

Minutes EACH: Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
4 PM to 7 PM on Wednesday, 1 October and 9 AM until 12 PM Thursday, 2 October
Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam

Subject				
	Welcome to new members and introductions Attendees: <u>Australia:</u> DNR: Jesse Jansen <u>Belgium:</u> NR: Marc Van Nuland DNR: Lode Verreyen <u>China:</u> NR Xinchun Liu <u>Denmark:</u> NR Jette Ammertorp <u>France:</u> NR: Olivier Nardy <u>Germany:</u> NR Cadjia Bachman DNR Christiane Bieber <u>Ireland:</u> NR Veronica Lambert DNR Eva Doherty <u>Israel:</u> NR Hadass Goldblatt <u>Italy:</u> NR Lidia Del Piccolo DNR: Federico Fioretto <u>Norway:</u> NR Hilde Eide <u>Poland:</u> NR : Anna Ratajska DNR: Marta Biedka <u>Portugal:</u> NR: Elisabete Loureiro DNR: Afonso Miguel Cavaco			<u>Spain:</u> DNR: Charo Dago <u>Switzerland:</u> NR Sara Rubinelli <u>The Netherlands:</u> NR Ellen Smets DNR Julia Van Weert <u>UK:</u> NR: Lorraine Noble DNR: Rebecca Riddell <u>US:</u> NR: Richard Brown DNR Monica Broome <u>PEC representative:</u> Arnstein Finset <u>Chair of tEACH:</u> Marcy Rosenbaum <u>Chair of rEACH:</u> Gerry Humphris <u>Past president:</u> Myriam Deveugele <u>President:</u> Jonathan Silverman <u>President-elect:</u> Evelyn van Weel-Baumgarten <u>Treasurer:</u> Karolien Aelbrecht <u>Representatives of SAS:</u> Victoria Armstrong Stephane Graham
1.	Apologies Australia NR: Kirsten McCaffery replaced by DNR: Jesse Jansen Japan: NR Hiroshi Miyashita Spain: NR: Ana Carvajal replaced by NR: Charo Dago AACH: Som Saha			
2.	Arrangements for minuting the meeting Marcy and Karolien will share minuting the meeting (in the future SAS will do this).			
3.	Orientation to the administration of EACH, role of the steering committee Description of composition of executive committee (EC): it consists of the three presidents (past, current and president-elect), the chairs from rEACH and tEACH, and the treasurer. They have monthly meetings, where day to day decisions are made. Important decisions come to steering committee (SC) either in a face to face meeting or via email. The SC is the decision making body of EACH.			
4.	Confirm minutes of the previous meeting in Verona			

	No changes, minutes accepted.
5.	Matters arising from the minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No matters arising from the attendees. Jonathan referred to the minutes and the terms of the chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gerry – rEACH, chair is elected for 2 years with review for a further term of 2 years. Marcy – tEACH, chair is elected for 3 years with review and renewal possible for another 3 years. The reason for this choice is continuity within tEACH.
6.	Matters arising from the AGM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected as new president-elect: Evelyn van Weel-Baumgarten Elected as new treasurer: Karolien Aelbrecht Compliments to Jonathan who handled the questions during the AGM very effectively; it was a demonstration of good communication. Myriam has received an email related to the election process which will be put on the agenda for the SC meeting in March - action JS Question raised about who is eligible to be elected president of EACH depending on what country he/she comes from - what constitutes Europe and who is eligible to be president - reserved for later in the agenda Minutes from the AGM which will be provided after this meeting - action Myriam/Karolien
7.	Achievements since last meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Even with challenges of a failed relationship with the initial new management company which will be discussed later, there is an improved membership database, a better understanding of the organisation, an increased membership from low-level at beginning of the year up to 240, a new website, a better bank accounting system – there has been considerable progress administratively and considerable achievements have occurred in rEACH and tEACH. We have now found a new management company, SAS. They will take over on November 1, 2014. We are now very confident about the future. Clarification to new members of the steering committee about the administration of EACH and the reason for a switch from Nivel to CJAM and now from CJAM to SAS. Noted that this change coincided with the change from Elsevier managing the conferences (at their request) and taking all the risk, when we were a smaller organisation – so this increased pressure to obtain a professional organisation to help with business administration.
