

Draft Agenda
Management Committee Meeting

COST Action IS0804

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

Eskişehir, Turkey, May 26, 2011

Present: Sharon Armon Lotem (Chair), Jan de Jong (Vice-chair, NL), Theo Marinis (UK), Natalia Gagarina (WG2 leader, DE), Joel Walters (IL), Anne Baker (NL), Eve Haman (PL), Shula Chiat (WG3 Leader, UK), Seyhun Topbas (TR), Belma Haznedar (TR), Jasmina Vuksanovic (SR), Laurie Tuller (FR), Phillipe Prevost (FR), Camille Messarra (LB), Fernanda Pratas (PT, replacing Joao Costa), Carolyn Letts (UK), Carla Contemori (IL, replacing Adriana Belletti), Pascale Engel (LU), Svetlana Kapalkova (SK), Daniela Slankova (SK), Grodana Hrzica (HR, replacing Jelena Kuvac Kraljevic), Natasha Ringblom (SE), Melita Kovacevic (HR), Agnes Lucas (HU), Sari Kunnari (FI), Olga Nenonen (FI, replacing Ekaterina Protassova), Daniela Gatt (MT), Ferenc Kemény (Hu, replacing Bence Kas), Naama Freidman (IL), Kleanthes Grohmann (CY), Maria Kambanaros (CY), Elin Thordartothir (IC), Vasiliki Chondrogianni (DK, replacing Tia Hansen), Arve Asbjornsen (NO), Alexandr Kornev (RU),

0. Welcome to participants

1. Adoption of agenda

The Agenda is adopted.

2. Minutes of last meeting

The Minutes are accepted.

3. Matters arising

Applicants for 2011 ISCH Conference Grant for Early-Stage Researchers Call, supporting the participation of Early-Stage Researchers to international conferences:

1. Carla Contemori (WG 1 Member, Italy) - GALA 2011, Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition, Thessaloniki, Greece - 06-08/09/2011 - Budget Requested: 420EUR
 - Linguistic vulnerability and clinical perspectives: sentences repetition in typical and atypical language development (Contemori C. & Garraffa M.)
 - The impact of number mismatch and passives on the real-time processing of relative clauses (Contemori C. & Marinis M.)
2. Ciara O`Toole (MC Member, Ireland) - Child Language Seminar, Newcastle-on-Tyne, UK, - 13-14/06/2011 – Budget Requested: 883EUR
 - Designing a Receptive Vocabulary Test for Bilingual Irish Speakers (Ní Shithigh, D and O`Toole, C.)

- Assessing and diagnosing language impairment in bilingual children: A minority language study (O'Toole, C. and Hickey, T.)

The SG committee believes that both applicants are equally good (the presentations are directly related to the Action, both are female Action members, both are ESR). The SG committee suggests to nominate the more junior applicant, Carla Contemori (IT). *The MC members voted and nominated Carla Contemori (IT) for the ISCH conference grant.*

4. Report from the COST Office – Unfortunately Julia is unable to attend.

- News from the COST Office
- Status of Action, including participating countries
- Budget status, budget planning and allocation process – Julia writes: “The strategy how to deal with the additional funds will be discussed by the COST CSO at the end of the month. Thus, please tell your MC members that they have to be patient until June – and be assured that I will get back to you as soon as I have something to say in this respect.”

5. Action budget planning status

Planned budget for 2010 after amendment

Meetings	76 000 EUR
STSM	16 000 EUR
<i>Subtotal Science Expenditure</i>	92 000 EUR
Secretarial Support	13 000 EUR
Total Expenditure	105 000 EUR

Budget report 2010

Newcastle meeting (46/137)	45 269.15 EUR
Cyprus meeting (36/68)	30 028.87 EUR
<i>Subtotal Meetings</i>	75 298.02 EUR
STSM (#8)	11 199.00 EUR
<i>Subtotal Science Expenditure</i>	86 497.02 EUR
Secretarial Support	12 222.41 EUR
<i>Total Expenditure</i>	98 719.43 EUR
Delta	-6 280.57 EUR

Planned budget for 2011

Turkey meeting	37 000 EUR
Malta meeting	31 000 EUR
<i>Subtotal Meetings</i>	68 000 EUR
STSM	15 000 EUR
<i>Subtotal Science Expenditure</i>	83 000 EUR
Secretarial Support	12 000 EUR

<i>Total Expenditure</i>	95 000 EUR
<u>Budget report 2011 (Estimates)</u>	
Turkey Meetings	30 000 EUR
STSM (#8)	7 535 EUR
<i>Subtotal Science Expenditure</i>	37 535 EUR
Secretarial Support	5 630 EUR
Total Expenditure (May 2011)	43 165 EUR

The MC members vote and accept the budget.

