

Board of Directors of the Organization for Computational Neuroscience

Minutes of the Meetings of July 21, 2012

Meeting started at 2 pm, 18 board members in attendance (and 1 non-voting local organizer - Rob Butera):

Avrama Blackwell, Erik Fransen, Victoria Booth, Volker Steuber, Jeanette Hellgren Koteleski, Astrid Prinz, Axel Hutt, Ron Calabrese, Udo Ernst, Boris Gutkin, Erik De Schutter, Maurice Chacron, Alex Dmitrov, Alla Borisyuk, Gaute Einevoll, Carmen Canavier, Markus Diesman, Nathan Schultheiss.

Introductions. Three of the four new board members (elected last fall) attended the meeting: and were introduced: Alla Borisyuk, Maurice Chacron, Gaute Einevoll. The fourth elected member - Bruce Graham, was not in attendance. Boris Gutkin is new to the board as representative of the local organizers for the 2013 CNS meeting in Paris.

Agenda

0) Approval of the Agenda, addition of points.

1) Legal matters

- 1.a Election of President
- 1.b New ex officio directors for 2013
- 1.c Executive Committee: composition for 2013
- 1.d Director elections:
 - analysis of 2011 elections, any changes to procedures?
 - Nomination committee 2012:

2) Members

- 2.a Report on membership and dues
- 2.b Members Meeting
- 2.c Honorary members
- 2.d Membership drive

3) CNS meetings

- 3.a Report on CNS*2012
- 3.b New procedures to check registration of abstract presenting authors
- 3.c Report on CNS*2013 planning
- 3.d Planning for the Program Committee
- 3.e Planning for Tutorials and Workshops
- 3.f Function of liaison to local organizer
- 3.g Travel grant and tutorial/workshop support procedures
- 3.h CNS*2014 and call for CNS*2015

4) Financial matters

- 4.a Financial report including estimate of 2012 expenses and CNS*2012 budget
- 4.b Sponsoring
- 4.c Financial planning for 2013
- 4.d Budget approval

5) Task division within the Board

- 5.a Reassignment of tasks within the board for 2013
- 5.b Future task divisions

6) Other matters

- 6.a OCNS and social media: Facebook, compneuro mailing list, twitter?
- 6.b OCNS sponsored meetings and courses
- 6.c Abstract submission, reviewing, program book etc for 2013: detailed planning of improved workflows

0. Agenda was presented. Two items were added to “Other matters”:

- a. Web content
- b. Mailing lists.

1. Legal matters.

1.a. We need to elect a new president. Erik D.S. sent out an email asking for candidates. No one volunteered. Under our Bylaws, officers can be re-elected. Erik D.S. mentioned that if he is re-elected, his term will total 5 years when this new term is finished, and he intends to step down at that time. Therefore, current board members, especially the new ones, need to think about this for the future.

Erik D.S. stepped out while the remaining board members discussed and voted. There were two positive comments, and no negative comments about Erik D.S.. Carmen C moved that we elect Erik D.S. President. Victoria B seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Erik D.S. was invited back into the room. It was recommended that Erik D.S. prepare a document outlining his duties - not the ones done to get the OCNS set-up, but the ones that will need to be continued. Another recommendation was that next year, those who are interested in being president, begin to “shadow” the president to learn some of those duties. Erik D.S. pointed out that the past-president stays a member of the board to help mentor the new president.

1.b. New ex-officio members of the board

Several board members will be rotating off, and either they need to be replaced, or their duties need to be re-assigned.

1.b.1. Carmen C is currently sponsorship chair. She said she typically gets 3-5 sponsors per year. Neuralynx, Brain Corp, and Springer were sponsors this year. Rob Butera, a local organizer, got a lot of other sponsors this year. He mentioned that Mathworks is potentially interested, but needs to be contacted early, say Jan-Mar time frame. It was suggested that Rob B should run for elections and possibly take over Sponsorship in the future.

1.b.2. Alex D is workshop chair. The workshop chair will pass to Volker S, who is assistant workshop chair. We need to appoint new assistant workshop chair to one of the new elected members.

1.b.3. Jean Marc Fellows is the ex-officio member who is publication chair. Astrid recommended that Gennady Cymbaluk be made publication chair. The role is to prepare abstracts for the BMC submission. The possibility that Gennady C would run for election was discussed, and then we would appoint him ex-officio if he was not elected. Traditionally publication chair is not duty performed by board member because it is more related to the CNS program. So, we decided to appoint Gennady C. ex-officio as publication chair.