8.	Election report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiteration of presentation in the AGM. Correction from the AGM: France has just appointed a DNR: Julien Carretier. The DNR and NR positions are still vacant for Canada and Sweden. March SC meeting will revisit the question of whether the 5 member criteria for the steering committee is still appropriate - action JS The question of why only Europeans are allowed as president was addressed by citing the history of EACH which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The founding of EACH as a European organisation. The conference must be in Europe. In the past, the rule that committee chairs must be European had already changed. AACH and EACH are slowly moving together Discussion of whether presidency should be restricted to Europe. Following points were made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Europe should have a distinct organisation from the American organisation. What is the added value of opening the presidency outside of Europe – would this be for bigger audience or more exchange? What is the definition of Europe? There are many possible choices (geographic versus Eurovision definition). There might be a geographic obstacle for people to be able to fulfill their duties as

	<p>presidents from too far away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to consider if EACH should change name to an International Association. ▪ There are concerns about being a competitor with AACH if we were to allow a US president – we want to be collaborative which we do through the US representative, and through the AACH representative. Also, the past president of EACH sits on the AACH board. ▪ There is the possibility of mimicking international organisations that have an umbrella administration with regional organisations beneath ▪ There has been a discussion with AACH about a world association and we currently believe we are not ready – we need more time. ▪ If the decision is postponed, in terms of the next round, is there a list of countries of from whom a president could or could not be elected? ▪ It is noted that sensitivity is not just within the executive committee but also within the SC – wondering if different members have different status? <p>Decision: The executive committee will explore the options for a definition of Europe and postpone the discussion of the concept of whether the presidency should be restricted to a European country? action executive</p>
9.	<p>Financial report and budget plan; future income generation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see the power point. • In 2013, there was a minor profit. • In 2014, we will have a loss of €31.200 which was anticipated and discussed during the previous SC. This anticipated loss includes the cost for the website and the transfer to CJAM. • However, in 2015 there still will be a projected loss of €8000, due to the unexpected extra costs associated with switching from CJAM to SAS. • EACH only receives €30-€35 as income from each membership and the remainder goes to PEC for subscriptions. Also, every year EACH gets a donation of €15,000 from Elsevier which is not guaranteed ad infinitum. • The above is the total of our income apart from what is negotiated from the conferences. • At present, an individual cannot be a member of EACH without getting PEC subscription. When we had low membership numbers, the donation of €15,000 was a good deal and in fact we have received a net gain for many years. With increasing members it will become less of a beneficial arrangement. At the present time, it is about break even. • Elsevier is interested in retaining and strengthening the relationship with EACH • We have a policy that we do not want donations from pharmaceutical companies, but would welcome donations from elsewhere. • The income from the Amsterdam conference will be €40,000, spread over the next two years. With Elsevier we only received approximately €2000 from the conferences. • We have negotiated for the Heidelberg conference in 2016 to receive €60,000 + 50% of any profits above this. In the power point, financial predictions were shown which demonstrate that this level of income from conference will enable EACH to have €16,000 annually to spend on projects for extending the cause of healthcare communication while retaining its balance (i.e. an investment in the organisation to make it able to grow). • It is noted that the risk is with the conference organizers using the Amsterdam model. We will be shifting more to the AACH (American) model where the organisation and management company take the risk. See later in the agenda
10.	<p>Setting membership fees for 2015 and 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EACH only gets €30-€35 for each member. The question is what the membership fee should be for the future? • There are some different perspectives: some see it as not much money compared to other organisations while for others it's a lot of money (based on country, position, profession, etc.). When compared to AACH where the membership fee is minimum \$240, we do not ask much.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main problem is that we only get €30, the remainder goes to PEC. One possibility is to disconnect PEC from membership and remove the cost of PEC to increase the EACH income. There is inequality with access to PEC because not everyone has access through universities. Elsevier does not want to break this relationship. The question is whether a higher annual donation or reducing the PEC price is negotiable? Another possibility is that there could be a renegotiation of the arrangement with PEC in terms of how many membership/subscriptions we would need to guarantee to continue to receive the donation. We have overall benefitted from our relationship with PEC. Current situation with PEC is a break even for both EACH and Elsevier. Concerns expressed that the loss of the hard copy version of PEC could be difficult. Also, we have an advantage of having PEC as an association journal – having an outlet for publishing is important – it is more complex than money. We need to inform the members more about this symbolic value of the journal. What would an individual member be prepared to pay? Different views were expressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some view it would be more difficult to get more members if we raise fees, others even from low income countries do not agree difficult to raise membership fees at the same time as trying to raise numbers are there other benefits/incentives for members. is it possible to have an income based sliding scale for different professional groups and for different countries benefit of being a member is that EACH exists and would not without members we need to have statistics about member backgrounds. Important to find out for future - action executive Is it possible to offer PEC with the conference in some type of package and to have 2 year membership? What are the benefits of being a member Many people pay membership with no obvious benefit except belonging to a group Could there be corporate as well as individual membership - this is allowed in our new constitution <p>Decision: First, the executive committee needs to negotiate with Elsevier around number of members, donation and fee structure and will not change the membership fee until then. Second, in the future we will have to revisit the membership fee which has not been changed since 2001. This will be done at the next SC meeting. Action executive committee.</p>
