Welcome to the Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior (SNEB) Advisory Committee on Public Policy (ACPP)! We greatly appreciate your service to the Society and leadership in advising the Society on public policy matters. The purpose of this handbook is to: (1) facilitate more timely and effective SNEB action on member-identified priority public policy issues at the federal level; (2) enhance new and current ACPP members’ contributions to SNEB policy endeavors; and (3) build the advocacy skills of SNEB members.

Created for new and current ACPP members, the handbook aims to define the roles and responsibilities of ACPP members by compiling relevant information from the SNEB manual and documenting past and current procedural processes. In addition, the handbook sets forth relevant procedures for advising the Society on public policy issues. The handbook also explains the types of activities and documents that have been and could be within the scope of ACPP. This handbook is only a tool to get started and will likely need to be updated periodically to reflect the current procedures and actions of the Society and ACPP. SNEB leaders and members, along with other organizations can use this handbook to understand the variety of approaches SNEB takes to advocate for priority public policy issues.

**Roles & Responsibilities of SNEB Leadership Regarding Public Policy**

The primary purpose of ACPP is to make recommendations on the national level priority public policy issues (e.g., Child Nutrition Reauthorization, Food Guide Pyramid, and Farm Bill) to Congress, the White House, and other federal government agencies.

**SNEB Board of Directors (BOD)**

The BOD has general supervision, management, and control of the business of the Society. The BOD has the final decision regarding any action taken by ACPP on any Federal-related activity reflecting SNEB’s organizational perspective. BOD approval is by majority vote. In regards to public policy, the BOD must:

- Approve any communication to national legislative, regulatory, and/or judicial bodies including, but not limited to:
  - SNEB priority issues
  - Endorsements of legislation and/or agency proposals
  - Letters on behalf of SNEB
  - SNEB position papers
  - Correspondence (letters, comments, thank you notes) on behalf of SNEB to lawmakers, congressional staff, and agency officials
  - Coalition letters

---

1 See also 8.2 Policies for Advisory Committee on Public Policy (ACPP) of SNEB Manual
Grassroots correspondence with SNEB membership, including Action Alerts
Testimony
News/Press Releases, Editorials
Surveys
Nominations that relate to Federal lawmakers, i.e., commissions, agencies, advisory groups, and coalitions

- Review and vote on the recommendations of ACPP concerning key Federal-related activities;
- Work with the ACPP Chair, as ex-officio BOD member, who will present ACPP public policy matters to the BOD and answer questions directly to the BOD. The ACPP chair may also call on the Subcommittee chairs to assist in presenting specific subcommittee policy documents to the BOD via teleconference or in the most cost-efficient manner possible; and
- Hire a public policy consultant to assist with the needs of SNEB’s public policy program.

SNEB Executive Director (ED)
The ED oversees the internal processes and communications among SNEB Board members and committees. In regards to public policy matters, the ED:

- Advises ACPP as necessary;
- Assists in facilitating ACPP recommendations to BOD;
- Provides deadlines for BOD meetings and includes ACPP recommendations in BOD packets;
- Serves as the key contact and will receive all documents created by SNEB’s public policy consultant;
- Participates on ACPP conference calls as necessary and is copied on all major ACPP communications, documents, and activities; and
- Supervises the evaluation of public policy consultant.

Advisory Committee on Public Policy (ACPP)
ACPP is a very active committee that focuses their efforts on the established public policy priority issues of the Society. ACPP holds regular telephone conference calls and provides input on a variety of matters relating to SNEB’s public policy priorities. ACPP is advisory to the SNEB BOD on public policy issues in which SNEB should participate on some level. ACPP’s primary responsibilities include:

- Advising and making policies recommendations to the BOD concerning nutrition education related public policy matters on which SNEB should have a voice;
- Developing SNEB’s Public Policy Survey, in conjunction with SNEB’s Public Policy Consultant. The survey is sent every 2 – 4 years to the entire SNEB membership to determine the society’s public policy priority issues;
- Developing legislative and regulatory positions based on SNEB’s priority issues, with input from all relevant Divisions and members to reflect the diversity of the organization.
- Develop work plan for SNEB’s priority issues;
- Drafting written communications as listed in ACPP’s Document Types section that support SNEB’s priority issues;
- Bringing forth opportunities, such as endorsing coalition letters, testifying before Congress, and agencies concerning SNEB priority issues; and
- Cooperate with representatives of other nutrition education associations on issues of mutual interest.
ACPP Chair
The ACPP Chair acts as the communication link between the BOD and ACPP. The primary duties of the Chair include:

- Serves as an ex-officio member of the BOD and is the main communications link between the BOD, ED, and ACPP;
- Participates on monthly BOD calls, provides ACPP updates and seeks approval on variety of ACPP actions;
- Drafts and sends out agenda for monthly ACPP calls;
- Leads monthly ACPP calls;
- Provides general oversight of all activities [Chair and co-chair];
- Reviews and comments on ACPP priority issues documents as needed;
- Assists in the development of SNEB’s legislative and regulatory positions;
- Provides advice and counsel on process for approval with BOD on public policy matters;
- Reviews regularly issued Legislative & Regulatory Bulletins (up to five per year) provided by SNEB’s public policy consultant; and
- Serves as main liaison between SNEB’s public policy consultant and ACPP.