1.b.4. Erik F is rotating off as past local organizer. He will be replaced by Maurice C who will become an ex-officio board member as future local organizer. The complication is that Maurice C is a newly elected board member. There was a discussion about whether to keep Maurice C as elected, or replace him and make him just an ex-officio member. The issues have to do with number of years on the board (one additional year as past local organizer) and duties (he will be too involved in local organization to assist with travel). Alex D made the recommendation that instead of the board deciding, Maurice C should officially resign from the board if he agrees that is the best solution. If he resigns prior to the Fall elections, then 5 new directors will be elected this year.

NOTE ADDED: Maurice C submitted his resignation as elected director effective December 31, 2012 by e-mail on July 24.

1.b.5. Nathan S is rotating off as postdoc representative and also does member approvals. This involves verifying that the member applicant belongs to the university or department listed in application, or possibly searching for the member applicant when no university or institute is listed, which is more work. Member approvals is done once per week, and only 1 ever denied (the applicant was emailed and never responded). Gaute E. agreed to take on member approvals. Avrama B recommended that Institute be made a required field in the application to facilitate the verification process.

1.b.6. Lars Schwaber is rotating off. He is currently webmaster. These duties will be transferred to a new board member. This duty requires some skill, so if no newly elected board member is suitable, an ex-officio board member will have to be appointed.

1.c. Executive committee composition for 2013.

Automatic members are President (Erik D.S.), Vice President/Secretary (Avrama B) Treasurer (Victoria B) and Past President (Ranu Jung). Two are elected. The current elected members are Carmen C, who is rotating off, and Astrid P. Marcus D volunteered to replace Carmen C. No one objected, so Marcus D is the new 6th Exec Comm member.

The exec committee also has a non-voting member. Ron was the non-voting member last year. It was recommended that Boris G become the new non-voting member. No one objected.

1.d. Director elections

There will be four positions (or 5 if Maurice C resigns).

Last year there were many more candidate than expected. Feedback on the process from the newly elected members was sought. Maurice C said the procedure was straightforward. After the initial browser problem was fixed, there were no more problems. Member voting was good: 46% of all members. The highest participation was from post-docs. 20% voted for 1, 13% voted for 2, 18% voted for 3, 26% voted for 4. Smaller percents voted for more. Some of the winners received significantly higher votes, but other winners only received one higher vote. There was another group receiving significantly lower votes. Overall assessment is that the procedure worked really well, and we should continue with the same procedure. The only concern for the next election is that we want to get a new post-doc member on the board. Erik presented two possibilities. (A) we request the members to cast at least 1 vote for a post-doc candidate. (B) If no post-doc candidate receives enough votes, we select the post-doc candidate with the greatest votes as the new post-doc candidate. After discussion of these, with no new solutions presented, we voted. The outcome was 10 votes for B and 8 votes for A. Note that implementing (B) will not prevent more than 1 post-doc being elected. Erik D.S. presented a suggested calendar of elections, which was accepted. The nomination committee for 2012 needs additional members. Two members from last year (Erik D.S. and Axel H.) are still on the committee. Duties include checking the outcome, and supervising the elections. Last year the committee also had to fine tune the rules, but this is not needed this year. Alex D. And Maurice C. volunteered for the committee.

2. Members

2.a.1. Report on 313 active (paying) members. 125 Faculty, 69 PostDocs, 119 Students. 317 non-active members (did not pay the 2012 dues). We discussed what to do about these non-active members. Erik D.S. informed us that once we have more than 1000 members (active or inactive) our MemberClicks costs go up. We can't delete the inactive member records without losing transaction information, which has tax implications. In addition, if we delete them, then they would have to reapply later if they want to have member benefits again. Erik D.S. proposed three possible solutions. (A) we charge a fee for re-activating inactive members. (B) we charge no fee for re-activating inactive members.(C) We make inactive members pay for all inactive years. Active discussion ensued. There is some work involved in implementing options (A) and (B). It is likely that many of the inactive members will re-activate for European conferences. We might want to eliminate inactive members after multiple inactive years. We will need to continue tracking membership patterns, and also look into tax laws regarding financial records. The general consensus was for option (B): that we do not charge for inactive years, or any fee. We include inactive members in the total membership count, though they are not entitled to any member benefits and cannot vote.

