EACH: **Steering Committee Meeting**

M I N U T E S
1430 – 1800 2 September 2017
0900 – 1200 3 September 2017

Item	Subject	
1	**Welcome and Introductions**	
	Australia: NR: Peter Martin	**Switzerland:** NR: Nicola Diviani
	Austria: NR: Marlene Sator	**The Netherlands:** NR: Ellen Smets
	Belgium: NR: Lode Verreyen	**UK:** DNR: Andy Ward (Sunday only via GoToMeeting)
	Denmark: NR: Soren Cold	**USA:** NR: Richard Brown
	France: DNR: Julien Carretier	**President:** Evelyn van Weel-Baumgarten
	Germany: NR: Eva Maria Bitzer	**Past-President:** Jonathan Silverman
	Ireland: NR: Eva Doherty	**President-elect:** Sara Rubinelli
	Israel: NR: Hadass Goldblatt	**Chair of pEACH:** Peter Martin
	Italy: NR: Federico Fioretto	**Chair of rEACH:** Gerry Humphris
	New Zealand: NR: Maria Stube (Sunday only via GoToMeeting) DNR: Jonathan Adler	**Chair of tEACH:** Marcy Rosenbaum
	Norway: NR: Hilde Eide	**Treasurer:** Karolien Aelbrecht
	South Africa: NR: Bev Bolton	**AACH:** August Fortin (Saturday only via GoToMeeting)
	Spain: NR: Charo Dago (Saturday only via GoToMeeting)	**Representative of SAS:** Fiona Grant
2	**Apologies** Arnstein Finset, PEC representative Gitte Pihl, DNR Denmark Aslak Steinbekk, DNR Norway Anna Ratajska, NR Poland Elizabete Loureiro, NR Portugal Margarida Figueiredo-Braga, DNR Portugal	**Countries not represented:** China Nigeria Poland Portugal

	Lorraine Noble, NR UK	
3	**Minutes of the last meeting in Dublin 2017** Minutes were accepted	
4	**Any remaining questions after AGM/information giving** The videos from the three sub-committees were a popular way of learning about what they had been up to between meetings. It would be preferable for these to be put on the SC pages as well as the EACH Members pages.	
5	**Brief introduction about the meeting** At the last Steering Committee meeting in Dublin it was raised by the NRs would prefer for the SC meetings to be more interactive and for there to be time during the meetings for the committee members to work together in small groups to discuss topics of importance to enable expertise to be better utilised and for NRs to draw upon the experience of each other. Therefore this meeting has been formulated so that the NRs can lead on what is important to them and shape the content of the meeting based on this discussion. Therefore the agenda is quite fluid and open for change as the meeting progresses.	

Item	Subject	Action
6	**Discussing steering committee role and suggested change and vote** *Facilitated by Lode Verreyen and Ellen Smets* In the last Steering Committee meeting in Dublin it was raised by the National Representatives that they are unhappy with the current structure of the meetings. It was felt that NRs are passive in the meetings and do not get time to participate on anything because the executive spend the whole time giving information rather than allowing time for discussion between NRs. This is because historically the SC were the decision making body in EACH and therefore were required to give their authorisation on various items so that the executive can implement work for EACH. This part of the meeting was chaired by two NRs – Lode Verreyen and Ellen Smets, to allow an open discussion of thoughts. Lode and Ellen asked the NRs the following questions: - Do NR want a change? What is your feeling about the current situation? - What would you change? Which direction do we need to move to? - What are the implications of changing? What might be a plan to achieve change? Federico Fiorretto (NR Italy) expressed that he finds the current situation is inefficient and frustrating. He argued that the executive bring issues to the SC for approval, but there is no time to discuss the issues only to listen and then agree or disagree. This leads to inefficiency with getting work done and a sense of frustration for both parties. Eva Doherty (NR Ireland) argued that she was ambivalent to change. She argued that if the SC are asked to take more on there is a risk to not get anything done as the group is too big. She suggested that most committees have lots of smaller working groups that get various issues done, rather than relying on one big group. There was general dissatisfaction that the Steering Committee do not have a Steering role (meaning they do not influence what is happening in EACH) Others raised concern that if the decisions were only left to the executive to make then the NRs would need to know what decisions are being devolved to them before	

