

14. 9 Position Paper Development, Review and Approval Process:

Position papers 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.

Position Paper Committee

The Position Paper Committee (PPC) consists of five SNEB members including:

- Three members from the Invited Papers subcommittee of the Journal Committee (JC), which will include the Editor in Chief (EiC) and two members of the JC (JC chair or designee, and one additional JC member). Chair of Invited Papers Subcommittee to chair Position Paper Committee.
- ACPP chair
- SNEB Member at Large serving as liaison to Divisions

It is expected that the PPC will meet at least three times per year, with the following responsibilities:

- identify topics that may be appropriate for a SNEB position paper
- receive topic ideas for position papers from SNEB members, Divisions, and/or SNEB Board
- select the topics for the position paper
- oversee the call and selection of authors
- identify ad-hoc working groups and convey their charge

Ad-hoc Committee of the PPC: Position Paper Working Group

Once a topic and authors for a position paper are identified, a Position Paper Working Group (WG) is convened. The WG is to serve one paper at a time and to follow the paper through to completion. The composition of the WG is:

- EiC
- Journal Committee member
- JNEB Associate Editor
- SNEB Vice President at the time the WG is convened
- One Past President of SNEB not currently serving on the Journal Committee

The EiC and the JC member will co-chair the WG and call meetings. The WG is to work with the position paper authors as the authors draft the paper, specifically as the SNEB position is elucidated. The WC supports the work of the authors and maintains communication with the Journal Committee and the BOD as the authors develop an evidenced-based position that reflects the society's viewpoint. Decisions should be made by consensus. The EiC will have the primary role of maintaining communication with the Position Paper Committee, Journal Committee, the BOD, and the JNEB staff.

A new and distinct ad-hoc Working Group will be convened for each topic with authors selected to become an SNEB position paper

Development, Review and Approval

Topic selection

1. Call for topics will be made to SNEB members with proposals submitted to the PPC co-chairs.
2. Each topic proposal will be submitted with the following information:
 - a. Statement of position: (in one or two sentences)
 - b. Background and rationale for proposed position: (about 1.5 pages, single spaced)

11/8/2017

- c. Objectives: (For example, “to provide evidence for effectiveness of school cafeteria-based interventions on increasing fruit and vegetables intake among children and youth.) Typically, multiple objectives are submitted targeting major segments of the proposed topic.
- d. Key points (to serve as an outline for the position; accompanying peer-reviewed citations for each point should be included)
- e. Reference list
- f. Suggested authors
- g. Collaborating organizations and type of collaborations (if applicable) (ie joint development with another society, etc.)

3. Topic proposals will be discussed by the PPC with consensus to move one topic forward for BOD review. The EiC will forward to the SNEB BOD. The BOD will be asked to give preliminary approval, call for more discussion, or decline to move forward. The EiC will notify anyone who proposed a topic that was not accepted.

4. BOD will submit decision to the PPC through the EiC. If needed, the topic proposal will be revised by the submitter through conversation with EiC and resubmitted to the BOD for approval. Once revised and/or approved the topic proposal will be sent by SNEB staff to the SNEB Division leadership for comment period of 14 days using an online survey tool. In addition to comments, division leadership will be asked to identify potential authors and a division member interested in serving as their reviewer for this paper. Staff to summarize comments and author suggestions for PPC review.

5. Once a topic and position meets consensus approval by BOD, a call for authors would be made, specifically soliciting authors who are SNEB members. Depending on the topic, it may be necessary to include non-members as authors to obtain the most qualified persons. However, the lead author must be an SNEB member. The PPC would select the author(s), help create a timeline and communicate the author selection to the BOD through the EiC with the understanding that author selection is confidential.

6. EiC to serve as main point of contact for authors during the development of paper with WG chair initiating frequent updates on development of the position. WG chaired by Journal Committee representative.

7. Once draft is available, SNEB staff to contact volunteer reviewers from SNEB divisions. Division reviewers will be sent pdf version of manuscript marked confidential and are given 14 days to submit comments using online review form. Comments will be compiled by staff and reviewed by WG to determine need for further revision.

8. Once Division-reviewed draft is available, SNEB staff to post online only version of the paper, marked confidential, in member-only section of the website. Members are given 14 days to submit comments using online review form. Comments will be compiled by staff and reviewed by WG to determine need for further revision.

9. The position paper will then be submitted through the JNEB submission/review process, the Editor-in-Chief would solicit 2-3 reviewers from JNEB reviewer pool. The WG and EiC would work with authors to identify those reviewer suggestions that are critical, good ideas, or not appropriate, according to each comment.

11/8/2017

10. The revised manuscript would then be sent to the BOD for comments/approval/rejection with blinded reviewer comments, division, and member comments. A majority vote by the BOD is needed for acceptance of the paper. Substantive comments will be sent to the WG for decisions as to whether the manuscript needs further revision. If so, the manuscript will be returned to authors for additional modification. If the WG feel the comments do not need to be addressed, their comments will be forwarded to the BOD for discussion and final decision.

11. Authors, JNEB reviewers, WG and division reviewers (individual's name and division they represented) would be acknowledged within the paper, as well as BOD approval. Member comments will not be acknowledged in the paper.

12. If paper is not approved as a SNEB position, the paper's authors are encouraged to submit to JNEB as a Perspectives article removing references to a position of the Society.