2.a.2 Multi-year memberships. Last year we implemented the option for paying 2 years at once, with a 50% discount for the second year. This was quite successful: two thirds of members paid for 2 years. A three year option was suggested and agreed to, with the same 50% discount for the third year. It is likely we will have fewer inactive members with a three year membership costing the same as two years. Member approval process was discussed. Currently it is once per week, more frequent during busy times. Problems arose close to early registration and abstract submission deadline. A blackout period around these deadlines was suggested. The same endpoint can be achieved if we announce membership application deadlines several days prior to these other deadlines (similar to what SFN does).

2.b. There is a members meeting on Tuesday and the agenda has been posted.

2.c. Honorary members. Presently we have one: Will Rall. We discussed whether we wanted more, and what the criteria should be. "Retired only" was suggested but not agreed upon. Other suggestions: Leaders in the field, Service to OCNS. Having members nominate or suggest candidates was suggested, but all agreed that the board should ultimately decide among the nominations. Voting for honorary members could alienate unsuccessful candidates. We decided to put honorary members (criteria, procedures) on the agenda for next year. Inviting honorary members to the conference makes this a real cost, but perhaps we can get sponsorship for the position.

2.d. Member drive (Alla B. leads discussion)

Last year we placed flyers at the SFN Comp Neuro social. We are currently working on flyers for the Paris mtg for the SFN 2012 social. Also the NY Acad Sci Neural coding meeting will place flyers. Alla B. will inquire whether the SIAM life sciences meeting will place flyers. She solicited other venues, and also what info to place on the flyer. Volker S. suggested FENS, and ANN meetings. Astrid P. suggested that flyers be placed on the website for members to take to other meetings they attend. Also, email the flyer to members requesting they post at their institutes. Requesting Ann at Springer take flyers to her other meetings was suggested. Erik D.S. said he would do this.

3. CNS meetings

3.a. Astrid provided report on submissions. Registration is ~10% higher than San Antonio (Ron C. reported 347 as latest numbers). Astrid P. reported trend of slightly more submissions from faculty. Only 28 travel applications were submitted. All were funded. This may have been due to the new requirement for 3 page extended abstract (instituted to allow for more reasonable review.) All agreed that this should be kept, but we need to announce it better. Nathan S. reported not being aware of new rule until he was at end of submission process. Award amounts were \$200, \$400 or \$800 depending on location.

3.b. Astrid P. discussed new rules on submission. There must be a registered member on each submission. Members may sponsor 2 abstracts, non-members may sponsor only 1 abstract. These rules resulted in 5 withdrawals this year, but no one thought this was bad - it might decrease empty poster boards, which really looks bad to conference attendees. The problem is that enforcing this rule entailed lots of work to cross check different lists - the abstract submission from ConfMaster and the registration from MemberClicks. Then multiple emails needed to be sent to make sure the abstract submitters registered. This is too much work for a volunteer position, and most of us agreed that we need a method to improve this. A single website for abstract and registration would be ideal, but Jean Marc F. looked into this last year and was unable to find a single system that would do all of this. One solution is to require registration first, then the registrant receives a ConfMaster login. This is similar to what FENS does now. Few might still need some verification, because a member gets two logins and could give one of theirs to someone else. We would have to guarantee a 100% refund to those whose abstracts were rejected, though this is a small number. A second solution is to submit the abstract on MemberClicks, then transfer the abstract to ConfMaster after the submission deadline. Then we could allow a later registration. We could automatically verify registration, and batch send emails for non-registrants. Option 1 might be difficult for students who have trouble finding travel money until late. Option 2 is difficult for members editing their abstracts prior to BMC publication and after the abstracts were transferred to ConfMaster. We had additional discussion on the pros and cons of these options. We are all aware that some people might not submit because of these new rules, though we should still have an extremely high number for the Paris meeting. Ron C. moved to accept option 1 (register prior to submission). Avrama B. seconded. The vote was 18 for, 0 against. It was pointed out that we get lots of submissions after our first deadline, thus we will need to continue to have an extended deadline. This will be especially important with the new registration rules. In addition, we should put this on our flyer, send multiple emails, and make it prominent on all websites. The board will need to test the system early.

