

Minutes Management Committee Meeting

COST Action IS0804

Language Impairment in a Multilingual Society: Linguistic Patterns and the Road to Assessment

Larnaca, Cyprus - October 28, 2010

Present: Sharon Armon Lotem (Chair), Jan de Jong (Vice-chair, NL), Natalia Gagarina (WG2 leader, DE), Kristine Jensen de Lopez (DK), Maria Kambanaros (CY), Philippe Prevost (FR), Vicky Chondrogianni (DK, replacing Tia Hansen), Chiara Levorato (IT), Laurice Anne Tuller (FR), Gordana Hrzica (MC Sub HR), Elin Thordardottir (IS), Peri Iluz-Cohen (IL, replacing Joel Walters), Camille Messarra (LB), Anne E. Baker (NL), Arve Asbjørnsen (NO), Ewa Haman (PO), Zofia Wodniecka, (PO), Jasmina Vuksanovic (RS), Natasha Ringblom, (SE), Carolyn Letts (UK), Carla Contemori (IT, replacing Adriana Belletti), Frenette Southwood (non-cost MC, ZA), Daniele Gatt (MT), Theo Marinis (UK), Ingrida Balčiūnienė (LT, replacing Laura Kamandulyte), Olga Nenonen (FI, replacing Ekaterina Protassova), Daniela Slancova (SK), Svetlana Kapalkova (SK), Ineta Dabašinskienė (LT), Alexandr Kornev (non-cost MC, RU), Joao Costa (PT), Naama Friedmann (IL), Solveig Chilla (DE, replacing Monika Rothweiler), Stanislava Antonijevic (IE, replacing Ciara O'Toole), Sari Kunnari (FI).

0. Welcome to participants.

1. Adoption of agenda.

The agenda is adopted.

2. Minutes of last meeting.

The minutes are accepted.

3. Matters arising.

4. Report from the COST Office – Unfortunately we do not have a representative here, but Francesca sent a letter about the budget status

- News from the COST Office – COST newsletter on COST webpage
- Status of Action, including participating countries – No new countries joined since the last meeting. Malta, Luxemburg and Croatia finalized the procedure.
- Budget status, budget planning and allocation process – Francesca's letter (Appendix I to the Minutes)

As is clear from the letter, 2011 budget is not yet complete.

5. Progress report of working groups – The WGs have all achieved the goal of sharing knowledge within the Action and are working on structures and task selection in year 2. Scientific reports of the WG leader will be part of the general discussion on October 29.

6. Action planning

6.1 Annual Progress Conference, Brussels, June 2-3, 2010 – notes (Appendix II)

6.2 Action Budget Planning for 2010:

Planned budget

Meetings	60 000 EUR
STSM	15 000 EUR
Subtotal Science Expenditure	75 000 EUR
Secretarial Support	10 000 EUR
Total Expenditure	85 000 EUR

Budget report 2010

Newcastle meeting	43 808.03 EUR
Meeting support	1 490.68 EUR
STSMs (4)	7 386.00 EUR
Secretarial support (estimate)	8 859.30 EUR
Cyprus meeting (including meeting support - estimate)	45 500.00 EUR
Total used (based on estimate)	107 044.01 EUR
Delta (based on estimate)	22 044.19 EUR

We were promised a third payment from the COST office to cover the estimated gap and were told that this payment will only be possible once we submit the final financial report of the year. This is why we asked the MC members for volunteers to receive their reimbursements only once (a contract for) the third instalment it received by the grant holder. 25 MC members volunteered which made it possible to hold this meeting on time and reimburse those who cannot wait as well as students who attended the meeting. We are very lucky that we got the COST office official notification of the budget amendment this week (see Francesca's letter in Appendix I) and we shall not have to take this measure. We thank the COST office. And a big thank-you to all the volunteers. Hopefully we shall not need to opt for this measure again.

40 participants are reimbursed for this meeting. The cuts we made for the Newcastle meeting: the accommodation & meals budget was reduced from the original 640 EUR per person to 420 EUR. For this meeting, further cuts were made, from 420 EUR to 340 EUR per participant, although we went back to four night (8 meals + four nights), but the accommodation budget was reduced from

120 EUR to 45 EUR per night based on the tariff negotiated by the local organizer), saving a total of 12000 EUR. Flights however, were more expensive.

No money was available for STSMs for the second half of 2010

The Action has proved to be highly successful. The meeting in Newcastle attracted 75 participants: 2/3 - eligible for reimbursement and a 1/3 (who are WG members) had to cover the transportation and accommodation at their own expense. Their willingness to pay their own expenses further shows the importance of such meetings in promoting collaborative networking and achieving our aims. The present meeting has attracted around 70 participants, 2/3 are eligible for reimbursement and 1/3 (who are WG members) are participating at their own expense. The limited budget makes it difficult to support early stage researchers.