The Action has proved to be highly successful. The meeting in Newcastle attracted 137 participants: 46 - eligible for reimbursement and the rest (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 Cyprus meeting attracted 68 participants, 36 were eligible for reimbursement and the rest (who are WG members) were participating at their own expense. The limited budget makes it difficult to support early stage researchers. The present meeting has attracted 71 participants, 40 were eligible for reimbursement and rest 31 (who are WG members) were participating at their own expense.

While we received requests for new MC members, no new requests are approved due to budget limitations.

In the Annual report we noted (p. 11) :

"The biggest drawback remains the budget situation (the extremely limited financial resources in IS0804) which leads to choice of low-cost/out of the way locations for meetings and makes it harder for every member to participate since:

1. it takes more time and effort to participate, and also involves own cost share due to lack of efficient or direct transportation.
2. no budget is available to support WG members who are often ESRs who want to attend the meetings, which is tragic, since the COST goals are very much focused on encouraging the involvement and training of young researchers

The budget situation makes it very difficult to plan future meetings and activities of the Action. The MC meeting thus far has resisted that idea of holding only one meeting a year, since it would diminish the synergy that the group is meant to create, but we might have to do it in the future to enable ESRs participation. The Action members have been extremely accommodating and cooperative in looking for options that fit our budget, so we were able so far to organize two meetings a year, but it is an endless struggle. "

6. STSMs status, applications (words by Laurie Tuller)

STSMs are a very successful tool. The problem is that we have more applications than funding. Report & Criteria for STSMs (see Appendix I on STSMs evaluation / problems / questions)

To sort this out, an assessment panel (consisting of SG members) will evaluate / score all the sent application using a point system:

1. **Action Relatedness:** priority will be given to projects directly related to the Action – applicants should state in a paragraph how the Action / WG will benefit from the project.
2. **Applicant Status:** priority will be given to ESRs.
3. **Action Membership:** priority will be given to applicants who are members of the Action
4. **Host Institution:** priority will be given to members of the Action or institutions that have some specific expertise that will contribute to the goals of the action.
5. **Present STSMs:** priority will be given to the Action members who have not benefited from an STSM.

Reimbursement for STSMs will be limited to 10 working days (“STSMs are financial contributions given as a fixed sum”), an amount of no more than EUR 60-90 for daily allowance and EUR 300 for the travel is recommended.

STSM applications should follow the general guidelines of this Action: the cheapest transportation and the cheapest accommodation available.

New STSM deadline: June 20, 2011, for STSMs from July 1st, 2011 till December 20th 2011.

Estimated budget: 7465 EURO.

The MC members voted and accepted the guidelines for assessing STSMs.

7. Publications, annual report

From the Annual Report (p.10):

"75 publications which are related to the action aimed at advancement and promotion of scientific knowledge in the field of Bilingual SLI were published by Action members since the last report (see complete list in Annex). Some of these publications reflect previous collaborations of Action members, while others reflect individual initiatives. **Four publications emerged directly** from activities supported by the Action. Numerous papers were presented at conferences and other public events."

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 (e.g., a paper which was supported by an STSM). 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 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.

8. Evaluations – from annual report:

“The main success of COST Action IS0804 is that it gathers a large variety of research experiences in different countries, with their individual histories, backgrounds and linguistic realities and finds common ground. The Action continues to provide an excellent platform for researchers and clinicians to share ideas and advance their research and practical work with bilinguals. Working with colleagues from so many different areas (linguistics, psycho- and neurolinguistics, psychology, speech and language therapy) has opened our eyes to the key issues involved in both bilingualism in general and bilingual SLI more narrowly. We are now actively working towards policy changes — or additions to current policy. We also work more closely with clinicians so we can fruitfully cooperate further with them — and impart our knowledge to them. These exchanges are rich and valuable for better interventions with children with SLI. Networking is also very good for ESRs; the mini workshop on narratives (WG2) in Berlin is a good example.

