

**HEALTHY ENVIRONMENTS PARTNERSHIP
PROCEDURES FOR DISSEMINATION-RELATED ACTIVITIES
Adopted by the HEP Steering Committee 12/17/02
Amended 1/12/07**

This document lists the guidelines and procedures that the Healthy Environments Partnership (HEP) has agreed upon for conducting dissemination-related activities of the Partnership. In addition, comprehensive, up-to-date lists are included of all HEP-related presentations and poster sessions (Appendix 1) and articles published, submitted, and/or in preparation and doctoral dissertations completed (Appendix 2.)

The Healthy Environments Partnership will use a standardized acknowledgement in publications, presentations, and other dissemination-related activities.

Standardized Acknowledgement:

The Healthy Environments Partnership (HEP) <http://www.hepdetroit.org/> has been working together since 2000 to understand how the environment affects risk of heart disease and obesity. HEP is a project of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center <http://www.sph.umich.edu/urc>, with funding from NIEHS (1 R01 ES10936-05; 1 R01 ES014234-01) and NCMHHD (1 R24 MD001619-01). The partners that have been involved in HEP are: Brightmoor Community Center, Boulevard Harambee, Friends of Parkside, Detroit Department of Health and Wellness Promotion, Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation, Henry Ford Health System (AIM HI), Rebuilding Communities Incorporated, Southwest Solutions, Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision, University of Michigan Schools of Public Health, Nursing, Social Work, Architecture and Urban Planning, and the Institute for Social Research.

DISSEMINATION PROCEDURES

2. The Healthy Environments Partnership (HEP) will implement the following guidelines for deciding who will attend and participate as presenters at conferences, cross –site meetings, seminars and workshops focusing on the work of HEP.

2a. Criteria for who will attend:

1. To the extent feasible, there will always be at least one University of Michigan and one Detroit community partner co-presenting. Exceptions to this guideline may be made with discussion and prior approval of the Steering Committee.
2. Steering Committee (SC) members who have the most expertise on the given topic will have first priority to be a co-presenter. If more than one person meets this criterion for a particular presentation, a rotating system will be used for selecting participants. When necessary, the SC members will vote on which representative is most appropriate.
3. Priority will also be given to those SC members who have been most involved with the

particular topic to be addressed in the presentation;

4. Flexibility will be maintained in choosing participants for conferences based on the needs of the presentation and funding available.

2b. Procedures and process:

1. Community partners should be involved as much as possible in making presentations - particularly in areas where they'll have more opportunity for capacity building;
2. Selected co-presenters must be actively involved in the planning of the presentation, ideally including development and review of abstracts prior to their submission, development of the presentation itself, and discussions about joint presentation of content;
3. When time allows, the criteria for deciding who should be a co-presenter will be brought to the SC for discussion and a decision: teams who wish to submit an abstract for presentation at a professional meeting should first discuss the abstract and timeline with the PI. Timelines should allow for discussion of the proposed presentation at a monthly SC meeting prior to submission of the abstract when possible: when necessary to provide time for SC involvement in developing the abstract and presentation (per #2 above), discussion may be held via email.
4. When time doesn't allow, the lead person for the presentation will first check with the proposed co-presenter(s) and if they agree to participate, will then send an email to the SC with recommendations for who should participate, including a deadline for responding to the request;
5. To the extent possible, and especially when the purpose and importance of the presentation seems to necessitate it, co-presenters will have the opportunity to practice "dry runs" of their presentations;
6. If someone who has agreed to participate is unable to do so, the decision for a replacement will be made by the SC or the other people presenting; and
7. Maintain a list of HEP-related presentations and poster sessions (See Appendix 1 for up-to-date list of HEP-related presentations and poster sessions).

3. Implement the following guidelines for deciding on authorship of academic journal articles and popular press publications about the work of HEP.

3a. Criteria for authorship:

1. To the extent feasible, there should always be at least one University and one Detroit community partner as co-authors;
2. SC members who have the most expertise on the topic will have first priority to be a co-author;
3. The PI and Co-PI should be involved in any papers written, unless they choose not to participate and provided they meet the criteria for authorship described under #6

below;

4. The number of co-authors will depend on the requirements of the publication. If the publication's guidelines limit the number of authors, a rotating system will be used for selecting co-authors. If the publication's guidelines do not limit the number of authors, co-authorship will be kept to a reasonable number
5. Priority will also be given to those SC members who have been most involved with the particular topic that will be addressed in the article; and.
6. Criteria for authorship will adhere to the following guidelines:

“All persons designated as authors need to qualify for authorship. Each author must have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for the content. Authorship credit will be based only on substantial contributions to: a) conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of data for that manuscript; b) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and on c) final approval by the coauthor of the version to be published. Conditions a), b) and c) must all be met. All parts of the article must be the responsibility of at least one author for each component of the article that is critical to its main conclusions (for example, one or more co-author must take responsibility for the accuracy of data presented in statistical tables). It is understood that editors may require authors to describe what each contributed, and that this information may be published.”

Adapted from: Mario Biagiolo, Judith Crane, Pamela Derish, Mark Gruber, Drummond Rennie and Richard Horton (1999) Draft White Paper, Council of Science Editors, CSE Task Force on Authorship,
http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/services/atf_whitepaper.cfm.

