

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 14 to Friday, November 15, 2019

The Dupont Circle Hotel, 1500 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington, DC, 20036

Or Phone: (408) 740-7256; Meeting ID: 885 350 082

IN ATTENDANCE (ALPHA ORDER)

Monica Baskin, PhD President-Elect*	Lisa M. Klesges, PhD Chair, Development Committee	Tracey A. Revenson, PhD Incoming Editor, Annals of Behavioral Medicine
Joanna Buscemi, PhD Chair, Health Policy Council*	Crystal Lumpkins, PhD Editor, Outlook	Margaret Schneider, PhD Member Delegate*
Heather Cole-Lewis, PhD Chair, Digital Health Council*	Scherezade K. Mama, DrPH Chair, Membership Council*	Rachel C. Shelton, ScD, MPH Member Delegate*
Michael A. Diefenbach, PhD President*	Megan McVay, PhD Chair, Publications and Communications Council*	Dori Steinberg, PhD, RD Co-Chair, Program Committee
Akilah J. Dulin, PhD Chair, Health Policy Committee	Suzanne Miller, PhD Editor, Translational Behavioral Medicine	Monica Wang, PhD Chair, Civic and Public Engagement Committee
Brian D. Gonzalez, PhD Chair, SIG Council*	Sherry Pagoto, PhD Immediate Past-President and Chair, Nominating Committee*	Sandra J. Winter, PhD, MHA Secretary/Treasurer and Chair, Finance Committee*
Amy Huebschmann, MD Chair, Education, Training, and Career Development Council*	L. Alison Phillips, PhD Chair, Program Committee	
E. Amy Janke, PhD Chair, Scientific and Professional Liaison Council*	Lila J. Rutten, PhD, MPH Member Delegate*	

* = voting member; quorum = 7 voting members

REGRETS (ALPHA ORDER)

Robert M. Kaplan, PhD Chair, Awards Committee	Kevin S. Masters, PhD Editor, Annals of Behavioral Medicine	Rajani S. Sadasivam, PhD Editor, SBM Website/Social Media Team
---	---	--

STAFF AND GUESTS (ALPHA ORDER)

Lindsay Bullock Executive Director	Andrew Schmidt Program Manager	
Bradford W. Hesse, PhD Chair, Open Science Working Group	Tara Withington, CAE Consulting Partner, SBM	

Fall Board Meeting, November 14, 2019

CALL TO ORDER AND CALL FOR DISCLOSURES

The meeting was called to order at 3:14 p.m. ET. No conflict disclosures were made.

BOARD MEETING GOALS

Dr. Diefenbach provided an overview of the agenda and goals for the first day of the meeting. The first several agenda items are dedicated to SBM's financial future, in particular new streams of revenue from a coordinated fundraising campaign and potential microcredentialing program, as well as reviewing and approving the society's 2020 budget. The following day's agenda is intended to focus the board on SBM's scientific/educational future, with updates on open science, the Provocative Questions presidential initiative, and SBM's inter-organizational partnerships via the SPLC.

FUNDRAISING CONSIDERATIONS

SBM commissioned a fundraising feasibility study in 2018 to identify opportunities for support and strategies for developing new streams of charitable giving. Initial results were encouraging, with the board deciding earlier in 2019 to revitalize the Development Committee and charge it with designing a fundraising campaign using the recommendations of the feasibility study.

Dr. Klesges presented a draft case for support that would provide the foundation of a fundraising campaign. Central to the campaign is the establishment of three funds to which donors could direct their contributions: Leadership Development, Science Communication, and Policy Advocacy. Donations to each of these funds would be dedicated to SBM's strategic initiatives in that area, such as student travel awards and leadership training scholarships under Leadership Development, or media training for members under Science Communication. Dr. Klesges noted that unrestricted gifts would also be accepted, with the board or executive committee being responsible for allocating those funds.

MOTION: The proposed fundraising campaign plan and three funds were approved by consensus.

Dr. Diefenbach asked the board to consider how best to begin realizing the fundraising plan.