The different WGs had very productive meetings and decided on the tasks that will be used. WGs are now in the process of creating and piloting tasks to be discussed in the next meeting. Although work is ongoing, it is anticipated that the findings will help to provide an equitable service for bilingual children and their families.

One of the MC members reflected on this year, saying: "I think this is one of the most effective large-scale networks I have been involved in. The academic level is excellent, and the discussions are open-minded and problem and solution focused." There is a general spirit of good cooperation.”

We will get the DC feedback on the report in June.

9. Request for new members

WG1:

Katarzyna Kuś - University of Warsaw (PL)

Prof. Eleni Sella – University of Athens (GR)

Rabea Schwarze - Goethe-University of Frankfurt (DE)

Corinna Koch - Goethe-University of Frankfurt (DE)

Magdalena Wojtecka - Goethe-University Frankfurt (DE)

WG2:

Prof. Wolfgang U. Dressler – Austrian Academy of Sciences (AU)

Antje Skerra – ZAS (DE)

WG3:

Dr. Christophe dos Santos - Université François Rabelais de Tours (FR)

Kirsten Schraeyen - University of Leuven (BE)

WG 4:

Janne von Koss Torkildsen - University of Bergen (NO)

Prof. Zoe Bablekou - Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (GR)

New applications to be approved in Malta should be sent to Natalia, the action secretary (bisli.org@gmail.com) up to two weeks before the meeting.

The MC members voted and approved the applications of new WG members.

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)

From Annual Report (p.9):

- 86% of the Action members and of MC members are female, reflecting the nature of the field. Of the MC members 45 are female and 9 are male. Of the WG members and MC substitutes 91 are female and 13 are male. We are striving to recruit more male participants in order to achieve gender balance.
- 60% of the Action members are Early Stage Researchers (ESR). 31% of MC members are early stage researchers and 74% of WG members and MC substitutes are ESR.

11. Non-COST country participations:

5 non-COST countries (6 institutions) have already joined the action (1 country and a second institution from the US in the past year).

Official applications:

1. Dr. Sonali Nag, Head of the Early Childhood and Primary Education departments The Promise Foundation, Bangalore, India (recommended by Shula)
2. Dr. Enkeleida Kapia, Center for Albanian Studies, National Research Institutes of Linguistics and Literature, Tirana, Albania (recommended by Theo)

The MC members voted and approved the applications of two new non-COST countries.

Expressed interest:

Dr. Linda Hand, Speech Science Program, Dept of Psychology, The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

12. Web news (Kleanthes)

Our website www.bi-sli.org is constantly updated with useful information. Kleanthes has been acting successfully as webmaster. The webpage includes information about both past and future activities as well as separate pages with FAQ for parents and clinicians in several of the Action languages:

- Slovak Version (thanks to Daniela Slančová)
- Norwegian version (thanks to Arve E. Asbjørnsen)
- Polish version (thanks to Ewa Haman and her team)
- French Version (thanks to Laurie Tuller and her team)

We ask for volunteers who are willing to commit themselves to translate the FAQ into other COST languages. This is an important step towards dissemination of the knowledge accumulated by the Action.

12.1 'Affiliated researchers' category for people involved in Bi-SLI in less definite way including everybody who got STSM. This could be also good for students who are involved in some work directly related to Bi-SLI but for a limited period of time.

12.2 Facebook (the page will be available at the end of June 2011)

13. Progress report of working groups - The WGs have all achieved the goal of approaching a methodological agreement by the end of the second year. Scientific reports of the WG leader will be part of the general discussion on May 27.

13.1 Long-term planning

13.2 May 14-16, 2012 – Berlin (Natalia Gagarina)

The local organizers are requested for future meetings to accommodate MC members at the same hotel for the MC members to be able to work together and to advance the Action goals.

The MC members voted and approved the change of location of the 6th MC and WG Meeting.

