

### New criteria for STSMs

The criteria proposed by the STSM Manager (Massimo Salgaro) in accordance with Anne Mangen (Chair) and Adriaan van der Weel (Vice-Chair) and proposed to the MC are the following:

- Three calls will be announced at the beginning of each budget year in order to permit E-READ members to schedule and prepare their STSMs and to approach their potential hosts. For 2017/2018 the **deadlines** are:  
10.05.2017  
10.08.2017  
10.11.2017
- As the STSMs are intended as a contribution towards the costs of a mission and regrettably cannot be fully funded by E-READ, our members are invited to seek further financial aid from other, such as local or national, sources. The Management Committee of COST Action IS 1404 has allocated a total budget of **EUR 12.350** for STSMs (budget of first call: EUR 4.100, second call: EUR 4.100, third call: 4.150).
- There will be two different types of STSMs:
  1. Working group STSMs (WG STSMs)
  2. Open STSMs (OP STSMs)The applicants should clearly express in their application which type of STSM they are applying for.

#### 1. WG STSMs

- The WG STSMs follow a top down approach and respond to the specific needs of every working group. The purpose of an STSM is to contribute to the overall scientific objectives of the COST Action, whilst at the same time enabling eligible Researchers to learn new techniques or gain access to specific expertise, instruments and/or methods not available in their own institutions. As the goal of E-READ is to gain new knowledge about the cognitive implications of paper vs. digital reading, priority will be given to STSMs focused on empirical (e.g., experimental) and interdisciplinary research. If the expected outcome of the STSM is an experiment, applicants should clearly state so in their motivation letter and describe its design. Furthermore, the applicants should explain the importance of their STSM within the goals of the chosen Working group.
- For each STSM call there will be 4 WG STSMs, that is one for each WG of E-READ. Each call announces the evaluation criteria of the WG STSMs established by the leaders of each WG. Well before the deadline, applicants should contact the WG members or WG leaders and prepare a plan for collaborative work. In each call, priority is given to WG STSMs: Only when the costs of WG STSMs are covered, the rest of the money is allocated to the open STSMs. Thus, the grants of the WG STSMs are variable, whereas the grants of OP STSMs are fixed.
- The WG STSMs are evaluated by 4 reviewers drawn of the evaluation committee which consists of the leaders of each WG and by the STSM manager, the Chair, the

Vice-Chair. Every WG should advertise its WG STSMs through appropriate channels and among the related scientific communities.

- Instead of granting a fixed sum to each STSM (as in the previous GP; 900/STSM), grants will be based on daily allowances differentiated according to cost of living of the host country and length of stay.

Cost of living: Taking into consideration the socio-economic status of the host country, the European countries can be divided into 4 groups (following Erasmus +), with a ratio of 16:14:12:10 as follows:

Group A (16): Denmark, Norway, Ireland, The Netherlands, Sweden, Great Britain

Group B (14): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Turkey

Group C (12): Germany, Latvia, Macedonia, Malta, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain

Group D (10): Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania

Length of stay: STSMs can have a duration of between 5 days and 90 days (and up to 180 days if the applicant is an Early Stage researcher).

The assessments are based on a 20 points scale (20 = highest evaluation, 0 lowest evaluation) in order to give more detailed and synthetic evaluations. The different assessment criteria are:

1. Evaluation of the motivation letter, which includes an overview of the proposed activities that will be performed. The letter must contain a plan of work for the visit, highlighting the proposed contribution to the scientific objectives of the relevant WG. The proposed STSM should fit the goals expressed by the evaluation criteria established by the WG leaders on each call.

1-10 points (10 points = highest evaluation, 1 point = lowest evaluation)

2. As the call encourages the participation of “Early-Stage Researchers” (ESR) in STSMs, a differentiation in age, based on the ERC calls, will be made in order to foster the participation of young scholars:

➤ Phd-Student: 5 points

➤ Starting grant researcher (1-7 years from the award date of the applicants PhD and the date of the applicants first involvement in the COST Action): 4 points

➤ Consolidator grant researcher (7-12 years from the award date of the applicants PhD and the date of the applicants first involvement in the COST Action): 3 points

➤ Advanced grant researcher (more than 12 years from the award date of the applicants PhD and the date of the applicants first involvement in the COST Action): 2 points

➤ Senior researcher (professor, retired professor or researcher): 1 point

The award date of the applicant’s PhD and the current position should be included in the CV.

3. Evaluation of CV (track record and publication list): 1-5 points (5 points = highest evaluation, 1 point = lowest evaluation)

## 2. OPEN STSMs

The Open STSMs follow a bottom-up approach and are open to proposals from every E-READ member and can concern one or more WGs. The applicants should contact the WG leaders well before the deadline to see if the STSM fits the goals of the WG and to discuss the potential work plan.

The OP STSMs are evaluated by 4 reviewers from the evaluation committee, which consists of the Chair, the Vice-Chair, WG leaders and deputies, and the STSM Manager. The selection of the reviewers is based on the topic of the STSMs and the WG to which they most obviously belong.

The assessments are based on a 20 points scale (20 = highest evaluation, 0 lowest evaluation) in order to give more detailed and synthetic evaluations. The different assessment criteria are:

1. Evaluation of the motivation letter, which includes an overview of the proposed activities that will be performed. The letter must contain a plan of work for the visit, highlighting the proposed contribution to the scientific objectives of the COST Action IS-1404. Furthermore, it is necessary that the proposed activity fits in the activities of the host institution (s. Letter of invitation).  
1-5 points (5 points = highest evaluation, 1 point = lowest evaluation)
2. As the call encourages the participation of “Early-Stage Researchers” (ESR) in STSMs, we propose a differentiation of age based on the ERC calls to foster the participation of young scholars:
  - Phd-Student: 5 points
  - Starting grant researcher (1-7 years from the award date of the applicants PhD and the date of the applicants first involvement in the COST Action): 4 points
  - Consolidator grant researcher (7-12 years from the award date of the applicants PhD and the date of the applicants first involvement in the COST Action): 3 points
  - Advanced grant researcher (more than 12 years from the award date of the applicants PhD and the date of the applicants first involvement in the COST Action): 2 points
  - Senior researcher (professor, retired professor or researcher): 1 point

The award date of the applicant’s PhD and the current position should be included in the CV.

3. Evaluation of CV (track record and publication list): 1-5 points (5 points = highest evaluation, 1 point = lowest evaluation)

4. Evaluation of the applicant's involvement in the ongoing COST-activities of IS 1404; We propose to reward the more active members (e.g. a WG leader should be privileged compared to a more passive member); relevant questions could be:
- Did s/he organize or plan a conference within our network?
  - How long has s/he been part of our COST-Action from the beginning or did s/he join the Action later?
  - Does s/he already benefit from external funds for their STSM? How much?
- 1-5 points (5 points = highest evaluation, 1 point = lowest evaluation)