6.3 Action Budget Planning for 2011:

Planned budget – our needs

Meetings (including a practitioners' event)	90 000 EUR
STSM	15 000 EUR
Subtotal Science Expenditure	105 000 EUR
Secretarial Support	15 000 EUR
Total Expenditure	120 000 EUR

Planned budget – How to share the cake?

MC+WGs Meeting	45 000 EUR
WG workshops	20 000 EUR
STSM	7 500 EUR
Subtotal Science Expenditure	72 500 EUR
Secretarial Support	12 500 EUR
Total Expenditure	85 000 EUR

With the financial situation, that is, the lack of clarity re COST budget for 2011, we propose that the meeting in May 2011 (Turkey) goes ahead as planned, but the Fall 2011 meeting (Malta) may be reduced to help adapt it to the budget if we do not get a budget amendment on time to arrange a full meeting. The budget for STSMs is for the first half of 2011. If we receive an amendment that can fund more STSMs in the second half as well, the MC can decide to increase it.

With the current budget (of 85,000 EUR), it was not feasible to hold a full second meeting in 2011 as was proposed in the MoU. With one meeting a year it will be

extremely difficult for the Action members to collaborate and ensure the advancement towards the objectives of the Action. One meeting a year will harm the continuity of the Action and will have a negative effect on our ability to increase scientific and societal impact. The Action will not be able to accomplish its goals (both scientific and assessment related) and we will be forced to revisit the vision of the Action and revise the MoU. In order to operate and advance towards the set aims the Action (including another meeting this year), the budget should be revised. We urgently request the COST office to try and provide us with the necessary funding.

The MC meeting accepts the possibility of having to change the setup of the MC meeting for Malta if budget is lacking, but maintains that such budget cuts seriously interfere with the Action's ability to reach its goals..

6.4 Action Planning (including meetings)

6.4.0 Location and date of next meeting

Anadolu University, Eskisehir Turkey, May 25-27, 2011.

Presentation sent by Seyhun

It will be followed by a practitioners' event as part of the Turkish national speech and language pathology congress

6.4.1 Long-term planning (including anticipated locations and dates of future meetings)

We should vote on:

Fall 2011 - Malta (words by Daniela)

Spring 2012 - Padua

The MC's support these locations (one vote contra Malta).

In addition, there are volunteers for:

Fall 2012 – Berlin

Spring 2013 – Reading

Fall 2013 – Lithuania

Final conference – perhaps Krakow

7. STSM status, applications (Laurie)

No new STSMs since the last meeting due to budget restrictions.

New STSM deadline: January 31st, for STSMs till May. A call will be issued once next year's budget is approved. STSM applications should follow the general guidelines of this Action: the cheapest transportation and the cheapest accommodation available.

Should we decide to limit the STSM reimbursement in order to enable more STSMs?

STSMs are not supposed to cover the full expense of a visit. It is a contribution. We can decide, if we want to limit the budget per STSM in order to allow more STSMs. 10 STSMs a year is a good number.

This policy is accepted by the MC meeting. For now, however, it is merely a consideration that applies when the budget is tight.

8. Publications, dissemination and outreach activities

- COST's advanced science communication training [Lisbon, 5-6 Oct] (report by Jan) Relevant information from this course will be made available on the website (closed section) so MC's can benefit from it.

- Please remember to update us with new publications related to the action's activities.

- COST would like to see joint publications (at least two different research groups from the Action) asap. This need not necessarily report new work, and can be limited to a comparative work based on presentations which were done in the past year or any other kind of collaboration (such as the one between Naama and Adriana which was supported by an STSM to write the paper). Multi authored writing teams should be encouraged and we need not wait four years to publish the work which emerges from the action.

- Publications – We shall need to make a clear distinction between Action related publications (which we had so far) and Actions supported publications (where at least some of the content or the possibility to write it together emerged from the Action's networking). Books and Special Issues of journals are valued by COST more than papers, but they clearly understand that papers often count more for promotion in academia.

- LiMoBis conference, practitioners' day and graduate school organized by Kristine Jensen de Lopez and the Cognitive Psychology Unit (DK) in September 2010, in Aalborg, Denmark (<http://limobis.aau.dk/>) was a great success. People were asking whether there will be a follow up every year. It seemed to fill a need. This is food for thought for us all.

- If your institution is planning / organizing a conference / workshop / summer school for 2011 which is related to the Action's aims, please let us know and the MC can decide to apply for the funding (within 2011 budget) to support such an event.

