

2. WHEREAS IGC and Commission documents have affirmed the importance for applicant countries to meet all the Copenhagen criteria;

3. WHEREAS the Treaty of Amsterdam and the European Convention on Human Rights have mandated that each individual applicant country must respect the rights of individuals and provide equal treatment to all persons irrespective of racial, ethnic, and religious origins;

4. BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that each individual applicant country continues to demonstrate significant progress towards conformation to the aforementioned criteria for maintenance of respective negotiations.

5. WHEREAS negotiations and the pace of said negotiations with applicant countries depend on each individual applicant country's degree of preparation as evaluated in the Commission Accession Partnership Reports of 1998, 1999, and 2000;

6. WHEREAS the Czech Republic is a democracy with a functioning market economy that has a low budget deficit, low unemployment, and a lowered inflation rate. Although the economy is an area of concern, the Czech Republic has made much progress in that sector;

7. WHEREAS the Czech Republic needs improvement in its treatment of the Roma minority, reform of the bank and steel sectors as well as the legislation governing those sectors, advancement of intellectual and property rights, developments in the field of agriculture, implementation of anti-pollution legislation and a strengthened Justice and Home Affairs sector, particularly where border control, immigration, corruption, and organized crime are concerned. The Commission also recognizes that the Czech Republic needs to continue restructuring its fiscal areas to better fit the fiscal system of the European Union;

8. WHEREAS Hungary is a democracy with a functioning market economy that has made strides in the areas of economic stabilization and budgetary and pension reforms. Hungary has made progress in structural alignment, protection of intellectual property, implementation of property regulations, and resolution of agricultural and transport issues;

9. WHEREAS Hungary needs improvement in the harmonization of Justice and Home Affairs, as well as in the combat of organized crime and protection of workers' health and safety;

10. WHEREAS Poland is a democracy with a functioning market economy that has maintained progress in withstanding competitive pressures and market forces within the Union. Poland has continued to progress in the aforementioned areas at a significant rate, as well as to improve in the areas of education, financial control, and the alignment and implementation of free movement of capital and services;

11. WHEREAS Poland needs improvement in the areas of agricultural structural reform, legislative approximation, and institutional strengthening;

12. BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that, in light of their demonstrated ability to effect internal structural reform to meet North Atlantic Treaty Association (NATO) membership criteria, as well as in consideration of their progress towards meeting the Copenhagen criteria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland be admitted to the EU by January 2005.

13. WHEREAS Cyprus is a democracy with a functioning market economy that has made significant progress in the areas of social policy, the environment, competition law, and Justice and Home Affairs. Cyprus conforms to the *acquis communautaire* in the areas of employment and legislation, as well as in overall economic health.

14. WHEREAS Cyprus needs improvement in the areas of agriculture, privatization of industry, communication, transport, and government economic policy.

15. WHEREAS the Commission recognizes the separation of the accession of Cyprus and the resolution of the dispute in accordance with Agenda 2000 as suggested by the Parliament and reiterated in the J. W. Bertens report adopted in April 1999.

16. WHEREAS Estonia is a democracy with a functioning market economy that has stable institutions guaranteeing the rule of law, human rights, and respect for minorities. The past elections were free and fair. Estonia should be able to make the progress necessary to cope with competitive pressures and market forces within the Union. It has made considerable progress in transposing and implementing the *acquis communautaire*, particularly in relation to the single market;

17. WHEREAS Estonia needs improvement in accelerating the naturalization of Russian-speaking non-citizens to better integrate them into Estonian society. Particular efforts, including investment, will be needed to implement the *acquis communautaire* fully in sectors such as the environment;

18. WHEREAS Slovenia is a democracy with a functioning market economy that has stable institutions guaranteeing human rights, good environmental standards, and an effective administration. It has continued to make progress in fulfilling economic criteria and incorporating the *acquis communautaire*;

19. WHEREAS Slovenia needs improvement in ensuring a wider consensus in government decision-making. Efforts to empower and integrate the Romanian minority, as well as to restructure the judicial environment, must also be made;

20. BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that Cyprus, Estonia, and Slovenia, although not members of NATO, be admitted to the EU no sooner than January 2007 if current progress towards meeting the Copenhagen criteria is sustained.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS -- MID-ATLANTIC EUROPEAN UNION SIMULATION -- NOVEMBER 30 -- DECEMBER 2, 2000

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2000

Time	Event
10:00 AM	ALL EMBASSY BRIEFINGS
12:00 PM	EU TELECONFERENCE WITH BRUSSELS
	MR. PATRICK COX MEP, IRELAND CHAIR, ELDR
1:30 PM	LUNCH
2:45 PM	BRIEFING US STATE DEPARTMENT
4:00 PM	INTRODUCTORY SPEECHES HEADS OF STATE & GOV'Ts
7:00 PM	WORKING DINNERS
10:00 PM	RULES BRIEFING