ACPP Member
ACPP is comprised of 8 to 12 members. Each member is selected through SNEB’s ACPP Membership selection criteria and process, as follows:

8.2.2 Criteria & Process for Selection of ACPP members
The following criteria will be used to identify new members of the committee:

CRITERIA:

- Nutrition policy experience: The majority of members should have some experience in food and nutrition policy, and should represent a variety of backgrounds including but not limited to international, corporate, and state/local advocacy efforts. SNEB members with less experience who have a strong interest should also be considered.
- SNEB experience: Former or current leaders, preferably with some SNEB Board experience, should be considered.
- Federal nutrition education programs: The committee should include members who have expertise in a variety of federally funded nutrition education programs.
- Geographic spread: The committee should include members who are based in Washington D.C., and also include people from other regions of the country.
- SNEB Divisions: The committee will attempt to suggest representatives from as many of SNEB Divisions as possible. Input from division and division leadership will be sought as policy issues arise.
- Public Policy Priority Areas: The committee will attempt to recruit representatives that have specific experience in the SNEB public policy priority areas.

The ACPP Chair and Co-Chair assemble the list of potential ACPP committee members, using the above selection criteria, including each candidate’s background and relevant experience. This information will be presented to the Board and Division leaders in grid format to illustrate representatives’ experience levels and balance on the committee. The ACPP Chair and Co-Chair will solicit potential members from the Board of Directors and Division leaders. If the list
has more than 12 potential members, the ACPP will prioritize suggested members names according to the strength of the selection criteria.

ACPP members serve a two-year term (serving July 30-July 30 for two consecutive years) and terms are staggered. All members are eligible for a maximum of (2) consecutive two-year terms. The ACPP chair will submit the list of potential ACPP members to the Executive Committee by June 1st of each year. The SNEB Executive Committee will review and vote on the list of suggested members by June 30th of each year. The Executive Committee will notify the ACPP Chair with their vote. The ACPP Chair and/or Co-Chair will contact these individuals to invite them to serve on ACPP. ACPP Chair will provide a written summary of the final ACPP membership to the Board by July 15th of each year. Committee members should represent a cross-section of SNEB’s membership by living in different regions of the country and working in various segments of nutrition education.

ACPP members roles and responsibilities include:

- Participating in monthly conference calls (up to 2 hours);
- Providing input/comments on SNEB priority issues;
- Serving actively as a Chair or co-chair for an SNEB priority issue subcommittee (1 issue) [as needed]. Chair duties include:
  - Assembling a subcommittee of SNEB members and if needed external assists;
  - Submitting subcommittee member contact information to SNEB;
  - Keeping subcommittee updated of ACPP or BOD action on relevant subcommittee items;
  - Reviewing and drafting appropriate ACPP documents to support SNEB’s priority issues;
  - Sending out notices and reminders concerning due dates for comments on position papers;
  - Reviewing comments/input and facilitating draft into final form;
  - Circulating comments to appropriate divisions, ACPP members, and other SNEB members as needed;
  - Obtaining approval and support of BOD on all policy actions;
  - Assisting in developing time lines and list of action items;
  - Providing names of key agency officials, members of Congress, and hill staff to distribute SNEB priority issue documents;
  - Assisting in distributing final product to appropriate officials;
  - Assisting in drafting and reviewing testimony or any other ACPP document;
  - Serving as an informal liaison to Divisions; and
  - Drafting press releases (with assistance of Communications Division).
- Serving actively on priority issue subcommittee;
- Drafting letters or other types of correspondence as needed;
- Reviewing and commenting on Coalition Letters as needed;
- Reviewing testimony;
- Drafting support letters for legislation and/or agency proposals; and
- Sharing information on SNEB priority issues.

If a committee member is not actively communicating with the ACPP Chair and fulfilling his or her responsibilities, a member can be asked to resign or be replaced during their two-year term.
ACPP Subcommittee Member

ACPP will usually assemble at least five subcommittees on selected SNEB priority issues each year. Some subcommittees work may extend beyond a year while others might have a duration of less than a year. Subcommittees may be as small as one or two members or as large as 10. The Chair should assemble the subcommittee she believes is appropriate for the task at hand, with the aim of recruiting members that have the expertise and time to accomplish the task at hand. The subcommittee should aim to have members that have a diversity in perspectives, geographic location, and in skill sets (field-based, policy, academic, industry, etc.). Subcommittee roles and responsibilities include:

- Participating in conference calls as frequently as needed for the task at hand;
- Providing input/comments on the subcommittee priority issue;
- Reviewing and drafting an ACPP document relevant to the task at hand;
- Sending relevant subcommittee notices, information, and articles to the subcommittee;
- Keeping up to date on the relevant literature and legislative activity;
- Assisting in distributing final ACPP document products to appropriate stakeholders;
- Assisting with recruiting relevant subcommittee members; and
- Serving as liaisons with coalition partners or related entities.