11.	<p>Future financial arrangements for subcommittees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue about continuing the summerschool in rEACH which requires about €10000 every two years. Following the end of a donation, there is no longer funding for the summerschool. Would it be possible that summerschool participants pay something? <p>Decision: rEACH needs to explore urgently replacing the donation and reducing the costs. Action Gerry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future financial arrangements for the subcommittees were explored. Currently, it is not clear what happens to any possible profits or underuse of the annual €2000 budget for EACH subcommittees <p>Decision: €2000 initial budget will remain for each of the committees, tEACH will retain the Vasella money to be spent over the next few years. All profits from subcommittees or underuse of the €2000 will return to EACH and committees will apply for funding for specific projects which will always be looked on sympathetically.</p>
12.	<p>Formalising expenses payments policy and procedure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is to develop a policy to be accountable for how money can be spent. <p>Decision: Policy and procedures will be worked on by the executive committee and brought to the next SC meeting in March- Action executive committee</p>
13.	<p>Financial arrangements for Heidelberg conference September 7th - 10th 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has been in discussion for 1.5 years. The Heidelberg conference proposal is closer to the ultimate model that we want to use for conferences in terms of returning to a University setting. Bid is €250,000 Euros including €60,000 for EACH and safety buffer of €25,000.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wolfgang Eich's department is taking the financial risk of it being cancelled. If there is an excess profit then EACH gets a 50% share of the additional profits. <p>Decision: the steering group gives the executive permission to sign the letter of agreement - action Myriam and Jonathan</p>
14.	<p>Donation fund to support grants for participants from low income countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in the last steering committee meeting, Marcy proposed that we offer people signing for membership the option to donate money to support the participation of people from low income countries and also as students. Some cautioned that some people apply as students to get a Visa. Another remark is that we need clear criteria if what low income countries are. <p>Decision: Executive committee will pursue how to set this up with the management company. Clear criteria need to be established defining what is "low income" or "student" in terms of the recipient - Action executive committee</p>
15.	<p>Planning and obtaining bids for international conference 2018 – expressions of interest required</p> <p>Different options were presented of models for running international conferences after Heidelberg:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) One option is that EACH uses its own management company to run the conference. This is similar to the AACH model which plans conferences with its management company and local hosts help with local information/venues. This means that the risk is with EACH and management company rather than local host. 2) Option 2 is to have no local host and the management company identifies a venue and place from a priority list from the organisation. SAS says that it is always more successful if they can work with a local team. 3) Option 3 is to continue with a model where the EACH management company (SAS) is not involved and the local host does all the management and organizing and, also takes the risk. According to SAS, income generation could improve if options 1 or 2 are opted for and the risk is quite low. One can insure against some of the risk depending on the reason for cancellation – one cannot be insured against cancellation because of lack of interest. <p>Decision: We need an approximate bid from SAS, so we know how much it would cost to use the management company. - Action executive and SAS</p> <p>Decision: The SC approved moving to option 1 for conferences after Heidelberg.</p> <p>Next step is now sending out invitations for bids which fit with option 1 including appropriate venue, etc. - Action executive</p> <p>Initial interest has been expressed by Portugal, Cyprus and Israel.</p> <p>There were some discussions about the risks of going to Israel. It was pointed out that Israel is politically unstable and that we should not expose the members to this controversial situation. Also, there could be some practical problems concerning some people's visa.</p> <p>Concerning Portugal, it can be held in Porto or Lisbon, depending on the best university facilities. Also, Portugal is not expensive with regard to travelling expenses.</p> <p>No information about Cyprus.</p> <p>Decision: The SC voted that it would not be worth Israel submitting a bid for a meeting at this time because of geographic, financial and stability issues. - Action JS to write to Shmuel to explain</p>
16.	<p>Changes to legal structure and charitable status; trustees</p> <p>The shift to a charitable organisation (CIO) was summarised. One of main points is that this new status removes liability from the SC and the membership. There are also considerable tax advantages. Once this process is finalized, all NR's will be listed as trustees of the CIO. We will have to have an annual general meeting although the meetings can be held electronically.</p>
17.	<p>Activities and priorities of standing committees and PEC</p> <p>a) research committee (Gerry Humphris, chair rEACH)</p> <p>Please see the report distributed by e-mail. Tabled report presented by Gerry concerning the activities of rEACH.</p> <p>special interest groups (SIG) – need to be members and membership status needs to be tracked. Need to clarify what the benefits are of being a SIG, including making sure there is designated space on the website for their activities.</p>