Ron C. mentioned that the local organizer is given control of the meeting part of the website. Thus, Boris G. must find someone to do this. Ron C. said that a standard program written to extract information would be great. Udo E. has started procedures for ConfMaster and the program book.

3.c. 2013 planning.

Boris G. Presented a power point summary of meeting planning so far. Several additional points were made. 1. Someone suggested that we provide 3-4 day metro cards in the registration packets, to save attendees from having to purchase these themselves. 2. Udo was concerned that 500 m² room was not

enough for posters. He recommended 5 m² per poster. If we assume 400 posters and 3 sessions, that is 140/session, and 70 boards. This is barely big enough. Boris G mentioned there is another, bigger room. Udo E will provide the numbers from Berlin, and Boris G will look into it. He mentioned it will be !3-4k euros more for a bigger room. 3. Hotels. We could provide a list of hotels in the 100-150 euro range. We might want to contact them even if we don't make any deals. Or, we might have a management company to negotiate rates and bookings, but this will have an expense associated with it. Erik F. mentioned that in Stockholm, the company was only interested in the high priced hotel, but was free. Erik D.S. mentioned that we do not want the internet price to end up being cheaper than booking through CNS. Boris emphasized that people should book hotels at least 4 months in advance because July is the height of the tourist season.

3.d. Program committee planning.

Current members are listed on the handout from Astrid P. Four are rotating off. An email was sent out to active faculty for volunteers. There were number of responses, that pool will be used to replace PC members rotating off, while keeping the balance (gender, scientific area, geographic distribution).

One issue was whether to continue with themes for the CNS meeting. The advantage is that it attracted a novel workshop this year, and possibly attendees who wouldn't come otherwise. The disadvantage is that it constrains the keynote speakers, makes it difficult to obtain higher profile speakers. In addition we won't want to scare off someone who normally attends. An extensive discussion ensued. One compromise is to have themes sometimes, such as when a good theme is suggested. Also, could select one high profile speaker (not all three), and then see whether a theme can be organized around that person. This also helps prevent recycling of the same high profile speakers all the time. Astrid P. asked for confirmation that the board is no longer requiring the PC to force a theme. It was also suggested that the members would be asked for their opinion on themes at the member meeting, but that this would be advisory only. This year there were two oral cancellations, and one occurred two days prior to the meeting. No pattern causing those cancellations was observed. The early cancellation was replaced, but the late one was not due to lateness. One possibility mentioned was to have an unofficial waiting list. Also, board members could possibly give a talk at the last minute. The unofficial wait list seemed to be the preferred suggestion, but that probably only more senior faculty could prepare a talk in such little time. Nathan S. suggested that we leave it up to the PC chair's discretion how to fill the slot. I.e., there is no need to go down the wait list in order.

Meeting was adjourned at 6 pm.

Minutes of the Meetings of July 23, 2012

Meeting started at 12:15, 19 board members in attendance:

Avrama Blackwell, Erik Fransen, Victoria Booth, Volker Steuber, Jeanette Hellgren Kotaleski, Astrid Prinz, Axel Hutt, Ron Calabrese, Udo Ernst, Boris Gutkin, Erik De Schutter, Maurice Chacron, Alex Dmitrov, Alla Borisyuk, Gaute Einevoll, Carmen Canavier, Markus Diesman, Nathan Schultheiss, Bruce Graham

3.d. continued Looking for potential successor for Astrid P. (term ends after Paris meeting). Looking at current program committee members. Perhaps need more senior faculty with management experience, perhaps higher scientific profile. Erik D.S. and Astrid P. have already asked one person, and they are waiting for response. Should we have pictures of PC members on the website? Advantage: opportunity for members to talk directly to PC. Astrid P. will request PC to send pix to Erik D.S.. Discussed whether we want PC to be elected. Difficulty is maintaining balance across scientific disciplines, as well as gender and geography. Alternative PC chair names was discussed. One or two other current PC members was mentioned. Possibly one of the new members would be good, since they will have a year of experience before they need to take over. This means PC chair must make sure there are sufficient numbers of sufficiently senior people. Volker S. pointed out that there are no junior (un-tenured) faculty on the current PC. One difficulty is that not all PC members are active. Erik D.S. recommended that the PC chair might want to request resignation of members that are inactive. Main PC duties are review of poster abstracts (given that very few are rejected, the PC doesn't shape conference this way), selection of keynote speakers, which can influence attendance. Consensus is that PC should continue to select their own members, but can use the pool of volunteers from the email announcement.