	they could decide if that is ok.	
	Richard Brown explained that despite asking his members for feedback on their concerns and issues, he doesn't get any replies and therefore is concerned that he can only bring his own personal opinion to the meetings, rather than representing his members.	P a g e
	Another suggestion was that the SC should provide more strategy for EACH and be able to talk about the objectives for the association in the SC meetings, to then allow the executive to put these ideas into action	
	Other NRs asked for more time in the meetings to discuss healthcare communication issues specific to their countries and would then be happy to allow the executive more freedom to run the association so that the SC meetings could be dedicated to this activity.	
	A suggestion was therefore to change who makes up the SC and therefore make it a smaller group that would be more practical. Should NRs form the SC or should they have a different role in the association?	
	Peter Martin argued that EACH needs a strategic direction and that is why there is no clear direction of what the NR role currently is. If there was a strategic plan then the SC could then mobilise this plan into action.	
	The overall feeling was that the NRs want more of a role in the SC meetings to make their attendance feel valued and worthwhile. The group therefore had a vote that they wished to discuss this in more detail on Sunday of the Steering Committee meeting.	
7	**Listing issues NR want to bring up and a summary of country needs and priorities with brief discussion** - Where can National Networks find support besides EACH? - Contacting the membership – how can we do this better? - Institutional membership - Reflect/discuss role as NR – what is the mandate and who am I representing? - Reflect/discuss the role of the SC - What is the purpose of EACH – what are the needs of our members? They seem to be customers of events only but not interested in the rest of EACH - Importance to discuss burning topics across different countries that are similar, blogs, private forums etc outside of meetings - Countries that align temporally or through shared issues: how can you enable countries to foster these links? - Want to use facebook to allow contact with whole network and not just own country members - How can members find big topics that members can benefit from and share this information? For examples, specific healthcare communication needs – more than one country could be working on same topic and not benefiting from the others resources and experiences - Can EACH endorse country projects? - Autonomy of NRs to represent EACH?	
8	**Working in small group discussions on country needs**	

Group 1: Policy discussion about creating a business case for decision makers to dedicate resources for healthcare communication

Initial outputs from this discussion:
- Power of EACH - not maximizing it to influence policy and government direction, need EACH to be much more strategic and a body of international expertise & engage with stakeholders in a more dramatic way
- Number of places are struggling with implementation research - what happens when you do these interventions, economics, need robust data, need to link pEACH and rEACH together to do this effectively
- Power of consumers - patient rated outcomes, are a massive way of influencing policy, how can we use consumer driven data to drive healthcare communication

Group 2: Think about how to reach other medical specialists to make them aware of EACH and what EACH can offer them

Initial outputs from this discussion:
Potential of attracting other healthcare workers to EACH, such as nurses, physiotherapists etc & how can EACH reach them better and what are their barriers, possibly funding and/or language & possibly prefer to attend specific conferences rather than a generic place like EACH. Need to focus on those that teach communication skills to these groups for the PR. Multidisciplinary/inter-professional work and discussions in the healthcare topic seems to be a important topic to reach these groups.

A summary from Jonathan on what we know so far:
- More interactivity in the meetings is clearly popular and works well
- Not clear what the options are and the implications
- A bit stuck and not sure how we can move forward

History of the SC:
- 4 people made up the executive - 3 Ps and Treasurer
- SC met once a year over dinner and no real decisions needed to be made
- EACH ran a conference every two years, so there wasn't a lot to organise
- Small in number of countries that were involved

Current situation:
- SC should be the highest decision making body; listens to advice from the executive about the decisions to be made, has a discussion and votes to make decisions which the executive then attempts to enact
- However, the SC has actually become vastly bigger with many more countries and a wide variety with different needs. And there is much more activity within EACH to make decisions about. Much more complex with limited face to face time.