Public Policy Division Point Person

Each year, SNEB asks each special interest Division to identify a Point Person for public policy. These individuals are not active members of ACPP. The Public Policy Point Person is advisory to ACPP. Responsibilities for Division Public Policy Point Person include:

- Act as the voice for their Division for SNEB public policy issues;
- Review/vote on any public policy opportunity falling within their Division’s substantive scope;
- Act in an advisory capacity to the SNEB Board of Directors when additional input is requested on any public policy action.

ACPP should actively involve the Division point person throughout the year and should consult the appropriate Division Point Person when specific topics related to a Division are considered. The point person may regularly participate at the subcommittee level. The point person should be willing and able to consult throughout the year and in Fast Track situations.

SNEB’s Public Policy Consultant assists the ACPP/SNEB in the following ways:

The Board contracts with a policy consultant (currently Waterman & Associates) to provide counsel, advice, and assist ACPP in setting objectives for an annual plan of work; prioritizing issues; and outlining strategic courses of action for SNEB to implement. The current Chair should review the current contract and discuss current services with SNEB leadership and the current consultant. While the contract defines the consultant services, the following is a general list of roles and responsibilities a consultant may have:

- Advise and consult with ACPP, Executive Director, and Board members regarding SNEB’s top priority issues, strategy and tools for communicating positions;
- Monitor and report on SNEB’s top priority issues;
- Provide regular updates on SNEB’s top priority issues;
- Alert SNEB regarding key legislative and regulatory developments, opportunities to testify, and key times to take other actions concerning nutrition education;
- Review letters, position papers and other communication tools for ACPP;
- Participate in ACPP conference calls; and
- Provide Board reports as necessary.

**Procedures Regarding Advising & Taking Action on Public Policy Issues**

If ACPP decides by a documented majority vote to advise the BOD on a public policy issue, then:

1) The ACPP Chair (or an ACPP member upon delegation from the Chair) should prepare a board report form explaining the recommendations and requesting the specific action required of the board (See SNEB Written Guidelines Form included at the end of this handbook). The ACPP Chair should copy the ED and the ACPP Co-Chair on all ACPP requests to the BOD.

2) The BOD will then respond to the written request during the next regularly scheduled board meeting or via email if a more timely response is required. Board approval may also be obtained via the *Fast Track Process* (defined further in next section) when a very quick turn-around time is required.

3) At the BOD meeting, the ACPP Chair will compile BOD feedback and prepare a written report (or email) to ACPP with the results of the BOD discussion/decision. This report will include specific areas needing revision and further response. The BOD may ask follow-up questions of the Chair or relevant ACPP members or subcommittee members via teleconference or email.

4) If revisions are to be done, the relevant ACPP members will incorporate the BOD feedback into the revisions process, and once input is appropriately gathered and incorporated, re-submit the final document to the BOD for approval using the same method as stated above.

5) Once the BOD has approved the ACPP recommendation, the appropriate ACPP group or membership will follow up with the specific action. If the BOD does not vote to take an ACPP action, then the BOD should provide the predominant BOD reason why that action was not taken. The BOD does not have to share every concern it has on every matter, but ACPP should have a transparent rationale for understanding why the BOD did not approve a particular course of action. This will also guide ACPP’s action on the matter under consideration and also its future advising.

**Fast Track Feedback**

*Priority Issues*

A fast track process is followed when a quick turnaround is needed to respond to a request for support or to take advantage of an opportunity, including coalition letters, alerts re: SNEB public policy priorities with an established position, piggybacking on another organization’s call to action, or sending an alert from SNEB as an organization, and/or asking members to respond in some manner. If the response needed is consistent with SNEB’s public policy priority areas, there is no need for getting additional input. Please note: If the process has begun and it is determined that an immediate response is not needed, ACPP Chair and/or Co-Chair may route the issue through the regular ACPP review process.

The process for SNEB’s public policy priority issues is as follows:

1) The ACPP Co-Chair or designee drafts the communication as they are well-versed on the issue and sends it to the full ACPP committee for review, comment and vote with a tight
turnaround time (e.g., 48 - 72-hours). Clarify the issues to review: timing of letter and the
evaluation of the collective power of signing onto the letter presented versus writing a letter
of our own.
2) All SNEB leaders have the opportunity to discuss and dialogue on the draft communication
via SNEB’s bulletin board system (BBS) or other communication venue (such as email).
The ACPP Co-chair will communicate a specific time someone will be online to monitor the
BBS discussion. A deadline will be posted after which comments will no longer be
considered.
3) The ACPP Co-Chair or designee sends the results and recommendation to the ACPP
Chair, Co-Chair (if appropriate) and SNEB Executive Director, along with any relevant
background information in 24 hours.
4) This communication is sent via urgent email (again with a distinct subject line) from the
SNEB Executive Director to the SNEB Executive Committee as soon as it is received from
the ACPP Chair or ACPP Co-Chair.
5) Executive Committee has 48 hours to review and respond with comments. The Executive
Committee members will include specific wording for edits they would like incorporated into
the revised document. A majority of the Executive Committee must approve the
communication for it to move forward.
6) SNEB Executive Director compiles, edits and informs the ACPP Chair, ACPP Co-Chair or
designee. If the Executive Committee decides SNEB should draft a separate letter from
the organization on the issue, the ACPP designee is responsible for drafting the
communication.
7) SNEB Executive Director and President or designee prepare final document. The
Executive Director will send it out with the President’s electronic signature in 24 hours.