3.e. Tutorials and Workshops:

Tutorials: Initially difficulty finding tutorials due to time of year. Ultimately 7 tutorials and 15 speakers. Guidance was 1 speaker per tutorial (which will cost \$7000 this year.) Budget was 10k, but that was based on 10 tutorial expectation: ~1k per. Tutorial speakers are happy with this. Attendance numbers given. Ranged from 6 (self-invited tutorial) to 25. Total numbers > 100. ~1/3 of main meeting. Udo E. thought this was good. Markus D. noted good discussions in the tutorials. Discussion of making slides available, before for attendees, possibly after for all members. Tutorials support the educational mission of OCNS. Resources website is only open for members. (Publications contains meeting abstracts - available to non-members also.) Should we make resources available to non-members? Presently even members are not using it. We've already instituted other member benefits. Even if resources are generally available, tutorials should be only available to members. Will slide availability decrease tutorial attendance? Ron C. thinks that people will still attend because you get much more out of it. We still have to get permission from tutorial givers. Requiring them might discourage some people, so perhaps we should strongly encourage but not require. We can post previous years as advertisement for future tutorials. One complaint was lack of coffee for tutorials. Boris G. was advised to have coffee for tutorials. Boris G. stated that cost estimate already includes tutorial coffee. Budget for next year tutorials will be 10k plus waivers. We will gather tutorial slides and post them on website.

Workshops: Alex D. reported that Pipeline is well established. He gets proposals on a regular basis. Several places where call for workshops is posted. Volker S. will have hard job next year because he will probably have to turn down workshops. This year there were 10 workshop proposals, possibly slightly more than this meeting can support. Some are 2 day. This year we had 7 WS on one day and 6 WS on another. Udo E. reported they had 10 rooms in Berlin. Currently Boris G. has 10 rooms reserved, which will support ~15 WS if some are 2 day. Workshop selection is becoming more important. ~1/3 of registrations are workshop only. There is a craving for small focused meetings. Some attendees complained about cost of workshop. Budget is 10k. Alex D. emails organizers that they have ~1k budget (not all workshops request money, those that do ask ~1k). Alex fills funding requests as they come in until money is low, then becomes more selective. One organizer arranged other funding. Since we are requiring registration early, we might need workshops decided prior to this.

Discussion on workshop cost. It is mostly expensive for non-members. We are cheaper than COSYNE by ~\$100 for non-members (even cheaper for members). Possibly we should put link to membership on the page listing rates. Some won't join because registration is reimbursed by grants, but not membership. Selection criteria for workshops? That's up to Volker S, but we should discuss at Board meeting. If they become very popular, we might need workshop committee. Most felt a committee was not needed presently. Possible criteria: (1) no largely similar workshops. Encourage similar proposers to fuse - this has been successful sometimes in the past, or the organizers will adjust their topic to be more different. (2) Discourage previous years? No, repeating a previous workshop makes the job easier for organizers. (3) A written proposal allows workshop chair to see how well organized the workshop is. Those with confirmed speakers can be favored. There are written workshop criteria, but they don't need to be enforced. Alex D. encourages more organization from more spontaneous submissions, and encourages more discussion time in those which are more symposium like. (4) Deadlines - after which workshops may or may not be considered. Do we want to require more discussion period in the symposium type of workshops? More experienced organizers usually allow this time. One symposium this year has posters. Drifting toward more formal workshops may be side effect of having separate registration fee (instead of embedding within meeting). People can't commit without this organization. Recommendation that announcement be earlier (Oct-Nov) and that strong recommendation be made for early submission because competition is expected to be strong. Alex D. brought up the possibility of posting workshop slides. This should be optional since these are research talks. Preferred format of slides for tutorials and workshops is PDF, not PPT. Video taping is another possibility. This is expensive to do well.

Boris G. brought up satellite meetings: One person has requested having such. Erik D.S. responded that we can't prevent this. We would prefer to have this be a workshop. A real satellite gives us no financial return, and it might be competition for workshops. But, this might be a benefit in that some people might stay for main meeting. SFN allows this, but then you pay a lot of money for the facilities. Could a satellite benefit OCNS? Reduced fees for members, require attendees to join OCNS? May depend on the scope of the satellite.

