

# SPH GUIDING QUESTIONS AND PROCESS FOR INSTITUTIONAL STATEMENTS

The questions below are designed to help guide SPH leadership around timely and/or institutional statements and recommend a process that engages various parties for an informed, collaborative, and coordinated approach. While we may not be able to predict every type of action and event that we will need to address, we can attempt to coordinate our efforts in order to engage with our community efficiently and effectively when the time comes. The needs of each party are unique and we encourage you to provide feedback that helps us all better address localized issues and actions. This plan is a working document and will be updated as needed.

UMAC Guidance for Leadership statements can be found [here](#).

## SPH VALUES

Collaboration

Community

Equity, justice & anti-racism

Meaningful positive impact

Innovation

Shared

learning

**Our vision** is a world of healthy people.

**Our mission** is to solve the greatest public health challenges and co-create health equity with communities in the region and the world. We do this by centering community as we rigorously pursue knowledge, put learning into practice, and train the next generation of visionary public health professionals.

## GUIDING QUESTIONS

- 1) What is the issue at hand?
- 2) Do we have enough information or capacity to issue a statement at this time?
- 3) Are we receiving requests from our community to issue a statement?
- 4) What is the UW's current plan on addressing the issue?

- 5) Does this issue directly relate to the SPH or specific departments? If so, how and which? Does it directly relate to other health sciences?
- 6) Who does a statement benefit/support and how?
  - a. Should anyone be involved in developing the communication?
- 7) Is this a principle statement, or an operational statement? If values, which?
- 8) What are the PR pros/cons of making a statement?
  - a. For the UW
  - b. For UW SPH
  - c. For Departments
- 9) What are the philanthropic pros/cons of making a statement?
  - a. For the UW
  - b. For UW SPH
  - c. For Departments
- 10) What are the pros/cons of making a statement from a legislative perspective?
  - a. For the UW
  - b. For UW SPH
  - c. For Departments
- 11) What are the pros/cons of making a statement from a culture/HR perspective?
  - a. For the UW
  - b. For SPH
  - c. For departments
- 12) Are there legal ramifications for making a statement?
- 13) Are there any resources we can provide or include in the statement?
- 14) Are there any policy changes that need to be made to provide infrastructure support for the statement?
  - a. If yes, what?
- 15) Is there any other action we need to take, or action we'd like the recipients to take?
  - a. If so, what?
- 16) Who should this message come from? SPH leadership, departments, thought leaders
- 17) How do we want to share this message?
  - a. Is this an evergreen statement, or a timely statement?
  - b. When would we like to make the statement?
- 18) What next steps/actions can we take or put in place that will reinforce the statement beyond publishing?
- 19) How long should we continue to promote the statement?

### **SUGGESTED ORDER OF OPERATIONS :**

- 1) SPH Comms Director checks with UMAC to determine if a statement is being considered at the central level
- 2) Convene with Department communicators
- 3) Have internal discussions based on guiding questions
- 4) Determine draft goals for communication, timeline (including desired publish date) and dissemination strategy

- 5) Receive feedback or approval from SPH leadership, chairs, and others as applicable
- 6) Circulate drafts, communications plan, and timeline to involved parties
- 7) Check-in and update (as applicable) - clarify if this is an “FYI” or “soliciting feedback” update:
  - a. UMAC
  - b. Departments
  - c. Centers (if applicable)
  - d. Program directors
  - e. OMAD
  - f. Subject matter experts
- 8) Finalize statement
- 9) Monitor internal and external response
  - a. Share qualitative feedback and quantitative impact with leadership and identified working group

