EACH: International Association for Communication in Healthcare

EACH: Advisory Committee Meeting
M I N U T E S
1400 – 1800 18 March 2018
0900 – 1200 19 March 2018

Item	Subject		
1	**Welcome and Introductions**		
	Belgium & Advisory Committee Chair: NR: Lode Verreyen	**Switzerland:** NR: Nicola Diviani	
	Ireland: NR: Eva Doherty (via Zoom)	**UK:** NR: Lorraine Noble	
	Israel: NR: Hadass Goldblatt	**USA:** NR: Richard Brown (Sunday only via Zoom)	
	Italy: NR: Federico Fioretto (via Zoom)	**President:** Evelyn van Weel-Baumgarten	
	Netherlands DNR: Julia van Weert	**President-elect:** Sara Rubinelli	
	New Zealand: NR: Maria Stube (Monday only via Zoom)	**Chair of pEACH:** Peter Martin (Monday only via Zoom)	
	Norway: NR: Hilde Eide (via Zoom	**Chair of rEACH:** Arwen Pieterse (via Zoom)	
	Poland NR: Ana Ratajska	**Incoming Chair of tEACH:** Sandra Winterburn (Sunday only via Zoom)	
	Portugal NR: Elizabete Loureiro DNR: Margarida Figueiredo-Braga	**Treasurer:** Karolien Aelbrecht (Sunday only via Zoom)	
	Spain: NR: Charo Dago (Monday only via Zoom)	**Representative of SAS:** Fiona Whitelock	
2	**Apologies** Marlene Sator, NR Austria Marc van Nuland, DNR Belgium Soeren Cold, NR Denmark Gitte Thybo Pihl, DNR Denmark Eva Maria Bitzer, NR Germany Andrea Gaisser, DNR Germany Giulia Lamiani, DNR Italy Ellen Smets, NR Netherlands Aslak Steinsbekk, DNR Norway Magdalena Horodenska, DNR Poland Jenni Levy, ACH representative	**Countries not represented:** Austria China Denmark France Germany Nigeria South Africa	
3	**Minutes of the last meeting in London 2017** Minutes were accepted		

4	**Brief introduction about the meeting**
	LV was welcomed by the committee as the new Chair of the Advisory Committee. He outlined that the first part of the meeting would be a short plenary session for the whole group to have quick updates from the Executive committee and sub-committees and a chance for any questions from the AC group.
	The majority of the rest of EACH meeting will then be focused on the NRs working together in small groups, to enable NRs to share expertise and develop project groups to work on specific topics.
5	**Trustee section: outlining the continued delegation of powers to the EC, as previously discussed and agreed on in the SC Meeting of London**
	• To help NRs keep up to speed with Executive Committee business, NRs will be sent the list of dates for executive meetings in advance so that you all know when to check the EACH website for the minutes.
	• EvWB updated the group on the strategic plan work that is being undertaken by the executive, as reported on in the A4 Executive Summary document.
	• The group clarified that if any NR has any questions they wish to raise with the executive they are now to contact their AC Chair – LV, and he will then bring it to the executive meeting
	• JvW asked how many conference attendees are expected and how many abstracts will be accepted. FW confirmed that the number of abstract submissions received was inline with Heidleberg and therefore a similar attendance is hoped for – of around 600 people. There will be approximately 550-600 abstracts likely accepted.
	• The NRs all agreed that they are happy for the executive to maintain decision making power
6	**AC member section:**
	Discussion of any new or existing activities or initiatives the NR wish to raise with the Executive
	1) Institutional membership:
	Two types of institutional membership were raised:
	a. An institution that has a lot of EACH members receives a membership package which is more cost effective than individual membership. This raises issues with financial income for EACH
	b. An institution/association that wishes to be a member of EACH, but may not have any individual members, for example International Communication Association (ICA), this gives EACH an opportunity to be known in other institutions and open doors for joint projects
	2) EACH website & the 'meeting zone':
	How can we get more people involved to make this more dynamic? How to get the balance right between making the site user-friendly and encouraging more uptake, but not creating too much extra work for those involved. The meeting zone could be used by NRs to help network and share expertise.
	3) Funding:
	Importance of finding grants to help with research areas and the need for developing strategies on how to collaborate on this. It would be helpful for the executive to centralise information about what grants are available on the website
	4) Publications:
	Sharing publications, to create almost like a small Research Gate
	5) EACH website:
	EACH's website is likely to get updated significantly in the future and the NRs would like input into what the content should be and what benefits for people are included on there
	6) PEC:
	Interacting with PEC – the Polish NR would like to have an article translated into Polish to use for their network. This could be a possible market for those countries where English is not well spoken. **Anna**

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

Ratajska is to email LV her idea of what she wants for the journal with a time limit, so that LV can approach the executive about this.