Non-Priority Issues

If an SNEB member brings a new issue forward for SNEB to consider, they must chair an ad-
hoc Subcommittee to quickly research the opportunity and present the opportunity to ACPP
and SNEB Division public policy point persons for their review and vote. If an organization
approaches SNEB with an opportunity for involvement, the Executive Director will facilitate this
process and get the relevant information to ACPP and SNEB Division public policy point
persons for their review and vote.

If the topic is not easily identifiable as one of SNEB’s public policy priority issues, the
opportunity must be reviewed by the ACPP Chair/Co-Chair, at least one of the three
presidents, and the SNEB Executive Director and meet the following criteria. These
established criteria are to allow SNEB the flexibility to respond to opportunities that are
appropriate to nutrition education, but may not fall within the established public policy priorities:

- It must fit with SNEB’s vision and guiding principles.
- It will not detract from resources dedicated to SNEB’s public policy priority issues.
- It can be accomplished with volunteer efforts only.
- It is not a controversial issue or one on which SNEB members are divided. A
  controversial issue is noted by a discussion marked by the expression of opposing
  views.
- An urgent (less than two weeks) response is needed.
Once the issue has been assessed according to these criteria and deemed appropriate to move forward, SNEB leadership follows the above outlined process.

If there is not majority vote supportive of the action, if an urgent response is not warranted or if it is on a controversial topic on which SNEB does not have an established position, the communication does not move forward and the topic is brought back to ACPP for additional discussion, review and/or recommendation to the SNEB board for future opportunities on the same topic.

**Types of ACPP Activities & Documents**

SNEB and ACPP create various types of documents in order to have a robust, informed discussion while developing policy and, after reaching agreement within ACPP and SNEB on those policies, disseminate the positions using methods appropriate for the targeted audience. In general, the materials may be categorized into three types:

1) Policy development documents;
2) Advocacy documents based on the policies adopted; and
3) Mostly internal ACPP and SNEB documents.

Below is a description of these types of materials.

1) **Policy Development Documents**

**Issue Grids**
To help ACPP examine an issue, an issue grid may be developed. An issue grid is an ACPP table-type document outlining a pertinent legislation, regulation, or issue. The grid is generally developed for internal ACPP and SNEB uses and should not be posted or shared externally unless the BOD approves the external distribution of the document. The grid lays out the various positions and potential actions SNEB might take. ACPP should also set forth the justifications for why ACPP believes SNEB should take action on the specific law, regulation, or issue. Moreover, ACPP should provide advice as to how SNEB should respond on a given issue. That is, the grid should outline potential courses of action. Some example actions to list include: ACPP writes a policy brief on this issue to inform the members of the strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches SNEB can take on this issue; SNEB contacts coalition organizations to see where other organizations stand on the issue; or SNEB not take action on this issue because it is not within the scope of the group’s mission or expertise. The grid may include what other organizations are doing and may set forth various key Congressional members to work with on the issue. The grid may also note SNEB members who have a particular expertise that might be useful to this endeavor or list relevant SNEB Divisions to contact to collaborate with on next steps.

**Policy Brief**
In order for the ACPP to begin analyzing and debating a particular policy on a topic of interest to the membership, a policy brief may be developed. A policy brief provides straightforward analysis of a topic relevant to SNEB policy priorities. Typically, policy briefs are informative, concise, and objectively written. The brief should not strongly advocate for one position over the other and should give equal attention to all sides of the issue. The goal of a policy brief is to objectively examine and provide background information on an issue so that SNEB can develop a more definitive policy statement or position. A policy brief may make strong
recommendations for SNEB action on the topic. A policy brief may be developed prior to the
development of other forms of SNEB written communication, such as a policy statement or
position paper. Experts representing the diversity of members potentially affected by and/or
knowledgeable about the policy topic should review the policy brief.

Depending on the complexity of the issue, the brief can be as short as one page single-
spaced. Alternatively, a policy brief can be written in a style that resembles a literature review
research format. The brief authors may even consider formatting the brief according to the
Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior (“JNEB” or “Journal”) Research Article guidelines
and submit the piece for publication.

The exact style, length, and substantive approach of the brief should be flexible to the
nature of the issue and follow a format appropriate in style and substance for the target
audience. In other words, a policy brief that takes the form of a research article in the Journal
may help provide SNEB members with a nice background on a policy while the scholarly
approach might be too lengthy and technical for a Congressional member. Understanding the
topic and the target audience is essential as SNEB members might prefer more timely and
shorter briefs on a hot topic and a Congressional staffer might have a keen interest and ability
to digest a more research-based scholarly article. Moreover, when this piece is needed, which
could be in as short as a day’s notice, may be a key factor in determining the style and length
of the brief. The authors should work with ACPP to determine the best approach to take in
format and style on this objective, evaluative document.

The brief should be edited and approved by ACPP and then sent to the BOD for
approval before wider distribution. If ACPP decides to attempt publication in the JNEB, then
publication is contingent on acceptance by JNEB and BOD approval is not needed.