3b. Procedures and process:

1. When time allows, the selection of who should be a co-author will be brought to the SC for discussion and a decision;
 2. Criteria for inclusion in a writing team will include: intellectual contributions, contributions to development of data collection instruments and methodology; contributions during data collection; expertise on the topic;
 3. When time doesn't allow, the lead person for the article will first check with the proposed co-author(s) and if they agree to participate, will then send an email to the SC with recommendations for who will participate, along with a deadline for responding to the request;
 4. Regardless of the co-authors, all SC partner organizations will be acknowledged in every article; and
 5. If a Steering Committee member who has agreed to be a co-author is unable to do so, the decision for a replacement will be made by the SC.
6. All selected co-authors must be actively involved in the development of the article, eg. conceptualization of the analysis,

reviewing printouts, reviewing drafts, (as described in point 3a6 above). Co-authors may be responsible for drafting specific sections of the manuscript;

7. The lead author is responsible for assuring that all members of the writing team are aware of these dissemination guidelines (e.g. by distributing them at the first meeting of the writing team and briefly reviewing them).

8. If there is any question as to whether a member of the writing team qualifies for authorship, the lead author, in consultation with one or more co-authors and the P.I., will determine whether all co-authors have met the criteria.

4. Implement the following guidelines regarding communication about HEP-related activities and findings with the media and at public meetings.

4a. Standardized acknowledgement of HEP for media and public meetings:

4b. The Standardized Acknowledgement shown on page 1 will be used in media releases and public meetings.

4c. Procedures:

1. The standardized acknowledgement of HEP (p.1) will be used for all publications, presentations, and other dissemination-related activities, including media releases and public meetings.
2. Whenever a SC member is contacted by the media regarding HEP activities, he or she will refer the contact to the HEP Principal Investigator or Project Manager who will direct the media to the appropriate HEP partner;
3. Press releases from HEP must be developed or approved by the HEP Principal Investigator or Project Manager;
4. Whenever an article or press release is given to the media regarding HEP activities, the article or press release will be provided to the HEP Principal Investigator who will share it with the SC; and
5. When making a presentation, the presenter will acknowledge that HEP is a project of the URC.

5. Develop and maintain a list of core articles regarding the work of HEP for dissemination through academic outlets.

Procedures:

1. Develop a list of current articles addressing key HEP research questions for dissemination through academic outlets.
2. Ideas for articles along with abstracts may be proposed to the SC for review (see Appendix 2 for an up-to-date list of HEP-related publications, submitted articles, and articles in preparation).

6. Disseminate information regarding the work of HEP through community newsletters, popular press, websites, community forums and other activities of the Community Outreach and Education Program.

Procedures for implementation:

1. Develop list of core publications for dissemination through community newsletters, popular press, websites and other media;
2. Develop a list of community newsletters, popular press, websites, and other media based on SC input and distribute to all SC members; and
3. HEP partners will inform the Principal Investigator or Project Manager whenever any specific media are approached to avoid duplication of effort.

List of potential community newsletters:

The Pipeline (Warren/Conner Development Coalition)

Parkside's New Day

Mack Area News (U-SNAP-BAC newsletter)

Morningside News

Chandler Park Newsletter (Chandler Park Neighborhood Association)

AWARE Newsletter

Outer Drive Chandler Park

El Central

Latino Press

SWDEV Issues

East English Village

Internal Organs

United Way Families

Healthy Detroit

GDAHC Newsletter

7. Implement procedures for educating local, state, and federal-level policy makers and funders about the benefits and results of HEP, with the goal of encouraging policies that address the inequalities that have been linked to health disparities and the protective factors that affect the cardiovascular health of adults in Detroit.

Procedures for implementation:

1. Work with the URC to create a list of relevant policy makers to whom information will be regularly and systematically distributed;
2. Create one-page summaries of published articles, papers and evaluation results;
3. Work with the URC to distribute articles, papers, evaluation results, and/or summaries thereof to policy makers.

8. Implement the following procedures for disseminating the results from HEP research and evaluation to SC members.

Procedures for implementation:

1. Provide mini-updates of research and evaluation findings for SC members; and
2. Disseminate one-page summaries of research articles or analyses to SC members, and include on the HEP website.

9. Implement the following procedures for addressing interest in the database beyond the core questions/core team.

Procedure:

1. Respond to requests from other investigators (faculty, researchers, students, community members) for access to our data by providing them with a copy of the dissemination principles (this document), the community-based participatory research principles for HEP, and the form “Request for Use of Healthy Environment Partnership Data.”
2. Dr. Schulz will review completed request forms and will consult with other members of the research team regarding the proposed analysis. Once she has ensured that the form has been completed adequately, that idea proposed as relevant to HEP and distinct from analyses currently underway, and that it contains the information necessary for SC review, it will be brought to the SC for consideration.
3. Requests may be approved, revisions may be suggested with review by the Co-PIs prior to acceptance, revisions may be suggested with review by the full Steering Committee prior to acceptance, or denied by the Steering Committee following discussion.
4. Decisions will be made on any given proposal following discussion and decision using the 70% consensus rule*.
5. Monitor the dissemination activities of HEP to ensure that the guidelines and procedures listed above are being followed.

10. The SC will review and update the dissemination procedures as needed to ensure that they are relevant and being adhered to.

** 70% consensus rule follows the general principle of consensus decision-making, in which all participants have to support a given decision. However, given the challenges associated with reaching consensus, the 70% rule involves a slight modification. With the 70% rule, everyone still has to support a decision, but they do not have to be behind it 100%. Rather, if all members can buy into a decision with at least 70% of their support, then an overall decision has been reached. Israel, et al. Lessons Learned in the Development,*

Implementation and Evaluation of a Community-Based Participatory Research Partnership.
Journal of Public Health Management and Practice, 7(5), 1-20. (2001)