Discussion of areas that the EC would like help and advise from the AC
None raised

Help us to define the role of the Deputy Chair of the AC
It was clarified that the AC will choose their deputy chair and that the process would be the same as that for electing the chair – an email will invite those to self-nominate for the role, and also ask any NRs who would be willing to sit on the nomination committee (who do not wish to stand for the role). The nomination committee will be led by LV as Chair of the AC.

Questions raised prior to the meeting were:
- Is it a task or requirement for the AC deputy to attend the AC meetings? It would be ideally the case that the AC deputy attends the meetings either online or face to face in order to support the AC chair
- What is meant by considerable experience in research/teaching/policy and practice? It was agreed by the group that 'considerable' implied extensive experience and that this criteria should be re-worded to be 'can demonstrate that he/she has personal experience in Research, Teaching and/or Policy & Practice.
- Is it sensible to require that the person has 2 years experience as a NR prior to application? Yes, this means that the NR has a good idea of how EACH works which will enable them to fulfil the role effectively

The group split so that those joining online met together and those attending in person met together. Both groups raised the point that they think it is important that the AC deputy replaces the chair on the executive meetings when the chair is not able to attend. The Executive, including Lode as chair, argued that it is not possible for someone to deputise on a meeting without having read all the minutes and supporting documentation surrounding the previous meetings and therefore doing the same job as the chair of the AC. It was suggested therefore that the deputy would be a co-chair and of equal role to the chair. However, only one person applied to be the chair of the AC and therefore it was felt that this was not a realistic expectation, but was an ideal situation in optimal circumstances. The discussion ended with the following conclusion: the deputy chair would not sit on executive meetings in the chair's absence, but would instead form a supportive role for Lode. **Lode Verreyen will write up his criteria of what he feels he needs in this first stage of the job.** Lode advised that both his role as chair and the deputy's role would evolve as the AC takes shape and evolves. This is to be made clear in the call for the deputy chair.

Questions raised during the meeting that require further consideration:
- How long can the chair hold the position for – should this be 4 years or 2 years as a maximum?
- The group wondered whether it would be possible to provide funding to allow NRs to attend the AC meetings as this would increase the ability of many to attend in person
- Would it be possible to arrange for an AC meeting to be attached to the ICCH conference every year, including when it is held in America as it was felt that a good number of EACH members attended both conferences?

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>

National Representative section:
- **Exchanging country priorities and sharing expertise**

LV briefly summarized the points raised in the NR reports received. The document showing all reports, with themes and key messages highlighted in yellow, can be found attached to these minutes.

Question from Eva Doherty – has anyone been asked by their national health provider to respond to a patient survey to do an intervention?

</td>
</tr>
</table>

UK – national in-patient survey occurs every year, but never been asked to an intervention
Please could any NR/DNR with experience of this please contact Eva Doherty.

How can NRs help facilitate an increase in members within EACH? The group agreed the following elements would help to increase membership:

Money
- Increased marketing to help get EACH known by those in the industry
- Discounted, two-year membership fee option, to help encourage those to stay as members during the years when ICCH is organized by ACH
- Would be good to include in the market testing what membership fee is considered affordable
- Could we look at ways to rank membership fees based on profession or country GDP?
- Institutional membership may be a way of making it more affordable for low income countries
- Need to think about what the incentives are for joining EACH
- tEACH courses are considered to be too expensive. Could EACH bring courses to a specific country/institution? This might encourage higher attendance, rather than just running them in one location in the UK each year. Courses need to be affordable otherwise institutions may look to use local experts to deliver training rather than using EACH. Is it possible to make part of the course online and then provide an experiential session with local facilitators in order to help reduce costs? The certification for the Train the Trainer programme is still in progress and so at the moment those who have taken part in the programme have not yet been certified to deliver EACH courses in their own countries.