Alex D. brought up possibility of teleconferencing for attendance of workshops and tutorials. This might impose a large duty on local organizer. We might only be able to do this for a small subset of rooms. Need to discuss a cost model. Must be able to guarantee video/audio quality. Otherwise we should not do it. Alex D. wants to try a few test cases of streaming next year. This is easier than video, but might still be difficult to implement next year. Axel H. reminded us of Springer book possibilities for workshops. Alex responded that this is indeed in the call for workshops.

Workshop budget for next year: There will be more workshops and we are losing Ranu's grants, so we probably need a larger budget. 15k suggested and accepted.

3.f. Function of liaison to local organizer. Udo E. reported it was easy this year. Ron C mentioned that many of his people greatly appreciated his help. Erik F. agreed. Udo E. is on board for one more year. Afterward we will have to consider extending or replacing him.

3.g. Travel grant and tutorial/workshop support (Jeanette H.K.)

We discussed this on July 21. It is great they have to submit summary. 24 complete, non-local applications. Budget spent is only 13k - this is quite small. We should keep same procedures but advertise better. The budget was actually 40k, with 5k for special awards, but we just didn't need it this year. Erik recommends that this budget be kept for next year.

Alla B. Recommended that call for abstracts be much shorter. List keynote speakers, but not workshop description, etc. Then travel awards becomes more prominent. Can also have a separate email for travel awards. Have link to workshops, etc. This will work if we have Paris website working early. Call for abstracts should not direct to general OCNS website, but meeting website. Have the critical items, such as call for abstracts, travel awards, more prominent. The Paris website will go live (without info and links) next week. Then Boris will be able to edit content. We could put link to apply for travel grant on the abstract submission confirmation page. Currently we put information, but a link might be better.

3.h. Future CNS meetings: CNS 2014: Quebec City (Maurice C.)

CNS 2015: call for European location is open. Only 1 inquiry. Erik is considering Antwerp, but would recuse himself from those discussions. Some private discussions about Prague. Same as last year, all proposals will be put on the website for access by board members. If Antwerp is submitted, Avrama will take over leading the discussions and voting for location.

Erik D.S. proposed that from 2016 on the call would be for a non-European location (instead of North American), therefore opening the possibility for meetings in Asia, Australia etc. Questions were asked about organizing CNS in Okinawa, but this would be costly because hotels are very expensive in July due to large numbers of tourists in July. Kobe conference center has contacted Erik D.S. Erik suggested they find a scientific organizer partner and consider submitting for 2016. Anthony Burkitt may be considering Australia for 2016.

4. Financial matters

4.a. Financial report (Victoria). We are in very good shape after Stockholm. Balance increased from 178k to 315k. For this meeting we will be in good shape. At present an estimated income of 18k, but there may be a few additional expenses. If we had spent our entire travel grant budget, the 18k might have been negative, but they do spend on registration so it wouldn't be too negative. We expect that NA meetings don't have a big profit, but we would like to avoid negatives. We have a new category: OCNS sponsored travel awards to other meetings. Fixed administrative costs is < 5k which is satisfactory - much smaller than the 25k membership dues. Additional discussion ensued about various budget line items. Boris requested an estimated budget from Victoria. Erik mentioned that OCNS doesn't really provide budget, but does provide advanced costs for deposits. Membership dues might decline with 2, 3 year membership fees, but we might get more money since many more people might join since Paris. We need to keep track of membership fees for these different categories.

4.b. Sponsoring (Carmen) - done on 21st.

4.c. Financial planning for 2013. We discussed budget for tutorials (10K), workshops (15k), travel (40 k plus additional 5k). We need to discuss travel support of sponsored meetings. For 2012 7.8 k has everything except ~1.5k for one student going to for ACCN 2012 in Poland. Erik provided list of conferences that we sponsored, either by providing travel grants to members, or other expenses. We also provided travel grants to courses. We received good publicity at many of these meetings. When board members hear about meetings that would be a suitable link, OCNS exec committee should be put in contact. The only real requirement is that we can provide benefits to members. The organizers will have to help us identify which of their applicants are OCNS members. For the courses, we offered two travel grants to each course (LASCON, ACCN), but the course only identified one member. In some cases we provide the money directly to the organization who then provides the travel to the student. We contacted Woods Hole CNS course, but did not receive a response from them. We must decide on budget for next year. Erik proposes that we allocate 15k this year. The budget was 12 k last year, and our budget would have been closer to this had there been two students for each course. No one objected. If we need more the executive committee can decide to increase budget. Avrama asked should we have a process for selecting meetings? Presently we do it as a first come first serve basis, and we have not gone over our budget. Erik suggested that we should keep it low key, as is, until we have too many requests. Then we can formalize the process.

