



Minutes

EACH Steering Committee Meeting 23rd February 2012, Verona (1.30-5 PM)

Present: Peter, Myriam, Hanneke, Gerry, Arnstein, Lidia, Sandra

Present on Skype: Marcy, Jonathan, Pål

1. Apologies: Jette, Wolfgang, Wolf, Ana, Hadass
Website not visible on skype so will be presented later
2. Arrangements for minuting: Sandra
3. Minutes last SC meeting (Chicago): approved
4. Budget & Accountancy:
 - a. Budget proposal
 - i. Sandra tabled the draft report for comments in advance of this being submitted to the General Meeting in St Andrews. The draft report will be circulated with minutes of this meeting so that those not present can clarify or comment before it is finalised for the General Meeting.
 - b. Issues around income & expenditure
 - i. Meetings. This year only one hotel night covered by EACH to attend the SC meeting, now less people attend? Maybe another location would be easier/cheaper/faster to reach than Verona; e.g. Amsterdam. Anyhow, the president and secretary should be present (and their costs reimbursed if necessary). Skype and teleconferencing should be facilitated, like so perfectly arranged in this meeting. SC members change every two years, SC meetings at EACH conferences only would be too few. Besides, AACH conferences are not attended by all. Still 2 meetings a year should be the goal.
 - ii. Standing committees
 1. Level of budget/sponsorship. This year's higher Vna costs could not be completely covered by the sponsorship. Next time R-EACH will go to another venue.
 2. Carry-over of committee budget from **one** year to next: Confirmed.
 - iii. Accountancy. Written report will be presented in September in St Andrews during AGM.
5. Standing committees
 - a. T-EACH. Increased number of offered courses (3 in 2012: what to teach; how to teach; curriculum development). EU operating grant was not successful, so no site visits yet.

- b. R-EACH. September course was very good. Four preconference workshops are being prepared for St Andrews. Proposal: profits will be distributed among R-EACH and EACH, will be discussed during the SC meeting at EACH 2014 conference. Y-EACH groups are very active.
6. National representatives & deputies
- a. There are still countries not covered by national representatives in the SC: will be taken up with the new SC members after elections.
 - b. Tasks and duties: reports from national representatives. For SC members it is not perfectly clear what they have to do as national representatives. This should include writing to members regularly about what is going on within EACH (SC minutes are on the website). The new EACH website can give more opportunities for this. A periodic email could also do this job, especially given the fact that the newsletter will no longer be made. A good example is the SDM group (on Facebook); they provide some sort of continuous presence. Forum discussions on the new website could also provide input for activities partly related to EACH, but with relevance for communication in healthcare. Update current membership to national representatives every three months: Sandra will do that.
 - c. SC nominations and elections. During St Andrews, several SC members will step down. The Nominations Committee will do the same job this year as two years ago, chaired by Jozien, with Jo Goedhuys and one new person whom Jozien will appoint. The SC expressed its thanks to Jozien for agreeing to convene the Nominations Committee once again. Sandra will prepare a list with representatives who have to resign. Current members will be asked if they want to stay on, members of the countries will be asked if they still approve their representative, next members vote for a new president-elect during the AGM in St Andrews. For some countries, the number of members may no longer be enough to warrant a representative.
7. Website and Newsletter
- a. Presentation of new website: content is open to discussion. Additional facilities will be added. The SC expresses their appreciation to Sandra and colleagues at NIVEL for the development of this new website which offers many more possibilities to communicate with members and others.
 - b. Newsletters: could have been a way of reminding people of what is going on in EACH. Unfortunately, Helge and Trond do not want to continue with making a newsletter, because no EACH member responded positively to them and they are change their places of work. The SC expresses its gratitude for their effort in producing two interesting newsletters.
8. AACH-EACH representative: AACH wants to have an EACH representative on their board. Jozien has done this for a few years. In Chicago (October 2011) Jozien resigned. AACH now asks for a new board member. Should the new member represent EACH or Europe? And should this person be an EACH SC or EC member? And what about reimbursement of travel and accommodation costs? Meetings by Skype may also be possible. Wolf and Jozien are both available. The SC believes that such a representative should be an EC member. The past president could be the right person, because (s)he knows most. Still, how useful is it for EACH to participate in the AACH meeting? Phone