What tends to happen - the executive makes all the decisions, presents information to the SC, asks SC to make the decisions, but no time for discussion
This leads to long agendas, passive input for NRs, NRs feel they have a lack of input and that their expertise is not utilised
If the SC want to increase interactivity in the meetings then there will be even less time for decision making

The executive presented two possible options.

Option 1 - Stay as we are:
- Executive makes all the decisions
- SC rubber stamps most decisions
- Introduce limited interactivity into meetings
Examples of how this would work in practice:
Choosing the budget for 2018 – the treasurer, presidents and SAS develop a budget and present it to the executive committee for discussion. This agreed draft budget is then presented to the SC in advance of the SC meeting. With very limited time in the SC for discussion and questions the SC are asked to approve it in a passive way
Strategic plan for EACH - executive will work on a draft strategic plan, present it to the SC. With limited time in the SC for discussion and questions the SC are asked to approve it in a passive way

Option 2 - SC becomes the Advisory Committee
The EACH trustees (NR and executive) continue to meet twice a year as an AC
They will discuss important issues for EACH in their country
Share expertise and help each other
Discuss in depth issues that are important to the development of EACH
Provide non-binding suggestions and advice to the executive on important issues
Highly interactive throughout
Chaired by – who – executive or NR appointed chair?

Under option 2 the executive committee would need to increase in size:
Same membership as now but increased by one representative of the NRs elected from the NRs
They would value the input from the AC
Make the decisions as the decision making body
AC would remain trustees of the association

Examples:
Choosing the budget – the AC will advise items that they wish EACH to do/work on/offer for the future, the executive will take this input and use it to develop a budget. Therefore the activities and resource suggestions could come from the AC and exec will try and work out how to make this possible
Strategic plan - AC will inform the exec about what they want EACH to do over the next 2-5 years, and what their countries need and the EC will take those into consideration and put a plan into action

Peter Martin highlighted to the group the enormous amount of work that is involved in being on the executive in making decisions. He felt it was important the SC realised the volume of work that would be involved if they wished to have a more active role in decision making, if they chose that that is what they wanted

Richard Brown asked if under option 2 if the NRs diminished role in decision making would affect their role as a named trustee of the charity?
Jonathan explained that according to the EACH constitution the NR will always be named trustees and eligible to delegate all decisions to a specific committee within the organisation
Federico Fioretto highlighted the need to be able to hold the EC accountable for their decisions and actions

The group broke into small groups to discuss the options and their initial thoughts:

<u>Group 1</u>: Julien Carretier, Nicola Diviani, Andy Ward, Richard Brown, Maria Stubbe
The group on the whole through that option 2 would be a good way forward
Advantages - time spent together in meetings would be better - joint projects, networking, more interactive, skills more utilised
Qs - if executive were the decision making body - how would they be elected? Needs to be more transparent.
Qs - How are the agendas for the AC meeting set - where will they come from? What as an advisory committee are we commenting on if we don't know what the meeting will contain in advance? Advisory plan - who creates this?
Qs - AC - representing views of the membership from their countries, there is concern from NR if they are truly doing that as the membership do not engage as much as NR want to. Members like to present work at conferences and get PEC, but maybe don't engage enough for NRs to truly represent. How can this be addressed?

<u>Group 2</u>: Jonathan Adler, Federico Fioretto, Eva Bitzer, Hilde Eide
Split group - some like the status quo with some tweaks and some prefer the second option
Jonathan Adler suggested it was helpful to think of the organisation in transition going from adolescence to adulthood. Change is difficult, some like to stay in the way that is known. The association does need to develop and that is hard and need to think in new ways. Not everyone will be happy.
Qs - how do you foster trust so the executive committee is seen to have wisdom and taken on board what the AC are saying and not just disregarding the advice given
Qs - Is this a country related thing or a topic related thing? Why should the committee be made up of NRs rather than just have a group of people interested on the healthcare communication topic
Qs - If NRs are representing country then what does this mean? Can they go to the government and say I am the EACH NR or this something the executive should do? What power do the NRs have?