- All these activities as well as research need funding (presentation by Ewa)

Ewa Haman mentions that sometimes additional funding for research is available at the national level. To explore this, the national coordinator should be contacted. Sharon reminds the MC of mentioning COST when applying for national funding ('COST opens doors').

9. Request for new members

MC Members

No new requests.

We cannot accept new MC members with our limited budget.

WG Members:

WG1

Carla Contemori (IT)

Sarah-Ann Muckley (IE)

WG2

Agnieszka Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (PL)

Cecile Monjauze (FR)

Stanislava Antonijevic-Elliott (IE)

Spyridoula Stamouli (GR)

Vicky Kantzou (GR)

WG3

Anna Adaktylos (AU)

Edith Kouba Hreich(LB)

WG4

Guillemette Henri(LB)

New applications to be approved in Turkey can be sent to Natalia, the action secretary, at bisli.org@gmail.com

The MC meeting agrees that under the present financial conditions no new MC members are accepted. The situation is different for near-neighboring countries (different budget) and WG members (not reimbursed).

10. Promotion of gender balance and of Early Stage Researchers (ESR)

- Constant efforts will be made to achieve gender balance in recruitment of early-stage researchers. Gender balance will be considered in approving STSM applications.
- The Action will encourage the involvement of early-stage researchers (MAs, PhDs, postdoctoral fellows)

11. Non-COST country participations

USA, Laida Restrepo – Approved by the MC, still awaiting COST approval

Expressed interest:

Australia: Willem van Steenbrugge, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, Flinders University of South Australia

Malaysia: Rogayah A Razak, Dept. of Audiology & Speech Sciences, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)

The MC will be asked to approve of them by e-mail once they apply officially.

The MC meeting welcomes Alexandr Koernev to the present meeting.

12. Web news

Our website www.bi-sli.org is constantly updated with useful information. This includes:

- Lists of MC members and WG members with links to individual homepages.
- Updates for meetings
- Presentations from the Amsterdam and Newcastle meetings are in the closed section; titles of the presentations are in the open section, the same procedure will be followed for the Cyprus meeting. Please make sure to send your presentation to Natlia at bisli.org@gmail.com
- Background questionnaires are in the closed section. The questionnaires already available have already generated key elements of a future core questionnaire.
- FAQ for parents and clinicians. We ask for volunteers who are willing to commit themselves to translate the FAQ into other COST languages by the end of December.
- A webpage-hit-counter was added that enables to count visitors (e.g. around 400 in October).
- Articles in the closed section organized according to WG
 - pre-print versions of articles written by the Action members
 - articles by other authors should be published with the obtained consent and the journal guidelines should be followed.

Kleanthes Grohmann has volunteered to be the new webmaster. This is much appreciated. The meeting supports the request above to have the FAQ's on the present website translated into every country's language by the end of December 2010.

13. AOB

13.1 Status of questionnaires

Before the meeting in Turkey, a common questionnaire will be piloted that will shortly be distributed by Laurie Tuller. Additional questions may be needed.

13.2 WG3 leadership

People feel there are shortcomings in the leadership of the NWR subgroup in WG 3. Concern has been expressed that WG3 coordinator, Dolors Girbau, has too little time to run the phonological processing (non-word repetition) part of the WG. Dolors herself communicated on several occasions that she has very little time for the task. We ask the MC to approve the Steering Group approaching Dolors with this concern and proposing that she steps down and a new leader would take over. The present leader, Dolors Girbau, will be contacted about this and asked to step down. It is felt that a change of leadership is necessary.

The WG is quite satisfied with the progress made during the Cyprus meeting. The work of Elin Thordardottir, who chaired this meeting, is much appreciated.

13.3 Meeting in Turkey

A. Organization of the meeting in Turkey:–

- 3 full days (4 nights). Save on accommodation.
- Practitioner’s event will follow the meeting
- Poster session
- Parallel sessions organized the following way:
- WG1 plans to split into subgroups

	1 st Day		2 nd Day		3 rd Day
9:00	Registration and Welcome WG1	9:00	WG1	9:00	WG2 WG4
12:30	lunch break+posters	12:30	lunch break	12:30	lunch break
15:00	WG2 WG3	14:00	WG3 WG4	14:00	WG1
		18:00	MC meeting	18:00	General Discussion
19:00	End of the day				

B. The participants` accommodation will be reimbursed based on the tariff negotiated by the local organiser.

There will also be a practioners’ meeting, for which COST members will be invited as speakers. It is important that the organisers provide the names of the speakers quite soon, so people can go ahead and plan their journey (which is dependent on whether they should include the practitioners’ meeting). Again, early planning guarantees lower expenses.