conferences may be equally useful. Two AACH Skype meetings and two AACH meetings in person is too much for EACH to participate in. AACH-EACH dinner meetings at conferences are also productive. A named representative from the EC (preferably the past president) will be suggested and he/she can delegate the job to someone else from the SC, i.e. one specific deputy. Myriam will write to AACH proposing this and seeking their views.

9. St Andrews 2012: Gerry presented a progress report with 43 received symposia (21 accepted), 53 received workshops (20 can be accepted), and 665 abstracts received (now being reviewed). There will be a lunchtime symposium on SDM, preconference workshops organized by T-EACH and R-EACH, and a French-speaking symposium. Developing countries could get 5 places for 50% fee reduction. Sponsoring should be sought. Suggestions should go to Gerry (gmh4@st-andrews.ac.uk). Scientific Committee meeting should take place after the abstract reviewing sometime in April. According to the website, people have to be notified of acceptance of their abstract by April 1. A hard copy abstract book is not yet covered by the budget.

10. Amsterdam ICCH 2014: Venue and budget are the two most urgent issues now. Academic buildings are not available after the summer holiday in the Netherlands. But the RAI is available and has a very convenient location and accepted as the venue for 2014. EACH would get a recognizable, intimate part of RAI, but it is expensive. The budget plan is based on 550 delegates and fees similar to St Andrews. This leads to a budget plan of EUR 320,000 incl VAT. VAT may not be needed for the delegate fee, that would leave funding for some extras. Additional activities may need to be covered by other sponsors. Merck Sharp and Dohme BV (MSD) has sponsored the first Dutch conference on communication in healthcare in 2012, and may do this again, as long as we do not disagree with the pharmaceutical industry sponsoring us. Calculation is based on 240 posters, 28 workshops, 18 symposia and 300 oral presentations in 11 parallel sessions. The SC feels that this may be too much: high quality should be more important, and some of the sessions may not be well-attended. Verona had 9, Oslo had 7, St Andrews will probably have 9. Besides, having fewer rooms means a lower fee. Nine parallel sessions may be enough with some extra rooms during some days. The RAI gives a choice between 7 rooms or 11, including 4 more remote, relatively cheap rooms, suitable for workshops. The interest in EACH is increasing, so we can perhaps be optimistic, especially as St Andrews attracted 665 abstracts. In addition, the SDM group may want to join EACH. If so, they would want a recognizable track. The budget is in balance with 11 parallel sessions, so we ask the Amsterdam group to decide on this. Maybe they can also hire the four rooms for 2 days only, (11 parallel sessions on day two and three, 7 parallels on day four), if that is enough to offer additional workshops. Nice keynote speakers will be invited, for suggestions, one can email Jozien (j.bensing@nivel.nl) or Hanneke (j.c.dehaes@amc.uva.nl) about this. The email list of potential attendees should be provided by Elsevier; Peter will raise this with Leighton and then let the Amsterdam group know. Advertising of the conference can be done through PEC. Leighton indicated last year that Elsevier would not continue with organizing our conferences. Members will also be asked to mention keynote speakers to the Amsterdam group (Sandra to email members about this together with an issue about PEC, below; the Amsterdam group will provide a few lines for this message). Maybe we should explicitly invite someone from the

Met opmaak: Lettertype: (Standaard)
Arial, 11 pt, Engels (Groot-Brittannië)

Met opmaak: Lettertype: (Standaard)
Arial, 11 pt, Engels (Groot-Brittannië)

Met opmaak: Engels
(Groot-Brittannië)

Met opmaak: Lettertype: (Standaard)
Arial, 11 pt

SDM group. The city council in Amsterdam probably offers a free boat trip on the canals for conference >400 delegates.