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2000

Time	Event
8:30 AM	SIMULTANEOUS SESSIONS
	EUROPEAN COUNCIL EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOREIGN MINISTERS ECONOMICS MINISTERS EP COMMITTEE, FOR AFFAIRS EP COMMITTEE, BUDGET
10:30 AM	WORKING COFFEE BREAKS
10:45 AM	RESUME DELIBERATIONS
12:00 PM	LUNCH: NAT'L DELEGATIONS
2:00 PM	NAT'L MINISTERS MEETING
	EP PARTY GROUP MEETINGS
4:00 PM	COMMISSION BRIEFING EU DELEGATION MR. JONATHAN DAVIDSON
3:00 PM	RESUME SESSIONS
5:30 PM	RECESS FOR DAY
7:00 PM	BANQUET
	SPEAKER: JOZEF TOTH DEPUTY CHIEF OF MISSION EMBASSY OF HUNGARY

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2000

Time	Event
8:15 AM	SIMULTANEOUS SESSIONS
	EUROPEAN COUNCIL JOINT MINISTERIAL EP PARLIAMENT PLENARY
10:00 AM	COFFEE BREAK
10:15 AM	JOINT COUNCIL & PARLIAMENT CONCILIATION SESSION
11:30 AM	LUNCH
1:00 PM	EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETS JOINT MINISTERIAL COUNCIL EP PARLIAMENT PLENARY
2:30 PM	COUNCIL SUMMIT ON DRAFT RESOLUTION
4:00 PM	EP PARLIAMENT REVIEWS COUNCIL ACTION
5:00 PM	SIMULATION ADJOURNS

SAMPLE PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE
(Used by some MEUSC institutions during the 2000 MEUSC Simulation)

Name Badges and Code of Conduct

Name badges should be worn during all scheduled EU Simulation Sessions, including Thursday evening's restaurant dinner and Friday evening's banquet. This will enable fellow delegates to get to know each other and their respective roles and to assist any special guests or visitors to understand delegate roles in the simulation. During all official meetings, a delegate gains recognition for speaking by raising a hand and waiting for individual session Chairs to announce one's turn to speak; upon being recognized, a delegate should announce one's alter ego, respective country, and Parliamentary Party Grouping (that is, if one is an MEP). The Delegate Dress Code for Thursday's Embassy and State Department briefings, all official European Council, European Commission, Council of Ministers, and Parliamentary sessions on Friday and Saturday, and Friday evening's banquet is nothing less than standard, professional Business Attire. This program-wide dress code underscores the level of professionalism and personal decorum that is anticipated from all delegates, at all times during the simulation. In the past, some delegations have chosen to dress even more formally for the banquet than for daytime meetings; this is not, however, a program-wide standard and is therefore left to the discretion of the individual delegations. Delegates should also note that the one exception to the "Business Attire" rule is Thursday evening's restaurant dinner meetings, at which time delegates may attend in more informal, yet equally appropriate, attire.

General Procedures

Because this simulation of the European Union government compresses several months of normal deliberations into two days, it is necessary to modify the official rules of procedure so that a conclusion may be reached within our time constraints. The initiator of legislation in the EU is the Commission. In this instance, a group of students (at least one from each school) has assumed that role and the Draft Resolution on European Enlargement was prepared by that group. The completed **Resolution on European Enlargement** will be presented to delegations prior to their arriving in Washington. Delegates (to the Councils and the Parliament Party Groups) should be prepared to begin analyzing this proposal over dinner on Thursday night, and the Party Groups in particular shall do this while considering other critical items business--namely, choosing party leadership.

Because **France** currently holds the EU Presidency, all European Council and Council of Ministers sessions will be presided over by the appropriate **French** alter ego (head of state or minister). All Council presidents, and all delegates who intend to seek leadership positions in the Parliament, should familarize themselves with the nature of those positions and the skills necessary for handling those positions effectively.

The European Parliament and its committees, unlike the Councils, must elect a President, Vice President, Chairs, and Rapporteurs as part of their official business. Therefore, Party Group meetings should not only include discussions about procedures for selecting Party Chairs and Vice Chairs, but also for selecting respective Party nominees for Chairs, Vice Chairs, and Rapporteurs of the EP Committees, as well as EP President, Vice President, and Rapporteur nominees. Party Groupings will also want to confer about possible strategies for promoting and winning these respective positions. While no one party has sufficient numbers to dominate the elections of Committee and Parliament leadership positions, each group should identify viable candidates as early as it is reasonable so as to allow maximum time to negotiate with other party groupings about these positions. Multiple party caucuses --both formal and informal--may be necessary to complete this process.