Policy Statement
Once a topic, potential policy issues, and, if appropriate, suggested policy positions are
outlined in a policy brief, a policy statement is drafted and used to provide a straightforward
statement or declaration of SNEB policy on a particular topic. Typically, policy statements are
concise and do not include extensive background information. Like a policy brief, the format of
the policy statement might be adjusted depending on its primary audience. The BOD must
approve the distribution of the policy statement. Upon BOD approval, the policy statement
may serve as the basis for the development of a position paper. However, in some cases, a
position paper may be developed prior to BOD’s consideration of a policy statement. In other
words, the BOD might form a position on an issue in the absence of a policy statement or even
a policy brief and ask ACPP to draft a position paper on the issue.

Position Paper
Using and expounding upon information gathered in producing the policy brief(s), a position
paper may be drafted to provide a comprehensive discussion of SNEB’s policy on one or more
topics. Containing extensive background information and analysis, the position paper provides
a more complete understanding of the issues and the reason behind the positions(s) set forth
by the organization. A position paper should contain authoritative citations. At least 3-5
experts in the field should review the position paper. These experts should include SNEB
members, but not all experts must be SNEB members. BOD approval is required. If published
in the JNEB, the paper must be submitted blindly and go through peer-review procedures as
set forth by the Journal. If labeled as a position paper of the Society, BOD approval is
required.
Joint Position Paper
SNEB may work in concert with other organizations to develop a Joint Position Paper. Before embarking on joint efforts, BOD approval should be sought. The authors and reviewers of the paper should also be approved by the BOD. Like a position paper, for submission into JNEB, the authors of a joint position paper should follow the position paper procedures set forth in JNEB and any related organization’s trade journal(s) publication guidelines.

Reports
SNEB may consider providing an evidence-based report on policy issues. This report should include policy recommendations, but doesn’t necessary have to. The report could be written and formatted in a style for Congressional and other federal executive agency members. The report requires BOD approval and the authors should contact the BOD and ACPP before embarking on drafting the report. Or, the authors may consider submitting the report to JNEB, following their appropriate author guidelines. If the report indicates its written on behave of SNEB or ACPP or its subcommittees, BOD approval is needed. The report should include an executive summary and a press release to include when disseminating the report.

Viewpoints
To encourage a thoughtful and inclusive process within SNEB, the JNEB may be used to further the discussion or provide alternative views. A viewpoint is an article generated for JNEB and adheres to the Journal’s prescribed format and blind review submission process. Depending on the circumstances, ACPP may seek experts to put forth opposing views on a public policy or submit its own view on an issue. ACPP may also submit a view based on its summary of nutrition education professionals' perspectives. This summary may be based on an ACPP initiated survey or literature review. A viewpoint is not a position paper and the position put forth by the author(s) is strictly the viewpoint of the author. If developed with the support of an ACPP subcommittee or ACPP, then the viewpoint may belong to the pertinent committee—not SNEB. The viewpoint route may be chosen if SNEB has not agreed upon one policy statement or position on the particular issue. The viewpoint may also inform or advocate for SNEB to take a particular stance on an issue and may become the foundation for an SNEB policy statement or position paper. Letters to the Editor may follow or work in conjunction with the viewpoint articles and all of these documents must adhere to the guidelines set forth in JNEB.

News Article
ACPP may consider communicating SNEB’s policy position(s) in a news article. A news article communicates an SNEB issue, action, or event. The format for news articles should conform to the outlet being targeted for publication (i.e., a local newspaper, trade journal, or news magazine). The content of the article should cite to authorities and reflect SNEB’s view on the pertinent issue. The BOD must approve the dissemination of the article. The Communications Division should assist in the drafting and dissemination of the press release and assist with any follow-up media communications.

Press Release
ACPP may consider using press release(s) to communicate SNEB positions or disseminate its policy position(s), report(s), or other materials or actions. A Press Release generally conveys information regarding an SNEB action or event. The format should be concise and include relevant contact information for SNEB leadership. If an event is promoted, the title, content,
location, and duration of the event should be included. The sponsor of the event, if relevant, should be listed. The BOD must approve the dissemination of the press release. The Communications Division should assist in the drafting and dissemination of the press release and assist with any follow-up media communications.

2) Advocacy Documents

Congressional Testimony
Congressional testimony is a detailed, thorough analysis of SNEB’s policy or position on one of SNEB’s priority issues pertinent to the Congressional hearing. The testimony must be approved by the BOD and is submitted to a Congressional committee, serving as SNEB’s formal remarks for the hearing. The testimony will be included in the committee hearing report. The testimony should clearly state SNEB’s name, contact information, the Congressional committee to which the testimony is being submitted, date, and title of the hearing. The body of the testimony should include an introduction, a description of SNEB, a purpose statement, and identification of the critical legislative points SNEB recommends adopting or modifying. The Congressional committee may have a specific format that the testimony must adhere to. These requirements may include page or time limitations.

a. **Written Testimony:** SNEB’s congressional testimony in written form submitted for the hearing record. Written testimony can be submitted even without the organization serving as an official hearing witness.

b. **Oral Testimony:** A summary of the SNEB’s written testimony vocalized through an in-person presentation, usually 5 minutes or less. May also involve responses to Congressional committee members’ questions. The oral testimony should follow the written testimony. Any significant modification to the written testimony must adhere to the Congressional committee hearing’s time limitations should be reviewed by the BOD prior to the hearing. Responses to Congressional questions should be based on SNEB’s policies and philosophies.