<u>Group 3</u>: Ellen Smets, Eva Doherty, Soren Cold
Qs - Would AC have a chair? Would that be the new NR on the exec committee?
Comfortable that the EC would be the decision making body
Qs - Concerned that a spilt wouldn't appear between the AC and EC
Could be more homework involved if the SC become advisory, so need to really think about that

<u>Group 4</u>: Bev Bolton, Marlene Sator, Hadass Goldblatt
Liked option 2, like the Advisory role
Identifying the issues might be a way of helping organising the information coming in from the different countries
Would help to have a template reporting structure organised in topics and issues to help discuss these issues
Implications of becoming more interactive as more time would be needed, more subgroup work would be needed at meetings

Further questions raised:
Qs - how is the agenda settled, what are the links between the AC & EC and what is the role of the AC and how important is being a NR? Fear that the AC will not be very useful. Do we represent our countries?

Formal vote: the group wishes to give the executive the mandate to work out option 2 to present to the NRs for consideration. 14 in favour; 1 abstain; 0 no

Small group work on input to strategic plan

Group 1: *(Peter Martin)*

1-2 years:
- Communication strategy
- Networking
- Clarify role of NR
- Clear strategy on membership - broad number or elite group
- Financial strategy
- Evidence of cost efficiency for healthcare communication

5 years:
- How EACH responds to policy documents
- How to influence policy
- What are the key topics of focus
- How to promote healthcare communication
- How to create metrics to measure to allow us to talk and compare

Group 2: *(Marcy Rosenbaum)*
- How to expand reach to who they are reaching and who is part of it and include those that are working in healthcare clinicians and patients
- Targetting what they do in different ways to go to specific meetings for example
- Forming alliances with national and international organisations
- Linking research and teaching education and policy - need to include teaching of patients and not just clinicians
- Need more opportunity to collaborate within EACH
- Leverage the international aspect of EACH, to add benefit to being more than just a national org
- Cost is an issue - want ot include studnets more
- How can members be more inovlved in each in diff time zones and can't afford to travel

Group 3: *(Gerry Humphris)*
- Institutional membership needs to be focussed on more
- National Programmes - some countries trying to influence policy leaders and makers and need to use experiences from countries that have done this to help others
- Learning from one nation to another
- Resources needed that poeple can use that are ready to use
- Have well respected between EACH and National organisations
- Marketing funnel - to try and attract people and look and engage with EACH's resources
- Translation from English to other languages to help generate interest from other countries

Answers to some questions given in meeting:
- NR concept is fixed in constitution and makes EACH unique, would be trickier to change
- Election process for executive: 3 Ps & T, are elected from membership; 3 subcom chairs are proposed by the members of the subcoms and then elects within that membership & then gets final approval from the executive
- There is a procedure and a fixed maximum term for the 3 subcom chairs

• The subcom election may therefore need to be democratic and wider if the option 2 is chosen • Constitution checks currently in place: • Charity trustees can delegate to the executive the whole running of the charity • The executive must report to the trustees all actions that occur • Trustees can take back control at any point if they are unhappy or simply wish to • Any trustee can call a meeting at any point to discuss anything that they wish to have and only require 2 to attend to have a valid meeting	

Conclusions

12	**Next steering group meeting:** Executive start work on model two and looking at ways to address the concerns Send back to NRs with solutions to give feedback on Have an in between GoToMeeting in about 3 months time for feedback and ideas Final draft prepared at the next 6 month face to face meeting to be considered	
13	**AOB** None	
14	**Thanks** Thank you to everyone for such valuable input and for helping to make this a successful interactive meeting.	