Committee Chairs, Vice Chairs, and Rapporteurs are elected by the membership of the individual committees. This selection process will be the first order of business when each Committee convenes on Friday morning; the eldest member of each Committee presides over this election, after which the newly elected Chair commences with the committee's official business. Vice Chairs assist the Chairs in the conduct of the committees' business, while the Rapporteur, who is generally considered to an expert on the topic under consideration, serves as the secretary for committee business. This process is replicated at the beginning of the Parliament's Plenary Session on Saturday morning: the election of EP President, Vice President, and Rapporteur will be the first order business during that session, again, with the Parliament's eldest member leading that process. The newly elected President, Vice President, and Rapporteur will then conduct the official business of the Parliament during its entire Plenary Session. The President will also represent the Parliament during the final session of the European Council.

After the **French** Presidents call the respective meetings to order, Council meetings proceed with opening statements by each individual member states; these statements should be approximately 2-3 minutes each, but no longer than 5 minutes. This progression is conducted according to the *Tour de Table* procedure, starting with the member to the immediate right of the President and moving in a counter clockwise direction around the entire table. The *Tour de Table* may also be utilized during the general course of meetings, particularly when the President deems doing so as necessary: to break a deadlock in the discussion, to bring order and movement to a discussion, or to identify formally a consensus that has been built--all with the intention to prepare the Council for a particular vote. During the course of general discussion and debate, each member shall keep remarks to a limit not exceeding 2 minutes, unless specific leave from this rule is requested from and granted by the President.

It is important for Council Members to understand, however, that Council meetings are not generally conducted in an atmosphere that is governed by rigid adherence to formal procedures, but rather in a more relaxed conversational--yet always diplomatic--fashion. This is not to say that emotions may not run high at times; but in such instances when heated discussions and issues emerge, members are to remember the diplomatic positions that they hold and the decorum that is appropriate for those circumstances. Moreover, the Council President is reminded of his/her obligation to maintain order in a cool, calm, deliberate, and always diplomatic manner.

The Council shall vote when its respective President initiates the action to do so. Furthermore, the President shall be required to open the voting procedure when an individual member specifically requests that the President to do so. The Council votes according to one of three different procedures outlined below: Simple majority, unanimity, and qualified majority.

Simple majority consists of an absolute majority of the members of the Council (in the 2000 simulation, 8 of 15 members) and applies primarily to questions of procedure. Each Member has one equal vote in this case.

Unanimity, since the passage of the SEA, has been severely limited and generally reserved for certain aspects of only the most sensitive areas: foreign policy, justice, some financial areas, or when the Council plans to change a Commission proposal against the latter institution's direct wishes. Each Member has one vote or may abstain under this system. On each of these particular issues, a Member must deem the issue to be of "very important interest" to that member state, in order to invoke the veto privilege.

Qualified majority (QMV) is a weighted voting system requiring 62 votes out of a total of 87 votes, according to the following weight of member votes:

10 France	5 Netherlands	4 Sweden
10 Germany	5 Belgium	3 Denmark
10 Italy	5 Greece	3 Finland
10 United Kingdom	5 Portugal	3 Ireland
8 Spain	4 Austria	2 Luxembourg

QMV is employed for all other decisions and issues on which consensus has not been reach and that are not described under the simple majority and unanimity systems. A blocking minority of 26 votes may be used to defeat a particular proposal being considered under the QVM system. Always remember, however, that consensus is the norm and goal of the Council of Ministers.

Point of Order
-- interrupts any speaker & must be recognized
-- no 2nd required
-- non-debatable
-- no vote required
Comment: President's/Chair's decision
Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I rise to the Point of Order....

Inadmissibility of a Matter
-- may not interrupt speaker
-- must be recognized
-- non-debatable
-- vote required
Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move that this matter is admissible/inadmissible....

Closure of Debate
-- may not interrupt the speaker
-- must be recognized
-- must be 2nd
-- non-debatable
-- vote required
Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move that we close debate....

Call to Order
-- made only by the President/Chair
-- non-debatable
-- no vote required
Comment: Made only by the President/Chair
Suggested Wording: I call this meeting to order.

Setting the Agenda
-- may not interrupt speaker
-- should be recognized
-- must be 2nd
-- non-debatable
-- vote required
Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move to make...the order of our agenda....

Adjournment/Recess of Debate
-- may not interrupt speaker
-- should be recognized
-- must be 2nd
-- non-debatable
-- vote required
Comment: Only appropriate before or during the debate
Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move that we adjourn/recess....

Closure of the Sitting
-- may not interrupt speaker
-- should be recognized
-- must be 2nd
-- non-debatable
-- vote required
Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move that we close the sitting....

Move (Motion) to Vote on Amendments

-- may not interrupt speaker

-- must be recognized

-- non-debatable

-- must be 2nd

-- vote required

Comment: Voting should start with the farthest amendment (ie., amendment to the amendment...)

Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move to vote on the amendment....

Motion to Voting on Text

-- may not interrupt speaker

-- must be recognized

-- non-debatable

-- must be 2nd

-- vote required

Suggested Wording: Mr/Madame President/Chair, I move to vote on....