Fact Sheet
The primary audiences for Fact Sheets are Congressional members or federal agency officials. These short advocacy briefs are intended to communicate SNEB’s position, and how the specific legislation and/or regulation will affect citizens. Fact Sheets should include the significance of the issue, the requested legislative action, and a brief description of SNEB. Fact Sheets require BOD approval.

Regulatory Comments
Testimony [as defined above] submitted in a written format to a federal regulatory agency. Or, a response to Federal Register notice. The Register will define the scope and format of the comments. ACPP and the BOD must approve comments before they are submitted.

Action Alerts
An action alert is a posting by which ACPP alerts members to take immediate action, usually calling their Congressional members, on a piece of legislation. The content of the alerts should usually follow the format of a policy statement. Alerts should contain links that direct members on the specific steps to take to contact their members and provide example messages to convey to congressional members. ACPP members or subcommittee members may use other grassroot approaches to reach out to members, such as direct email contact to
members in key Congressional states or phone calls to encourage them to contact their Congressional members. Action Alerts need to be approved by the SNEB BOD and are distributed by SNEB staff to all SNEB members.

**Letters**
A letter can either support or oppose Congressional members or federal agency officials on their legislative, regulatory, or program efforts. Letters can also be used to nominate federal lawmakers, i.e. commissions, agencies, advisory groups, and coalitions (unless, another process or form is specifically indicated for submitting nominations). In addition, letters can be sent to industry or non-for-profit organizations. Suggestions for further work or refinement to existing efforts may be included in the letter. Letters to the Editor or Op-Ed Articles may also be submitted or requested by ACPP. All letters require the approval of the majority of ACPP members and then need to be submitted to the BOD for their approval to disseminate the letter.

**Sign-on Letters**
Other organizations may submit to SNEB letters or documents they would like SNEB to “sign on to” indicating their support on the issue. Sign-on letters are one way Congress and their staff can gauge support for a particular issue. Organizations generally understand that each group signing onto the letter may have slightly different positions on a specific matter or, in some cases, no position at all. But, if the letter does not conflict with an organization’s official position(s), then it is good practice for the organization to lend its name for the common good. Most of the time these letters cannot be modified, since an organization signs onto a particular version of the letter, major substantive changes would require re-approval by all the other organizations signing onto the letter. So, major substantive edits are discouraged unless necessary. Pending SNEB’s position on the issue and the quality of the letter, SNEB may sign on. If ACPP suggests further modifications to the letter before signing onto the letter or would like to explain to the authoring organization why ACPP suggests SNEB not sign onto the letter, then a written letter with the suggested modifications or rationale for not signing on will be drafted. The letter will require approval by the majority of ACPP members and then needs to be submitted to the BOD for final action. ACPP does not have to articulate why it does not approve every sign on letter presented to it for review. Inadequate time to review may necessitate not signing onto a letter.

3) *Mostly Internal ACPP and SNEB Documents*

**Public Policy Survey**
Disseminated every two to four years, the SNEB surveys the entire SNEB membership online to determine the Society’s public priority issues. Attention is given to send snail mail to members who indicated lack of Internet access. The SNEB Public Policy Consultant may assist in the survey development, implementation, and evaluation. As needed, less formal and more periodic surveys may be used to reassess SNEB membership on a particular issue(s). ACPP should participate in the development and evaluation of the survey. If ACPP desires to create their own survey of membership, ACPP should submit the content and the format by which the survey will be submitted to membership to the BOD so they can approve the dissemination of the survey.

**SNEB Priority Issue(s)**
An SNEB Priority Issue should identify SNEB’s Federal priority issues for the year (post Annual Conference to subsequent Annual Conference). The Public Policy Survey of membership should inform the priorities. The priority issues should also relate to upcoming or pending legislation. The issues can be broad such as improve the role of nutrition education in food assistance programs or specific such as ensure funding for one nutrition education coordinator in each state’s child nutrition programs. Priority issues may be particular to one year or, like the Farm Bill, continue for year or two between preparation and enactment. The priority issues should be limited to three to five depending on the time and energy needed for the issue.

**SNEB Priority Issue Bulletin**

An SNEB Priority Issue Bulletin should provide SNEB members with updates on SNEB’s Federal Government Priority Issues. The bulletins are posted on SNEB’s Web site and SNEBEZE. SNEB Priority Issue Bulletins contain information on the significance of the issue, background, a summary of the status and outlook for this issue, and SNEB’s most relevant actions and positions related to the issue.

**Resolution Response**

A resolution is a member-initiated method to put forth support for SNEB to take action on a particular issue. The resolution has a member approval process and upon approval it is submitted to the BOD. During the resolution process and when and if a resolution is approved by the members, ACPP will consider each of these resolutions. ACPP will draft a resolution response that puts forth its own advice to the BOD on the pertinent issue and the proposed position and actions set forth in the resolution. ACPP will serve as a resource to members and the BOD during this process. Depending on the BOD’s approval and recommendations, ACPP will take appropriate policy actions.