Dr. Klesges suggested the campaign start with a soft launch focused on "broad" rather than "deep" donations and building a culture of giving before heavily promoting the fundraising efforts. Board participation would be paramount in establishing a culture of giving, and regardless of the amount that each individual board member is able to give, 100% of the board should be expected to make a donation once the fundraising campaign is underway. Being able to exhibit buy-in from leadership could also help encourage other donations and preempt pushback from members who already pay membership dues to SBM.

Dr. Schneider asked how student/trainee and early-career members would or would not be involved. Dr. Baskin proposed including ways to donate and levels of support that would appeal to all types of members, while Dr. Phillips added that members who become "invested" in SBM at an early stage may be more likely to continue donating in the future. A key component of reaching out to these members will be emphasizing the benefits of the initiatives funded by donations, particularly those under the Leadership Development umbrella. For donors at all career stages and abilities to give, sharing clear goals for the raised funds and highlighting successful outcomes further down the road will be critical for building an ongoing case for support. Donor recognition at all levels of giving would also be a key aspect of keeping past contributors engaged and encouraging new donations.

Dr. Miller asked when corporate and/or institutional giving would be incorporated into the fundraising campaign. Dr. Klesges confirmed that the idea is to begin actively cultivating those kinds of outside relationships after a base of internal giving has been established. Additional conversations will need to be held at the board level to consider conflicts of interest related to gifts from industry, as well as the role of the Membership Council and SPLC in exploring donations from affiliate members and organizational partners, respectively. The Development Committee will strive to have an official giving policy ready for the board's April 2020 meeting.

MICROCREDENTIALING UPDATE

Dr. Huebschmann informed the board that ETCD's microcredentialing subcommittee has been focused on developing a special pre-conference workshop for the 2020 Annual Meeting. Following the conclusion of the microcredentialing feasibility study and after obtaining cost estimates for program development, the committee recommended the program be put on hold until 1) a library of content could be assembled for eventual use in microcredentialing modules, and 2) SBM can develop a better understanding of the potential audience for behavioral medicine credentials.

The in-person training, entitled "From Engagement to Outcomes: Applying Behavioral Science to Design Effective Digital Health Behavior Change Interventions," is based on well-attended sessions that SBM members have presented at the Connected Health Conference (CHC) over the past several years. Now that the program for the workshop has been mostly finalized and registration for the Annual Meeting is open, the subcommittee is working to implement a marketing strategy that includes bringing on a student intern to help develop and disseminate marketing materials, utilizing an email list of CHC attendees, offering a discount code that members can share with others in their networks, and promoting the training on local event boards such as Eventbrite.

Dr. Pagoto noted that difficulties identifying a target audience during the feasibility study gave the committee pause, and the workshop is in part a test of the assumption that non-member, non-academics working in industry are the ideal audience for an SBM microcredential. Participants will be asked to complete an evaluation to help determine interest in a microcredentialing program among a digital health/mHealth audience and identify the kinds of microcredentialing content that that audience would find most useful.

Dr. Baskin added that several SBM members met during Obesity Week and discussed the possibility of holding a similar workshop at Obesity Week 2020 to generate additional content and gauge interest in microcredentialing from a clinical audience.

2020 BUDGET

Dr. Winter notified the board that SBM continues to budget conservatively as a matter of policy, projecting \$0 in return on the society's investments with Capital Counsel and adopting increased membership dues rates that were approved by the board during its previous meeting in August.

As mentioned during the discussion of fundraising considerations, a new "Development" line item has been created to capture expenses related to the proposed fundraising campaign, with \$32,100 in costs projected for the first year. In addition, funding for a new half-time development coordinator position has been added to the EDI management fee. A new "Credentialing" section has also been added to the budget, however only expenses and projected income for the 2020 pre-conference workshop are included at this time.

Dr. Winter also cited lower projected expenditures as a result of eliminating hill visits in favor of utilizing SBM's new health policy ambassadors, and reduced costs for holding the 2020 fall board meeting in Milwaukee rather than DC.

MOTION: Dr. Winter moved to approve the 2020 budget. Dr. Janke seconded. The motion carried.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m. ET.

Fall Board Meeting, November 15, 2019

CALL TO ORDER AND CALL FOR DISCLOSURES

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. ET. No conflict disclosures were made.

CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Dr. Diefenbach moved to approve the August 2019 board of directors meeting minutes and council and committee reports. Dr. Gonzalez seconded. The motion carried.