13.3 Fall 2012 (end of October) – Padua (Chiara Levorato)

Padova is a city of 250.000 people, with 50.000 students, an old university, an old city center. It is half an hour from Venice.

Travel: there are two possible airports: Venice airport 'Marco Polo' and Treviso airport. In both cases there is a bus that leaves from the airport and, with few Euros (4 or 5), arrives at Padova in 45 minutes.

Accommodations: MC members can stay in a beautiful hotel near the site of the meeting (the University, Faculty of Psychology) and the price is 80 euro per person. Others can stay in rooms or apartments for about 30/40 euro per person, breakfast not included.

The MC members voted and approved the change of location of the 7th MC and WG Meeting.

13.4 We can have only one meeting in the winter or early spring of 2013 (February/March) to prepare for the final conference. We have volunteers from Lisbon.

13.5 Training school (2012)

In the MOU we proposed to hold a training school in the third year (2013). We want to check the possibility of doing it adjacent to the international LOT summer school (NL) which offers courses to graduate students. The Action will reimburse the lecturers for travel and accommodation and will provide a financial support for a number of students.

13.6 Final conference – perhaps Krakow end of June / early July 2013 (see below)

Julia writes: “for the time being, it is still allowed to hold the final conference within three months after the official Action end date. However, if you opt for that, the event would be handled as pay-as-go (meaning by us here at the office), and your expenses for the whole

event (including reimbursements) would have to be limited to 40.000 EUR (and these 40.000 EUR would be deducted from the budget of the last grant year). All in all, I would strongly recommend you to organize the final event within the official time frame of the Action. This gives you much more flexibility.”

A more detailed proposal will be available at the next meeting.

14. Place and date of next meeting

November 28-30, 2011 – Malta – Details from Daniela (see Appendix II)

15. AOB

15.1 Status of questionnaires (words by Laurie Tuller)

The questionnaire meeting listened to a couple of pilot studies of the action questionnaire, including suggestions for questions which could be eliminated. It was decided that the action needed two types of questionnaires: a very short version (for some research projects) and a longer one (but greatly reduced from the one piloted). The Tours and Beyrouth teams volunteered to propose a reduced version to be used in further action studies. They will put this on the action Forum for discussion with other interested members, who can choose to use it in studies to be reported in Malta. In Malta we will discuss the reduced version(s) with the aim of adopting an action questionnaire for research, but also to submit to the Assessment Committee for dissemination to clinicians.

15.2 Report of the assessment committee (words by Elin Thordardottir)

The Assessment Committee held its first official meeting at the Action's gathering in Eskisehir. The committee discussed in general terms the potential clinical implications of work coming out of the Cost-Action and ways to maximize the clinical applicability and impact of this work in the future. With some studies underway, but many more to come, the importance of this committee will increase in the coming years. At the present time, one clinical tool is close to being completed - the background questionnaire developed under the leadership of Laurie Tuller. The committee has discussed with Dr. Tuller the future involvement of the Assessment Committee in the eventual adoption of this questionnaire.

Another pressing issue raised by the Assessment Committee concerns the diagnostic criteria used to identify SLI in the various participating countries. It is well known that although there is a general consensus on the conceptual definition of SLI, there is large variability in the evaluation methods used and specific criteria applied to identify a "significant language impairment". Such disparity in methods can have a very important impact on the quality and interpretability of research findings. Across the Working Groups, researchers working in different languages are carefully coordinating their

research tasks to eliminate cross-linguistic confounds and to create tasks that yield meaningful cross-linguistic comparisons. By the same token, it is important to avoid the important confound that is introduced by differences in diagnostic criteria and evaluation methods. A current goal, therefore, of the Assessment Committee is to take steps to attempt to coordinate diagnostic procedures across language groups. As a first step in this process, a questionnaire was circulated prior to the Turkey meeting surveying current diagnostic practices, criteria and availability of assessment tools in various language communities represented within the Action. Representatives of 13 countries responded. An overview of the findings was presented and discussed at the meeting of the Assessment Committee. This overview revealed important discrepancies in diagnostic methods and criteria used. A short overview of the findings is displayed in the ppt. presentation which was presented at the MC meeting (the presentation will be available on the www.bi-sli.org).

