

2010 APHA Annual Meeting
Science Board Business Meeting
Sunday, November 7, 2010

Present: John Santelli (Chair), Maureen Lichtveld (Vice Chair), Elizabeth Bancroft, Michele Bloch, Vicky Cardenas, Alex Crosby, Miryam Gerdine, Juanita Carol Graham, Rebecca Head, Sonja Hutchins, Omar Khan, Kawika Liu, Howell Sasser, Rosemary Sokas, Joan Stelmack, Toni Yancey

Absent: Gilbert Gee, Camara Jones

Minutes

- I. Introductions
- II. Executive Board Update (John)
 - a. Giorgio Piccagli (Executive Board Chair) convened the ex-officio members of the Executive Board to get their thoughts on membership to Executive Board
 - b. John expressed his concern that there is limited science role in the EB, and therefore the SB representation on the EB has somewhat futile. However, members agreed that Science Board having an “ear” on the EB is critical. Maureen reiterated her commitment to be full engaged to break some of the barriers and dispel myths about the Science Board.
- III. Joint Policy Committee
 - a. Results from the late-breaker meeting: 7 policies were submitted and 2 were approved to move forward. There was much JPC discussion about the late-breaker criteria; how do we modify the criteria/guidance given to membership to ensure quality late-breakers are submitted? All SB members concurred that late-breakers should be held to the same evidence-base as regular policies.
 - b. Clarification is needed on what qualifies as new, emergent, or important in reviewing potential late-breakers.
 - c. Moving up the date for late-breaker submission should be considered to allow for more time for review.
- IV. Governing Council Policy Working Group Report- SB members were given copies of the report prior to the meeting. Overall, the Board agrees with many of the recommendations of the report; many of which address issues the Board discussed in at 2009 report to the Governing Council. However, there were some Major concerns:

- a. Social justice and human rights policies. Currently, no committee is specifically tasked with reviewing policies these types of policies. In addition, currently there are no strong criteria for evaluating these policies. The report seemingly presents social justice and human rights policies as being less scientifically based and therefore should be evaluated in a different manner. There is a strong evidence base for human rights, and much progress is being made in qualitative science. Criteria for evaluating these policies should be developed. Also, consideration should be given to having an additional governing body of APHA (Ethics committee) review social justice and human rights policies.
 - b. Report focuses mainly on how to deal with rejected policies and does not address Conditional policies that do not always incorporate the SB recommendations.
 - c. Report does not address the issue of existing policies. Is there a mechanism for authors to receive feedback on whether a new policy would be needed or covered by existing policy? Would the policy be useful/used by staff?
 - d. Report also does not address the issue of providing authors with all section/member comments.
- V. The Science Board will develop a response to the GC report to give to Barb Goliath. Omar and Kawika will work on social justice component. Maureen will develop an overall roadmap; everyone will send comments to John. The response is included at the end of the minutes.
- VI. Potential roles/activities for the Science Board - The discussion of the policy working group report generated many ideas and potential roles for the Science Board to improve the policy process and enhance the scientific integrity of APHA policies. Ideas include:
- a. Clarify the role of the Science Board role: critics vs. mentors and identify potential problems of the two roles.
 - b. Assist with the development/enhancement of science in policies. Consulting with authors during policy development.
 - c. Define what constitutes scientific evidence (development a document; potentially a subcommittee). Any document developed should address the precautionary principle.
 - d. Develop stronger criteria for evaluation of science in social justice policies. It would be helpful if (at least) a draft of said criteria were available for the spring policy review process.
 - e. Develop a roadmap to systematically embed science in the process. This includes creating a network members (through the sections, SPIGs, caucuses) to

be supported by Science Board members to ensure scientific integrity. In creating the roadmap, it will be critical to define role of Science Board and staff (interpretation of whether a policy covers existing policy). There's also an opportunity to look upstream for gaps in science to support policy and advocacy.

- f. Pursue additional opportunities to inform members of the role of science in policy and leverage existing and new resources. This could include using time at business meeting; scientific sessions; peer education session; getting on the agenda at the ISC meeting (mid-year) to share science roadmap; and section mid-year meetings.

VII. Committee Volunteers Assignments

- a. JPC – Maureen(Chair), Elizabeth, Joan, Miryam
- b. 2013 Theme –Omar (Chair), Howell, Rebecca
- c. Scientific Session – Sonja, Vicky (Chair), Rebecca, Juanita
- d. Social Justice/Human Rights- Kawika (Chair), Sonja, Omar, Howell, Alex
- e. What is Science – Toni, Michele (Chair), Sonja, Elizabeth, John, Miryam
- f. Science within APHA – Maureen, Juanita

VIII. Frequency of meetings

- a. Bi-monthly full committee call
- b. Monthly subcommittee calls
- c. Monthly email digest

Authors responsible for providing references and creating a google groups; on demand vs. or up front through APHA staff: “Authors should be prepared to submit references upon request”