NEW BOARD APPOINTMENTS

Dr. Baskin proposed the following new board appointments, for 3-year terms unless otherwise noted:

- Carly Goldstein, PhD; Chair, Civic and Public Engagement Committee
- Cynthia Castro Sweet, PhD; Chair, Digital Health Council
- Valerie Myers, PhD; Chair, Education, Training, and Career Development Council
- Michele Patel, PhD; Chair, Web and Social Media Team
- E. Amy Janke, PhD; Chair, Scientific and Professional Liaison Council (1-year extension)

MOTION: Dr. Pagoto moved to approve the new board appointments. Dr. Diefenbach seconded. Dr. Janke abstained. The motion carried.

SPLC PRIORITIES

Dr. Janke provided some background on the SPLC's recent efforts to develop a strategic plan and method(s) for critically examining new and existing partnerships for their alignment with the council's strategic plan and SBM's mission and vision.

Formalizing a strategic plan and procedures for new liaisons will also help the council determine which of SBM's inter-organizational relationships that are currently being managed on an ad hoc basis by individual members should be made into official SPLC partners, which could be better managed at an informal level by the SIGs, and which should be sunset.

The council has proposed that when considering a new liaison relationship, it will evaluate:

1. Alignment with either SBM's long-term vision or organizational initiatives.
2. Feasibility with current resources including budget, time, and staff support.

The council will also adopt a series of criteria that it will apply to existing partnerships to determine whether those relationships should be maintained, modified, or sunsetted entirely:

1. The liaison remains aligned with SBM's long-term vision and/or organizational initiatives.
2. The liaison is producing products of value to SBM, its membership, and the field of behavioral medicine.

3. Any resource costs associated with the liaison are considered appropriate to the demonstrated outcomes.

Dr. Janke shared a proposed evaluation rubric with the board that incorporates these criteria for new and existing liaisons. The SPLC's request for the board at this stage was to weigh in on the proposed evaluation framework and examine whether it appropriately aligns with the society's strategic goals and makes effective use of available resources.

Dr. Janke also noted that SPLC has been interested in developing policies and procedures to combat a lack of institutional memory and difficulty in maintaining relationships with liaison partners when the council member who had been the point person with that liaison leaves the SPLC.

Dr. Mama asked whether SPLC would manage partnerships with non-scientific (read: industry) organizations, and if not, which council or committee should be responsible for shepherding them. Dr. Janke noted that SPLC doesn't handle industry partnerships currently and that other groups such as the Digital Health Council could be more appropriate, and Dr. Diefenbach added that individual members who have preexisting relationships with industry partners could be tasked with leading those relationships. Dr. Klesges suggested that the Development Committee could also assist with shepherding those relationships if they had a financial component.

Dr. Diefenbach recommended that the SPLC consider working with the SIG Council to identify dormant liaisons or non-SPLC partnerships that could be effectively managed at the SIG level, and Dr. Gonzalez suggested the SIGs may find it useful to have a template for effective relationship building or tips for engaging other organizations with SBM. It may also be helpful to share guidelines with the SIG Council and other councils and committees for the types of relationships they should manage themselves and those that should be proposed to the SPLC or directly to the board/Executive Committee.

OPEN SCIENCE WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Dr. Hesse presented a summary of the working group's activities since being officially convened in April. The working group was charged with exploring the implications of open science for SBM and its members, educating the SBM membership about open science, and developing actionable recommendations for the SBM board, and it has divided its efforts toward these goals into three facets relevant to SBM: editorial policy and publication, resource sharing, and citizen science.

The first of these three facets, editorial policy and publications, has been led by Drs. David Conroy and Kenneth Tercyak, in collaboration with Sarah Andrus from Oxford University Press. The group reviewed the status of *Annals* and *TBM* against the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines established in 2015 and found several areas in which the journals could increase their commitment to transparency. The working group's recommendations will include steps that both publications can take to move from level 0 to level 1 of each of the eight standards set out in the TOP guidelines. Dr. Winter raised a concern with sharing patient data that cannot be effectively de-identified. Dr. Hesse noted that the working group has been considering this and will do a deeper dive on the subject before submitting its final recommendations, and Dr. McVay added that adopting an expectation of data transparency could encourage authors to share as much of their data as possible without mandating the sharing of sensitive information. Dr. Lumpkins suggested that a future special issue or special section of *Outlook* could be dedicated to continuing the conversation on this and related issues, to contribute to the working group's charge of educating the SBM membership about open science. Dr. Diefenbach proposed developing a Grand Rounds webinar and Dr. Baskin suggested holding a Twitter chat on the subject as well.