The meeting of the Assessment Committee was characterized by much interest and enthusiasm. Several members of the Action who are not official members of the committee attended and shared their points of view. Future plans of the Committee include continued work to provide assistance to researchers in planning their diagnostic protocol for their upcoming studies. To this end, the Assessment Committee will request the provision of a longer meeting time at the next meeting in Malta, including a meeting open to all interested members. More long term goals include the monitoring, and promotion of dissemination of relevant clinical findings to clinical professionals.

15.3 Meeting in Malta

A. Organization of the meeting in Malta:

- 3 full days (4 nights / 6 meals). Save on accommodation.
- Practitioner's event – Daniela will check and let us know by email.
- Poster session
- Parallel sessions with WGs splitting into subgroups, following the model of Cyprus and Turkey

B. The participants' accommodation will be reimbursed based on the tariff negotiated by the local organizer. (see appendix II)

16. Closing

Appendix I - Criteria for attributing STSMs: Fuel for Discussion, and a Couple of Proposals (Laurie Tuller, May 2011)

STSM Evaluations:

1. STSMs since last meeting

Table 1. December 2010 STSMs:

	Last Name	First Name	Title	Affiliation	Host Institute
1.	Sharon	Armon-Lotem	Dr	Bar Ilan University (IL)	City University, London (UK)
2.	Maria	Kambanaros	Dr	University of Cyprus (CY)	Bar-Ilan University (IL)
3.	Marta	Magiera	Ms	Jagiellonian University (PL)	City University, London (UK)
4.	Anna	Tomas	Ms	University of Warsaw (PL)	University of Cambridge (UK)
5.	Alexandr	Kornev	Prof.	St.Petersburg State Pediatric Medical Academy (RU)	ZAS (DE)

Table 2. January- May 2011 STSMs:

	Last Name	First Name	Title	Affiliation	Host Institute
1.	Natalija	Radivojevic	Ms	University of Belgrade (RS)	Arizona State University (US)
2.	Nadine	Calleja	Dr	University of Malta (MT)	City University London (UK)
3.	Kyriaki	Tantele	Ms	CAT (CY)	ZAS (DE)
4.	Esther	Ruigendijk	Dr	University of Oldenburg (DE)	Tel Aviv University (IL)
5.	Carla	Contemori	Ms	University of Siena (IT)	University of Reading (UK)
6.	Anna	Marzecova	Ms	Jagiellonian University (PL)	University of Granada (ES)
7.	Aneta	MIEKISZ	Ms	University of Warsaw (PL)	University of London (UK)
8.	Andrea Anahi	Junyent	Ms	University of Padova (IT)	Arizona State University (US)

2. Summary of the STSMs in this action: 2009, 2010, and 1st Call 2011

Table 3. Number and Budget Requests: Requested versus Granted¹

STSM Call	Requested		Granted	
	Number	Total Budget	Number	Total Budget
Nov 25, 2009	3	3 155 €	3	3 155 €
Jan 31, 2010	4	7 386 €	4	7 386 €
Nov 27, 2010	4	3 813 €	4	3 813 €
Jan 31, 2011	8	10 123 €	8	7 535 €
TOTAL	19	24477	19	21 889 €

¹ I have not included the STSM that was financed directly by COST (St Petersburg to Berlin).

Table 4. Status of STSM Grantees

Early researcher	Status of grantee			
	Other Student	PhD Student	Post-doc	Faculty
3	2			1
3	1	2		1
0	2			3
8		7		1
14	5	9	0	6
74%	26%	47%	0%	32%

Table 5. Which labs sent and which labs received ? (* = lab not member of action IS0804)