	<p>b) teaching committee (Marcy Rosenbaum, chair tEACH) Please see the report distributed by e-mail. Tabled report presented by Marcy concerning the activities of tEACH.</p> <p>c) information about PEC (Arnstein Finset, editor in chief) PEC has been successful in publishing in the field of communication in healthcare. Also, the impact factor has increased. Arnstein gave more information about the 'sister' journal of PEC (also see previous SC), where certain research papers, ideas, etc. can be published that is not 'good enough' for the original PEC. This is an online journal. Arnstein suggests to use the blank page within the journal for a regular column in each edition to provide information about EACH, the subcommittees, individual steering committee members, successes, advertise tEACH courses, rEACH summerschool, etc. . This will also reach non-members. But, for this we need a designated person to make sure that the EACH pages are continuously used. This also would fit with an electronic newsletter which will go out to the membership Decision: The executive committee proposes that the president-elect will be responsible for this. The SC agrees. action executive</p>
18.	<p>Tasks of the executive, tasks of the national and deputy national representatives Brainstorm of questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to identify how to let NRs know about their country members and keep them updated. The issue of privacy was raised, but a few members have expressed not wanting their email addresses to be shared. Still we need to clarify if the current members are okay with having their NR know who they are – Action JS to send an email asking people if they do not wish their emails known to NRs to respond. • NRs will have access to the database of members in their country – likely by early December so they have time to remind people to renew their membership. Action SAS with the executive committee • We need 2 lists – one of EACH members and one of all the attendees of the ICCH. <p>Decision Executive to send out regular recommendations to NRs for what might be in correspondence with members. Executive needs to designate a link person to the SC who will oversee this. Action executive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remark: not all people see themselves as "communication" people which means that we need to look further in other disciplines and maybe make individual contact. <p>Decision: All NRs need to be sent the new logo for use in their correspondence regarding EACH and during presentations - Action JS</p>
19.	<p>Administrative arrangements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The association management company changes were discussed.
20.	<p>Recruitment of new members - how to extend our membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recruitment drive The EC has already been successfully chasing up memberships including those within the SC and all conference attendees have been approached by email. Arnstein recommended a member drive asking current members to invite new members and get some reward such as access to SCCOPUS through Elsevier. New methods of payments need to be explored such as direct debits and two-year payments - Action SAS • special interest groups See report of rEACH. They need to become a member, but we also need to inform them what EACH can give them. • simulated patients (Cadjia Bachmann) Simulated patients do not have a voice in Europe so investigating whether some type of affiliation would be useful. In process of investigation action Cadjia • national advanced cancer facilitators UK (Sandra Winterburn) This group of over a hundred facilitators are looking for an academic organisational home to link to as a formal affiliation and perhaps have own webpage within the website. We need to consider whether they would want to be a closed group or an open group perhaps leading to a European oncology

	<p>communication teaching group. Members would all need to become members of EACH.</p> <p>Decision: The SC agreed to offer this group a home and the exact mechanism will be discussed in tEACH - Action Marcy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organisational membership e.g. Belgian association of physiotherapists <p>Other outside organisations have expressed interest in affiliation, and the EC should use an organized approach to map out what organisations might be appropriate affiliates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed if there would be a possibility to have national webpages – for example a German page. Jonathan’s response is that simple web pages are no problem but these could come at some expense if it needs to be interactive such as a blog, etc. So it would need to be brought to steering committee with a sense of what types of changes in functionality of the website, and its costs would be needed.
21.	<p>New visions for EACH - where are we going and where do we want to go? Research, teaching, implementation and politics</p> <p>The new president’s vision is that we move forward in thinking about advocacy and implementation and politics as part of our focus as a way to enable research and teaching to have influence on healthcare.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an important idea, we need to do this on a national basis with networking within countries; we will possibly need a separate committee which will bring rEACH and tEACH together; we need to have an understanding of the language required to communicate clearly to policymakers with clear evidence; we need to work with people with expertise in talking on a policy level. • Jonathan and Gerry have connections with people who may have this expertise. • We will also need to look at differences between countries and what is common in terms of challenges and political priorities; we need to look for openings at present, and need to make links with patient organisations such as the European Patient Forum, how can we encourage patients to be aware of and promote the impact of our work. <p>Decision: The SC approved moving forward with this additional vision. The SC also approved the establishment of a new implementation group, perhaps primarily and as a start from the SC. Action executive</p>
22.	<p>New website possibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • methods of talking to the membership • newsletters • twitter et cetera • advertisements of external courses - a policy <p>Look in our history as there was a previous policy (minutes in Oslo) – Action Marcy and Myriam</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upkeep of website <p>What content needs correcting, what structural changes would be needed – minor versus major. Please have a look and send your comments directly to JS - Action all steering group members</p>
23.	<p>Information about next EACH conference in Heidelberg, Germany</p>
24.	<p>Next steering group meeting</p> <p>Will not be linked to the Verona meeting in February.</p> <p>A poll will be sent out very soon to identify potential meeting dates in March 2015 - Action Jonathan</p>
25.	<p>AOB</p> <p>Thank you, Ellen, for the location and the catering.</p>