14. Closing

Appendix I – Francesca's letter

I am happy to inform you that we managed to secure the extra 20.000 EUR we promised you. I would need to check internally how to proceed for the grant amendment but it's sure you will receive them, and hopefully sooner than foreseen. Please bring this message to your institution and to your MC and thank them for their precious cooperation.

Regarding the budget for next year, for the time being we managed to allocate 85.000 EUR to your Action. Unfortunately we haven't received yet the top up of our funding from the European Commission and we cannot commit more than this. The current scenario indicates that we should get the top up by June next year. Should this be the case, we could proceed as this year, and make an amendment for increasing your budget as soon as we get the green light from the European Commission.

I am completely aware that this is not the ideal way for planning your activities but we are trying to do our best to accommodate the requests with our budget. Your Action is one of the biggest within ISCH and rest assured you that it's always in the priority list for top ups as we are fully aware that the grant you received is limited considering the size of the Action.

I think it would be good if you prepare the Budget & Work plan for the 85.000 and agree already on extra activities that could be funded in case extra funding is made available during the year. In this way, we will make the process a little bit faster and you will be ready to go ahead with the extra activities as soon as we give you the green light.

Once again, I'm sorry I cannot give you the chance to better plan your activities but unfortunately this situation is out of my personal control. I am really trying to do my best and Julia too.

Please convey this message to the MC and in case there are questions, please collect them and send them to me. I will be happy to reply directly to the whole MC upon my return at the office in mid-November.

I'll keep you posted for the process of the grant amendment.

Thanks for your cooperation and understanding, very much appreciated.

Good luck for your meeting.

Appendix II – Notes from APC

The APC gave me a great opportunity to see how other more mature Actions work and to understand what COST office expects to see from us. They kept stressing that COST is about building bridges.

I summarize hereby a list of ideas that I have collected during the meeting which I would like us to keep in mind and consider for our Action. They are not ordered by importance but as they came from the different presentations and comments.

- STSMs are not supposed to cover the full expense of a visit. It is a contribution. We can decide, if we want to limit the budget per STSM in order to allow more STSMs. 10 STSMs a year are a lot.
- Publications – COST would like to see joint publications (at least two different groups from the Action) asap. This need not necessarily report new work, and can be limited to a comparative work based on presentations which were done in the past year or any other kind of collaboration (such as the one between Naama and Adriana which was supported by an STSM to write the paper). Multi authored writing teams should be encouraged and we need not wait four years to publish the work which emerges from the action.
- Publications – We shall need to make a clear distinction between Action related publications (which we had so far) and Actions supported publications (where at least some of the content or the possibility to write it together emerged from the Action's networking). Books and Special Issues of journals are valued by COST more than papers, but they clearly understand that papers often count more for promotion in academia.
- Visibility of COST – COST urges us to organize Action related panels and symposia in scientific meetings (e.g., the upcoming IASCL, if someone wants to go for it). Though they do not offer to support such activities, it will make us look more active and raise the likelihood of getting more funding. Note that it is something we do anyway, and all we need is to mention that it is related to the work in our Action.
- Visibility of COST – another way to raise visibility is to organize our meetings or training schools adjacent to other conferences. This will make it possible for more people to attend our activity. In such a case, COST is likely to help with funding (but it should be request as part of the yearly budget), and would like to make sure that the two events are clearly distinct.
- Training schools – A day or two of PhD presentations and posters or an addition of training day for PhD student by Action members adjacent to an MC/WG meeting, can count as an ESR training school. Here again there is no need to wait for final results to put up such an activity. COST will provide partial to full support of such event. LiMoBis is an event of this kind, but unfortunately we could not get it supported by COST due to the limited budget.
- Dissemination to Clinicians and Policy makers – it is wise to start this as early as possible in order to raise awareness and form some sense of commitment with these target groups. The FAQ are a good start but we might want to think of using leaflets or a newsletter to enhance the relations. This can increase the chances of making societal impact. Interaction with policy makers early on is very important. How do we do it at our local level? At the EU level? Some of our MCs might have ideas

- Early stage researchers – COST would like to see PhDs and MAs emerge from the Action
- In order to allow more local organizer support (double it in fact) we should virtually separate the MC meeting from the WGs meeting (even if they take place at the same location on the same days). This of course depends on our budget. It also raises the number of meetings in our report and webpage, which make COST happier.
- We can charge a registration/fixed fee from the participants (e.g. 40 EUR per person) and provide lunch and dinner as part of the program.
- Needless to say, they would like us to submit joint grant proposal to support the research which emerges from the networking. Even submitting a joint proposal counts.
- In the last year (I know it is still very far, but what I put in writing will not be forgotten, I hope), we might want to consider organizing several smaller conferences spread over the year, maybe around WGs topics rather than the regular WGs meetings. This clearly depends on how much we achieve by then.