Institutions	Lab Grantee	Lab Host
Aalberg, DK: University of Aalberg	1	
Barcelona, ES: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*		2
Belgrade, RS: University of Belgrade, Department of Psychology	1	
Berlin, DE: ZAS		2
Cambridge, UK: Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics, U. of Cambridge		2
Cracow (PL): Jagiellonian University	2	
Granada (ES): University of Granada, Department of Experimental Psychology and Physiology of Behavior		1
London, UK: Psychology and Human Development, Institute of Education, University of London		2,5
Msida (MT): University of Malta,	1	
Nicosia, CY: University of Cyprus	4	
Oldenburg, DE: University of Oldenburg	1	
Padova(IT): Department of Developmental and Socialization Psychology - University of Padova,	1	
Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar Ilan University	2	1
Reading, UK: University of Reading		2,5
Siena, IT: Università degli studi di Siena, Siena	1	1
Tel Aviv, Israel, Language and Brain Lab, School of Education, Tel Aviv University	1	1
Tempe, Arizona, USA: Arizona State University, Department of Speech and Hearing Science		2
Tours, FR: Imagerie & cerveau U930, Inserm & François Rabelais University	1	
Warsaw, PL: Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw	3 ²	1
Zagreb, HR: University of Zagreb		1
TOTAL	19	19

3. The problem

The problem is quite simple: what should be the criteria for granting STSMs for future STSM calls? This problem did not arise for the first three STSMs of Action IS0804, as total requested budgets did not exceed amount allocated (in fact, they were below these amounts)—see Table 3. The last call (January 2011 call) did not follow this pattern:

- (1) Total amount requested by the **8 applications: 10 123€**. Total amount budgeted for this STSM call: **7 500€**. Difference = **2 623€**.

The ensuing discussion (see Section 3) led to need for clarification about decision making. (Another important part of this problem is that the time frame entails that decisions must be made in a few hours, as the STSM deadline is for STSMs that start immediately. Here is the time frame we gave ourselves for the last STSM: “The Cyprus MC meeting voted to open a

call for STSM taking place between January 31st and May 31st. Interested individuals must apply on-line and to me by **January 31st.**")

The points raised are presented in this document. Section 2 gives reminders about COST rules and recommendations for STSMs. Section 3 presents a list of criteria that arose in the exchanges over the January 2011 STSM call, Section 4 gives facts and figures about the four STSM rounds financed by the action so far, and, finally, in Section 5, some proposals for how to proceed.

4. The COST rules and recommendations (see Vademecum)

"The financial contribution for a STSM will be a fixed grant based on the Applicant's budget request and the evaluation of the application by the STSM assessment committee. An amount of EUR 60 to 90 for the daily allowance in particular for longer stays and EUR 300 for the travel is recommended but not obligatory. The total of a STSM shall normally not exceed EUR 2 500 (EUR 3 500 for Early Stage Researchers)."

"It is recommended that this **assessment panel** consists of more than two people in order to avoid a conflict of interest, in addition to one person who is authorised to take the decision (normally the Chair). External advice may be sought."

"MC members and other assessors should not involve themselves in the assessment of proposals in which they have a personal or financial interest. In exceptional circumstances (e.g. uniqueness of expertise), such a bar may be waived with the agreement of the other members involved, if the interest is declared and considered not to compromise the potential decision."

5. The variables raised in e-mail exchanges about January 11th STSM Call

- 1) Is the host an (active) member of the action?
- 2) How closely related to the action is the proposed project?
- 3) Is the applicant a student?
- 4) Is the applicant a full professor?
- 5) the amount of per diem request
- 6) the number of days requests
- 7) previous STSM received in our action
- 8) the amount of travel money requested
- 9) Should one host get to receive more than one STSM?
- 10) Should one lab get to send more than one STSM?
- 11) Should we evaluate the content/quality of the proposed project? (How?)

Various arguments were given for and against taking these variables into account, including: "We should give priority to people who have never done an STSM before, to projects that are tightly related to the action, and then reduce costs according to number of days, per diem, and student/faculty status."

"We should give as many STSMs as possible to foster networking within the action and between the action and other labs, but we can limit the amount of COST IS0804 contribution

² 2 of these STSMs were granted to the same individual

to these stays by reducing the number of days we will finance and the amount of per diem we will contribute to. “

“ Travel money should be limited (and made more equitable more between applicants), along with the other considerations.”