**ACPP Minutes**

ACPP will take minutes of its monthly calls and post them to the SNEB-ACPP bulletin or the current ACPP Chair and Co-Chair should maintain a copy of ACPP of the monthly minutes. The ACPP Chair is also responsible for maintaining on the bulletin board or in their own Word files records of key substantive emails and a list recording any voting that occurred via email. The Chair should share these files with SNEB staff and future Chairs.

**SNEB Reports**

ACPP will provide written documentation as needed to SNEB on its progress and goals. These reports may include periodic suggestions on refinements to existing ACPP documents and procedures. ACPP may also provide documentation to SNEB on its evaluation of SNEB’s policy consultant. As needed, ACPP will submit committee member recommendations and evaluations.

**Motion Memos**

A motion memo sets forth ACPP’s advice to SNEB on proposed actions. The purpose of the memo is to articulate to SNEB the document(s) and/or actions ACPP is considering developing on an issue. The memo should be numbered as to enable SNEB to respond with approval, rejection, or modification to the various suggestions with a specific and detailed response. The intent of the memo is to inform the BOD of ACPP’s thoughts on an issue and ensure SNEB support of an endeavor before ACPP invests its limited volunteer time on a route SNEB BOD
does not support. The motion is only generated to get initial BOD impressions and does not substitute for final approval of any final draft documents.

**Annual Conference Proposal**

Each year, ACPP will propose at least one session at the Annual Conference. Ideally, ACPP should plan the Policy Plenary Session. The proposal should be written according to the SNEB’s conference submission guidelines.

**Webinar**

ACPP may work with SNEB to propose a webinar on relevant policy issues. ACPP should submit to the BOD a proposal similar to the annual conference proposal format.

**Key Components of SNEB Documents**

ACPP members should review the SNEB website for past ACPP documents. These prior documents should guide future action. SNEB staff can also assist in ensuring each document contains: (1) SNEB logo, (2) SNEB mission statement, and (3) SNEB contact information. The SNEB staff will also convert the final document to a pdf file and assist in document dissemination. SNEB staff will ensure all written communications conform to the Written Communication Guidelines. Every ACPP document should be submitted to the BOD with the SNEB Written Communications Guidelines Form included below.

**Dissemination Strategies**

Before, during, and after preparing any type of document, ACPP should work with SNEB leadership and the Communication Division on dissemination strategies. Depending on the type of document, ACPP should consider sending the document to key Congressional members or Executive Branch staff. SNEB should send to relevant organizations and possibly consider, if appropriate, getting other organizations to sign-on to the document or write a letter of support. Other communication strategies include posting to relevant list_sers, such as SNEBEZE, and having SNEB staff send an email with the document to all SNEB members. ACPP should strive to post all its documents to the SNEB website and, if appropriate, get other organizations to include the material or a link on their website. If appropriate, relevant press outlets should be contacted to help further communicate the SNEB message.

**Prepared during 2007-2009 by:** Sheila Fleischhacker, PhD, JD Linda Drake, MS (ACPP Chair 2007-2008) and Jennifer Wilkins, PhD, Rd (ACPP Chair 2009-2010), along with ACPP 2007-2009 members contributed feedback throughout the process. Input was also sought from ACPP Past Chairs. Tom Joseph at Waterman, SNEB Policy Consultant, provided feedback. SNEB leadership reviewed an initial draft and their approval will be sought on final draft.

*Updates made in 2015 by ACPP.*
WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS GUIDELINES FORM

Directions for submitting documents for consideration by the SNEB Board of Directors

All documents submitted to the SNEB Board for approval by Divisions, committees, or subcommittees, must be accompanied by the following completed form. The information provided in this form will help the Board make a timely and informed decision regarding the disposition of official written communications from the Society.

Please fill in all items below and attach a copy of the document that is being submitted for consideration as an official statement from SNEB. Please number each line of the document. It is expected that all submissions will be articulated in a professional style and that the document will be edited in final format.

Documents submitted at least three weeks prior to a scheduled Board meeting will normally be considered at that Board meeting. To check on the Board meeting schedule, please contact SNEB office.

1. Title of paper:

2. Type of written communication (please check only one; see attached addendum for descriptions of each):
   - Platform/policy statement
   - Position paper
   - SNEB Division (specify):

3. Date of Draft:
   - Draft form
   - Final copy

4. Corresponding author or representative (include name, address, email, phone, fax):

5. SNEB division/committee/subcommittee submitting request: (Designate the committee or division and subcommittee, if appropriate and attach a copy of the form on the next page that documents division involvement in preparing the paper)

6. List SNEB members authoring paper: (Please provide a signed disclosure form for each author – form enclosed)

7. List people/groups from whom authors have sought input and designate comprehensiveness of viewpoints [names and affiliations]: (Please provide a signed disclosure form for each person/group – form enclosed)

8. List SNEB members who reviewed the paper, specifically individual members who responded to the draft document:

9. Identify primary audience (please check all that apply):
   - Federal legislators
   - State legislators
   - Health professionals (if only specific ones, please describe):
   - Nutrition educators
   - Consumers
   - Other (please describe):