11. EU bid/operating grant. Gerry introduced Giovanni Vigano from Synergia, Milano. Giovanni introduced Synergia and the EU grant. Our first EU operating grant application did very well, but we did not get funded. The EU feedback was quite positive; we scored 12 points and should have 13. It does show that EACH is eligible to apply, which is very good. If we are successful next time, we could continue to apply every year. We should be clear about our financial budget, that determines the EU funding; the EU funding will be 60% of our total budget. For next time, the network will already have proved to be eligible. Call is now open, deadline is March 9. The bid is there, requested changes need to be made, e.g. to explain how EACH mission match the EU priorities in their program. Evidence for e.g. solving health inequalities, should be added, we can do so with Gulliver papers. We should add a dissemination plan, and increase staff costs. Giovanni also presented the way Synergia supports companies, networks and organisations who want to apply for EU grants. They start working with potential partners before a call is published; they work pro-actively, e.g. by examining the draft work programs. They ask for ideas and look for possible funding. See: www.synergis-net.eu. Synergia does not ask money at the application stage, they are paid back via the projects.
12. Patient Education & Counseling. PEC is doing well, high backlog has been reduced. Large number of submissions, 2010 impact factor 2.2, 2011 will be published soon. As of January 1, Peter Schultz and Robert Hulsman are deputy editors. EACH will discuss with Elsevier to change the name to Patient Education & Communication. If this has no adverse consequences, this will happen, and PEC will get a new cover on January 1, 2013. PEC wants to keep the acceptance rate at a realistic level. So, criteria for acceptance of papers should become more clear. Papers with a more general, conceptual, or theoretical content are most often cited, and should be stimulated. PEC now has reputation, which may change with another name. Scientific quality of papers should be the most important criterion. Arnstein agreed, and emphasised that there should also be relevance for clinical education or communication generally. One of the ingredients for quality, is, exactly, theory, so these criteria can be combined. New members for the editorial board will be needed, before April 1. Names can be send to Arnstein (arnstein.finset@medisin.uio.no). EACH members can be asked if they want to nominate themselves or someone else (Sandra will invite members after having received a note from Arnstein). For the EACH pages in PEC: four times per year should be enough instead of the monthly page: one from the president, one from the chairs of R-EACH and T-EACH and the fourth from the chair of the upcoming conference. So each conference will have two pages. If we agree, Arnstein will distribute format and deadlines to those involved. Myriam will be the first after the St Andrew conference, for the November issue of PEC.
13. SDM request, details of which distributed before this meeting as a summary of the discussions so far. Pal is in favour of having them join EACH. Gerry: in a time of economic restraint, bringing together two groups should be encouraged. Jonathan: the issue was if we should have a separate standing committee for SDM or a SIG. Peter: SDM seems ahead of us, e.g. on technology and

implementation and changing practice. Hanneke: within the SDM group there are contradictory views on getting together with EACH. She does support the idea. So far they do little in teaching. But how does it fit in to our structure? Lidia: there are also other relevant groups, e.g. the motivational interviewing group. Arnstein: supports the idea because there are many papers in PEC on this topic. Myriam: we should offer them something like a home within our community. Peter: we do not have to give every group the same sort of home. We should take the opportunities one by one. We should show them our enthusiasm. Other decisions will follow from that. We could come with a definite proposal in St Andrews. If SDM joins, their members should become EACH members. For the Amsterdam conference, there is enough room to fill a track. In the SC meeting, we invite Glyn as an observer and try to sort out the framework before that time. Peter will inform Glyn of our discussion and liaise with him further in advance of the next SC meeting.

14. AOB (Liability insurance has been arranged. Peter thanked Lidia for organizing the accommodation and organizing the Skype link.)

Opmerking [PS1]: I think that's included earlier.