6. Some suggestions and questions

Given that there are now various projects going on in the action, I think we should give priority to **STSMs that are directly related to the action**, and, therefore, that the **host institution** should also be either a member of the action and have some specific expertise that will contribute to the action's goals. I also think that we might consider giving priority to particular meetings of subgroups of WGs to advance work in the action. As for the **status of the applicant**, it seems to me that just knowing that someone is a full professor, for example, doesn't tell us whether they have access to alternative sources of funding (salaries vary widely among the countries in the action, especially in these times of government austerity measures). I therefore think that this criterion is simply not possible to apply, and therefore that we should limit ourselves to the “early researcher” criterion. I also think we should give priority to **action members who have not benefited from an STSM**. If we continue to grant STSMs the way we did in the most recent call, we will be able to grant approximately 20 STSMs per call, which, with maximum 5 remaining calls (1 in 2011, 2 in 2012, and 2 in 2013), means there are potentially around 100 STSMs left. Do we want to try to spread these out among labs (in terms of grantees and hosts)? As to **evaluating the content/quality of the project**, this would entail a commitment on the part of the Steering Committee to spend time really looking at the proposals, and grading them, the way we would, say, a conference abstract. I think most of us would agree that this needs to be done to some degree. This raises the question of who is to do this among the Steering Group. My suggestion would be that the **assessment panel** consist of Steering Group members (a minimum of 3 people, I think, but , of course, all information would be sent to all members, as in the past) who are neither potential grantees nor potential hosts for that particular STSM round, and that, furthermore, we set up a clearer time frame. (People need time to buy their tickets, etc. and we need time to make decisions, and notify people of the decision.) My suggestion for the next call:

Appendix II

FIFTH MC AND WG MEETING 28TH TO 30TH NOVEMBER, 2011

MEETING VENUE

San Antonio Hotel and Spa, St Paul's Bay, Malta

ACCOMODATION

San Antonio Hotel and Spa, St Paul's Bay, Malta

The **Accomodation Reservation Form** will be on the Action website following the Fourth MC and WG Meeting held in Turkey. Once completed, the form is to be e-mailed directly to the Hotel (e-mail address on Form).

Conference accommodation package (4 nights: 27th November to 1st December, 2011)

In Twin Room on Bed & Breakfast basis: €132.00 per person

In Twin Room on Half board basis: €172.00 per person

In Double for Sole use on Bed & Breakfast basis: €182.00

In Double for Sole use on Half Board Basis: €222.00

Extra nights: either before or after conference

In Twin room on Bed & Breakfast basis: €17.50 per person per night

In Double for Sole use on Bed & Breakfast basis: €30.00 per night

If delegates will be staying for fewer nights, they are to e-mail Hotel for the relevant accommodation rate (e-mail address on Accomodation Reservation Form).

Hotel facilities:

- Free use of wellness centre, including gym, sauna, steam bath, indoor pool, jacuzzi
- Free use of safe in room

These clauses should be negotiated as they are unacceptable for most of the Action members: Rooms are secured until 15th September 2011. Following this date, rooms are not guaranteed and rates may increase. **So, as far as possible, accommodation is to be booked by 15th September.** A 35% deposit will be charged. **This is fully refundable if cancellation is made by 15th September.**

Persons staying elsewhere will each need to pay €50 at the hotel to attend the meeting, so it is highly recommended to stay at the hotel.

TRAVEL INFORMATION

Airlines flying to and from Malta International Airport include:

Air Berlin

Air Malta

Alitalia

bmibaby

Brussels Airlines

easyJet

Emirates

KLM

Lufthansa

Norwegian Air Shuttle

Ryanair

Spanair

Transfers by taxi to and from hotel are to be booked together with accommodation. Payment for transfers will be made at hotel upon arrival.

If delegates arriving at similar times form groups of 5 persons or over, they are to contact the hotel regarding the possibility of a group transfer by minibus, which will be cheaper than taxi transfer.

TOURISM INFORMATION

The hotel is only a few minutes' walk away from the seafront. There is a man-made sandy beach close by, and several pubs, restaurants and shops are within easy reach. The Qawra Bus Terminus, with buses travelling to different parts of the island, is only a two-minute walk away.

More information on tourist attractions can be found on :

<http://www.visitmalta.com/main?l=1>

Details on guided bus tours can be found on the following websites:

<http://www.maltasightseeing.com/EN/content/50>

<http://www.city-sightseeing.com/index.phtml?command=search&clear-search=true&destinations=Malta>