10. Describe projected outcome(s) on primary audience(s):

11. Identify the relevance of the paper’s content and specific intended outcomes related to SNEB’s mission, priorities or activities: (Cite significant support for or variance from SNEB’s mission/activities/priorities)

12. Identify ways this paper will be used (check all that apply):
   - Policy development
   - Public education through media
   - Other (please describe):

13. Identify products that might result from the distribution of this paper (check all that apply):
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14. **Describe additional support needed from SNEB’s administrative staff or volunteers.** For consensus positions, viewpoints, etc., reflective of SNEB membership perspective(s) and requiring member input, please send your draft document to each SNEB division for review. (Specify what would be requested from SNEB, e.g. inclusion within JNEB, inclusion within website, distributed to SNEBEZE, etc.)
SNEB REVIEW PROCESS

For Reviewers: To Be Completed by each Division/Committee to report their review of the submitted material (not to be completed by those submitting the paper). The goal of the SNEB review process is to produce documents that are 1) professional in style and tone; 2) represent a comprehensive viewpoint; 3) are relevant to the SNEB mission and vision; and 4) are evidence based.

1. SNEB division/committee/subcommittee reviewing and providing input:

2. Paper relevant to SNEB mission/goals/activities:
   - Yes
   - No

If no, please provide rationale for consideration as an SNEB document:

3. Paper cites peer-reviewed literature or authoritative documents:
   - Yes
   - Not sure
   - Not applicable
   - No

If no, please provide rationale why this is not necessary:

4. Current draft of paper reflects comprehensive viewpoints:
   - Yes
   - Not sure
   - Not applicable

If not applicable or no, please provide rationale why this is not necessary:

5. Paper articulated in a professional style and tone:
   - Yes
   - No

6. Indicate your recommendation regarding the status of this paper:
   - Ready to be passed to Board for consideration
   - Ready after minor revisions (please indicate required changes)
   - Has merit but needs major revisions (please indicate and provide input)
   - Not appropriate in this format (please provide input)

Each division is responsible for ensuring that the individual reviewers have no conflict of interest with respect to evaluating the paper. Conflicts of interest include commercial, proprietary, or financial interests that are, or could appear to be, in conflict with an unbiased evaluation.

Respond to Corresponding Author by: ___ /___ /___

ADDENDUM: Types of Written Communications

Description and content of various forms of Written Communication:

1. Policy Statement: A policy statement is used to provide a straightforward statement or declaration of SNEB policy on a particular topic. Typically, policy statements are concise, do not include background information or discussion related to the organization’s position, do not quote facts and figures developed by outside sources, and do not utilize a bibliography. The policies approved by the SNEB Board may serve as the basis for the development of position papers. However, in some cases a position paper may be developed prior to SNEB Board consideration of a policy statement.
   a. Platform Statement: A compilation of all SNEB policy statements.

2. Position Paper: A position paper provides a comprehensive discussion of SNEB’s policy on one or more topics. It contains background information and analysis in order to provide a more complete understanding of the issues and the reason behind the positions(s) set forth by the organization. A position paper can include outside authoritative sources, including a bibliography, and should be reviewed by at least 3-5 experts in the field.

3. SNEB Issue Fact Sheet (1-2 pages): SNEB Issue Fact Sheets are developed to facilitate advocacy on SNEB’s top priority issues. The primary audience for Fact Sheets are Congress and the federal agencies. These fact sheets are intended to communicate the SNEB position and provide understanding of how specific legislation and/or regulation will affect nutrition educators. Fact Sheets should contain the following sections: 1) Issue 2) Requested Legislative Action 3) SNEB Position 4) Description of SNEB.
4. **SNEB Priority Issue Bulletin**: A SNEB Priority Issue Bulletin should provide SNEB members with updates on SNEB’s Federal Government Priority Issues. The bulletins are posted on SNEB’s Web site. SNEB Priority Issue Bulletins contain the following sections: 1) SNEB Position 2) SNEB Action and Position 3) Status 4) Background.

5. **Congressional Testimony**: A document created by the organization to convey a position on specific legislation that is the focus of a congressional committee hearing. The testimony will be included in the committee hearing report. Congressional testimony is developed from a position paper and is a detailed, thorough analysis of an organization’s policy on one of the organization’s priority issues. The testimony is submitted to a congressional committee and serves as the organization’s formal remarks for a congressional hearing being conducted on a specific SNEB priority issue. The testimony should clearly state the organization’s name, contact information, the congressional committee to which the testimony is being submitted, date, and title of the hearing. The body of the testimony should include: 1) Introduction 2) SNEB Description 3) Purpose 4) Identification. It is important to check on the particular committee format for both written and oral testimony and to adhere to page or time limitations specified by the committee.
   a. **Written Testimony**: The organization's congressional testimony in written form submitted for the hearing record. Written testimony can be submitted even without the organization serving as an official hearing witness. **Oral Testimony**: A summary of the organization’s oral testimony vocalized through an official witness at a congressional hearing. Customarily a five minute time limit on oral testimony.

6. **Regulatory Comments**: Testimony [as defined above] submitted in a written format to a federal regulatory agency. Response to Federal Register notices fall under this category.