Potential market:
- Should EACH link to other associations in order to encourage more members? For example, International Communication Association (ICA) or Association for Medical Education in Europe (AMEE)
- A key aim of EACH is to improve communication in healthcare, therefore EACH need a good reach within healthcare practitioners and those that need access to support in teaching. The group felt that a lot of practitioners are not aware that any research takes place in this area and therefore that there is any help out there for them.

Language:
- What is the link between EACH and PEC? Some countries require journal articles in their own language, is this something PEC would consider doing?
- EACH could potentially grow its membership by making some elements more accessible to those who have limited English, for example Poland, Spain and Italy. As experts in communication we need to demonstrate empathy for those who English is not their first language.
- Could the tEACH courses be conducted in local languages where required?
- Email communication misses a lot of depth (tone of voice, non-verbals), it would be good for EACH to use video more as a means of communicating messages

8	**Project groups**
	Optimize the reporting between the AC and AC Chair, and the EC, e.g. a brief country report with priorities every 6 months, prior to the AC meetings? - Some NRs has an issue with the word report, but agreed that it was good to communicate and update every year. - The group requested an online discussion forum to allow NRs to network regularly between meetings to keep everyone up to date on their activities and a way of asking for help in between meetings. It was felt that this would help inject motivation into the group. **Lorraine Noble highlighted that the UK Council had a very effective blog system. LN is to email FW more details about this so that SAS can investigate how to implement a similar system**

	In light of the new structure of the AC, do we need to adapt the criteria for the position of NR and DNR? Basic information can be found in the document from 2015 from the EC and the results of the discussion at the Dublin meeting - It would be good to produce a 'Quick Start' guide for NR/DNRs to help those new to the role understand the structure of EACH and their role. It would also be good to set up a buddy system, so that each new NR/DNR has an experienced NR/DNR to shadow for their first year. - The new role of the NRs is to shape the priorities of the association for executive to then implement. The NRs need clear guidelines on what the strategic plan of the association is, the role of the executive, the role of the AC and how these work together and therefore what the NR/DNR's tasks are in order to facilitate this - It became clear in the discussion that different NRs are interpreting their roles differently. Whereas some individuals saw their role as very one way (ie from the NR to EACH and not from EACH to their country) other NRs did not see it like this and were representing themselves as representatives of EACH in their own countries and getting the recognition for that. Each discussant briefly summarised the level of networking in their own country and it was clear that because most of the discussants were researchers that they knew about the research networking but not about the teach networking. This should be addressed so that the NRs knows and takes responsibility about all the networking. - LV has produced some videos in the tEACH group about how to network within your own country, these would be helpful to share with the NRs to help them develop their role. - Is the AC a confederation of peers or is this a hierarchy? Is it the role of the NR to follow instructions from the executive and do homework or can the NRs mold their role how they want it to be going forward? - There is huge variation among countries depending on the number of members and other variables and how can we take this into consideration as we redefine the role and understanding of what the representatives do? **Action points from the meeting:** - Wherever possible each NR should be able to attend at least once a year a face to face AC meeting (need to see if it is possible to get any funding from EACH to help achieve this). LV to set up quarterly zoom meetings for the AC, to allow them to continue working between the face to face meetings. - LV will be the point of communication between the AC and executive - LV to produce criteria for the deputy AC chair to detail the help that he requires right now. LV will share this with the AC with a 10 day deadline for feedback. - NRs offered their support to help canvass members, if required, for the market testing to be carried out by Iain Simpson. This might be particularly helpful in countries who are less confident using English. Sub-groups: - To re-write criteria and role of NR/DNR and how this fits with the executive and whole organisation. This is required before the election process at the end of April. **Volunteers to email LV by 9th April.** - To generate ideas on how to improve EACH's reach through translation of certain elements (for example, particular documents or pages of the EACH website) - To go over the 'Meeting Zone' draft to refine it - To decide what role will ACH and PEC have in the new Advisory Committee
Conclusions	
8	**Next Advisory Group meeting** **LV to send out a doodle for an online AC meeting to be held in 3 months time.** Next face to face meeting will be held in Porto, Portugal on the 4th & 5th September 2018.
9	**AOB** LV will email the AC a preliminary agenda for the meeting 2 weeks in advance and ask for any input on issues that anyone wishes to include

	It was agreed that NRs would be given 10 day deadlines for responding to urgent items and 2 weeks for something non-urgent
10	**Thanks** Thank you to everyone for such valuable input and for helping to make this a successful interactive meeting, both in person and online.