4d. Budget approval. Erik moved we accept. Volker seconded. Board voted unanimously to accept budget.

5 Task division within the board. Erik repeated what we agreed on at the July 21 meeting.

6a. OCNS and social media (presentation by Gaute)

We have website.

We have a facebook person. It was set up after last year's meeting. It was setup by Malin of INCF, and difficult to transfer to Gaute as person. Alternative is to setup facebook page (easier to transfer admin), and that was done for this meeting. We should do that for each meeting. Room sharing is one possibility (though that was done this year by local organizers). We have the comp-neuro mailing list set up a long time ago. There is a Springer site, and CNS presence on that site: a specific CNS meeting group in NeuronNet. There are also independent groups that are related to comp neuro. On facebook, on google+, on linkedin, on NeurOnLine (Comp Neuro on SFN); on Frontiers there is a blog. It is unclear how much these are used, and these are comp Neuro, not CNS specific.

In addition to meeting facebook page, Gaute suggested a facebook page for organization itself (similar to INCF facebook page). Gaute joined twitter as part of his duties and has been tweeting. INCF also has twitter account. We should make OCNS twitter account for us to tweet about the organization or just comp Neuro in general. One possibility (reported by another member about one of his orgs) is to provide

different people in the org with a week where they are responsible for tweeting. Our difficulty is to feed the news feed on our home page. Mostly just meetings and Schwartz page. Would be helpful for board to feed news. Axel thought this probably won't work - suggested one person responsible. Alex mentioned there are already people doing this out there. Gaute thinks he could start and then identify others. Erik F suggested we put this on OCNS website. Nathan thinks that once people friend the OCNS page, there will be a lot more activity, since many of the members are already posting a lot to their facebook page. Some people don't use facebook for professional stuff, and only linked in. We must be flexible, but we must have clear rules, such as the primary must be the OCNS website. No one should have to go to facebook for OCNS information. Volker inquired whether we are tracking webpage visits. MemberClicks does this. Facebook would allow recommendations be submitted (INCF does this). Books are posted to the members section by Axel, he will take recommendations via email. He doesn't mind taking recommendations from facebook. Consensus to add an OCNS org presence to facebook to start, and continue with twitter. Once its up and running, we can consider adding linkedin. We need new CNSorg.org address to link to the facebook account so it doesn't go to Gaute's personal account. Erik will create this. On facebook, can't friend an organization, can be come organization, or "like" it.

6.b. OCNS supported meetings - discussed under budget.

6.c. Detailed planning for CNS 2013. Can we do some stuff on ConfMaster to make program books automatic?

Items added yesterday:
mailing list (Alla)

On MemberClicks: 336 members, 316 past members, 318 participants from past conferences. Alla has been using a different list of 1401 email addresses. But this doesn't have names or any other information, mostly overlaps with MemberClicks. has been deleted from this list. We also have google spreadsheets, individual from previous meetings, from which the current mailing list came from. We are considering putting this mail list onto MemberClicks, which would tell us whether this email is already on another list. Another possibility is to only use the MemberClicks names and retire everything previous. Presently this is not possible, because some are not people but are organizations. If we delete it we might lose these people/orgs who are not complaining. We don't pay for extra contacts on MemberClicks unless we exceed 3000 (different limit than members). The main problem is that we don't have name information. Nathan recommended that we send email saying if you want to continue receiving email, please send us information (name). Alex recommended we should only have them contact us if they want removal. If we can extract last name/first name from email addresses, we could then enter into database. MemberClicks could send them a password. We need to make sure that there aren't additional duplicates from people that registered for the meeting in the past three months. We always want to retain organizations on this mailing list. The plan is to make new unified mailing list (once more eliminate duplicates) and upload to MemberClicks