Dr. Hesse then shared the working group's progress on its second facet, resource sharing, which has been led by Drs. Dominika Kwasnicka and Molly Waring. The group's work thus far has focused on incentives for researchers to share their data (e.g., CV entries

for published datasets), platforms for sharing datasets and other resources such as codebases or intervention materials, and funding opportunities to facilitate the sharing of these various resources. One such resource sharing platform that the working group has been exploring is OpenDigitalHealth.org (ODH). ODH has already been in contact with the Digital Health Council and Behavioral Informatics and Technology SIG regarding a partnership with SBM, and the working group will be further examining opportunities for collaboration and potential concerns related to licensing and intellectual property protections on the platform.

Dr. Hesse reported that Drs. Eric Hekler and Abby King have been focusing on the working group's third facet of citizen science. While the majority of recommendations in the prior two facets will be designed to promote openness and transparency among and between scientists, open science principles can also include stakeholders from outside the scientific community. There exist a number of platforms and initiatives promoting citizen science in the realms of healthcare, population health, and public health. The group has further divided programs in each of these areas into those that are professional-led, those that are citizen-led, or those led by a combination of citizens and professional scientists, and looked at which programs support historically-marginalized groups versus those that target groups who have traditionally possessed resources. In addition, the group has been considering the ways in which citizen science initiatives can increase buy-in and provide opportunities for participation in a way that helps to rebuild public trust in science after decreasing public confidence in scientists in recent years. Drs. Hekler and King have proposed adopting a "participating" rather than "protecting" mentality for involving public stakeholders in scientific discourse, leveraging citizen scientists' knowledge and expertise at the question generation, data collection and interpretation, and implementation stages.

The working group will continue to develop recommendations for SBM in each of these areas and make a final presentation during the spring board meeting.

PROVOCATIVE QUESTIONS PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVE UPDATE

Dr. Diefenbach reported that following the initial provocative questions survey earlier this year, the steering committee worked with consultancy KnowInnovation to consolidate the results and develop a final list of seven synthesized questions that encapsulate the bulk of responses. These clustered questions were then sent back to the membership in October to be ranked in order of importance, with respondents being randomly assigned a version of the survey instructions that asked them to consider the questions' importance to them personally, to the field of behavioral medicine, to SBM, or to citizens and society.

The steering committee's next steps will be to incorporate those rankings into white papers that will be submitted to *Translational Behavioral Medicine* and/or *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, and Dr. Diefenbach will present the findings during the presidential keynote at the 2020 Annual Meeting. The committee will also be considering how to incorporate the provocative questions into science communication and will look at ways to translate the questions into actionable steps.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE UPDATES

Dr. Phillips shared with the board that abstract rejection rate for the 2020 Annual Meeting has trended higher as a result of a steadily increasing number of abstract submissions year over year. There was a combined 20% rejection rate for all abstract types this year, compared to 8% and 9% for the 2019 and 2018 Annual Meetings, respectively. In particular, pre-conference courses, panel discussions, and symposia were extraordinarily competitive, with 40%, 47%, and 43% of those abstract types rejected.

Dr. Phillips reported that the Program Committee had received questions and complaints from several abstract authors and noted that other board members may be, or may have already been, contacted by submitters regarding their rejected abstracts as well. As such, the committee has been discussing possible methods of explaining how abstracts are reviewed and why rejection rates were

higher this year. Dr. Baskin proposed an article in *Outlook* that addresses some of submitters' concerns and reiterates the inherent rise in rejection rates in the face of record high abstract submission numbers. Dr. Mama added that in her conversations with disappointed submitters, several said they were unable or unwilling to attend the Annual Meeting as a result and would therefore not be renewing their membership for the upcoming year. Any piece that addresses rejection rates could also highlight the benefits of attending the meeting and keeping one's membership current even if you aren't presenting this year.

Dr. Phillips also provided the board with a preview of the 2020 Annual Meeting plenary sessions and presented the keynote and master lecture speakers:

- Opening Wednesday Keynote – Kara Hall
- Thursday Morning Keynote – Ruha Benjamin
- Thursday Evening Keynote – Michael Diefenbach
- Friday Morning Keynote – Danielle Schlosser
- Friday Evening Keynote – Susan Michie, Pól Mac Aonghusa, Robert Wachter
- Closing Saturday Keynote – Laura Carstensen
- Thursday Master Lecture – Miguel Hernan
- Thursday Master Lecture – Julian Thayer, Distinguished Science Award Winner
- Friday Master Lecture – Alex Rothman
- Friday Master Lecture – Ashley Graham for Truth Initiative, Jessie Gruman Award Winner
- Saturday Master Lecture – Brad Hesse

HEALTH POLICY AMBASSADORS UPDATE

Dr. Buscemi reminded the board that per Dr. Binta Beard's recommendation during the 2018 fall board meeting, SBM is shifting its policymaker outreach strategy from once-annual hill visits by SBM leaders to sustained contact from volunteer health policy ambassadors. Central to the policy ambassador strategy is the adoption of policy priorities that SBM will focus on for the next three years, and the targeting of key legislators in each of those policy areas. The three policy priorities approved by the board during its August call are:

1. Educate lawmakers about evidence-based ways to best manage pain and combat opioid misuse
2. Educate lawmakers about the unique healthcare needs of rural populations and evidence-based strategies to improve their health outcomes and quality of life
3. Educate lawmakers about evidence-based ways to ensure children from all income levels have access to and actually eat healthy foods

Dr. Buscemi reported that the Health Policy Council conducted research over the summer to identify roughly seven legislators relevant to each policy priority area, with SBM staff assisting to match each legislator with potential ambassadors from among the membership. Efforts have been focused on the pain/opioid misuse policy priority thus far, and while at least one match has been made for each of the legislators that the council has decided to target for this topic, it has been difficult to identify multiple prospects for every district/state. According to Dr. Beard, ambassadors would be most effective if they had subject matter expertise and lived within the district or state represented by the legislator to which they were assigned, however Dr. Buscemi noted that the Health Policy Council is considering alternative approaches, including inviting non-member subject area experts to join SBM and serve as ambassadors, or assigning member experts as ambassadors even if they reside outside of a legislator's district.

Several board members enquired whether SBM should target state-level policymakers instead of, or in addition to, federal legislators. Dr. Buscemi agreed that outreach at other levels would be a worthy aspirational goal, but with the resources SBM has available for advocacy at this point, focusing on members of Congress would be likely to have the greatest impact. SBM can also

consider partnerships with other like-minded organizations active in the policy space.

SURVEY PANEL UPDATE

Dr. Mama noted that the Membership Council was charged during the spring board meeting with establishing a survey panel that could be asked to provide feedback on certain society initiatives in lieu of surveying the full membership. As part of the council's efforts to revitalize the SBM Champions program this year as well, it was determined that the two programs should be merged. This will serve the dual purpose of assembling a panel that is made up of committed SBM members and representative of the membership as a whole, and give the champions, some of whom had previously noted a lack of activities associated with their role, a new way to serve the society. SBM staff has helped to identify a diverse set of potential champions, and the Membership Council is currently sending out invitations. Dr. Mama encouraged board members to consider questions that their councils, committees, or working groups might want to present to the survey panel for feedback.

NOMINATIONS REMINDER

Dr. Pagoto announced that nominations for a new member delegate and president-elect were being accepted through December 6, and invited all board members to submit nominations and encourage their colleagues to do so as well.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IN 2020

Dr. Baskin informed the board that SBM will be undertaking a strategic planning exercise next year, with a large portion of the fall 2020 board meeting being dedicated to the initiative. The last time that the board participated in such an exercise was in 2013, and as the agenda items from the board meeting illustrate, reexamining strategic priorities is already something that is being worked on at the council and committee level so a society-wide consideration of strategic goals is overdue. Requests for proposals have been sent to consultants to facilitate the strategic planning process, and additional details will be shared with the board in spring.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m. ET.