



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Health Promot Pract. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 February 12.

Published in final edited form as:

Health Promot Pract. 2022 November ; 23(1 Suppl): 21S–33S. doi:10.1177/15248399221117477.

From Practice to Publication: The Promise of Writing Workshops

S. René Lavinghouze, MA, MS¹, Laura Kettel Khan, PhD¹, M. Elaine Auld, MPH, MCHES², Doreleena Sammons Hackett, SM², Danielle R. Brittain, PhD³, David R. Brown, PhD, FACSM¹, Eryn Greaney, MPA², Diane M. Harris, PhD, MPH, CHES¹, Leah Michele Maynard, PhD¹, Stephen Onufrak, PhD, MPH¹, Alyssa G. Robillard, PhD, MCHES⁴, Randy Schwartz, MSPH⁵, Sana Siddique, BS, CHES², Cole G. Youngner, MPH⁶, LaNita S. Wright, PhD, MPH, MCHES⁷, Terrence P. O'Toole, PhD, MDiv¹

¹Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA

²Society for Public Health Education, Washington, DC, USA

³University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, USA

⁴Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ, USA

⁵Public Health Systems Consultants, Manchester, ME, USA

⁶Contractor to Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through McKing Consulting Corporation, Atlanta, GA, USA

⁷Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, GA, USA

Abstract

Practitioners in health departments, university extension programs, and nonprofit organizations working in public health face varied challenges to publishing in the peer-reviewed literature. These practitioners may lack time, support, skills, and efficacy needed for manuscript submission, which keeps them from sharing their wisdom and experience-based evidence. This exclusion can contribute to literature gaps, a failure of evidence-based practice to inform future research, reduced ability to educate partners, and delays in advancing public health practice. Our article describes the writing workshops offered to Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity (DNPAO), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) funded programs in 2021. This project consisted of three 60-minute introductory writing webinars open to all recipients, followed by a Writing for Publications workshop, an 8- to 9-week virtual learning/writing intensive for

Address correspondence to S. René Lavinghouze, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 4770 Buford Hwy K-50, Atlanta, GA 30341, USA; shl3@cdc.gov.

There are no conflicts of interest or financial interests related to this work by any of the authors of this manuscript.

Supplement Note: *This article is part of the Health Promotion Practice supplement, “Reducing Chronic Disease through Physical Activity and Nutrition: Public Health Practice in the Field.” The purpose of the supplement is to showcase innovative, community-centered, public health actions of SPAN, REACH, and HOP programs to advance nutrition and physical activity among priority populations in various settings. The Society for Public Health Education is grateful to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity for providing support for the issue. The entire supplement issue is available open access at https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/hppa/23/1_suppl.*

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material for this article is available at <https://journals.sagepub.com/home/hpp>.

selected writing team applicants. The Society for Public Health Education staff, consultants, and CDC/DNPAO staff developed, refined, and presented the curriculum. The workshop for public health practitioner writing teams was offered to two cohorts and included extensive coaching and focused on potential submission to a *Health Promotion Practice* supplement, “Reducing Chronic Disease through Physical Activity and Nutrition: Public Health Practice in the Field” (see Supplemental Material), which was supported by CDC/DNPAO. We describe the webinars, the workshop design, modifications, evaluation methods and results.

Keywords

workforce development; program infrastructure; writing teams; publishing; professional development; program development; writing technical assistance; manuscript preparation assistance; technical assistance; public health professionals; public health practitioner; implementation science

Practice wisdom draws upon public health practitioners’ experiences and expertise in developing, improving, or adapting practices to implement public health intervention programs (Chen et al., 2011; Dunet et al., 2013). However, public health staff in health departments, university extension programs, and non-profit organizations may lack the resources, program infrastructure, or opportunity to use or develop scientific writing skills to share their practice-based learnings with their field and community (Dunn Butterfoss, 2011; McBride et al., 2019; McMullen et al., 2022). They may not have time, scientific writing experience, familiarity with manuscript submission, or confidence that their lessons and experiences will add value to the field, leaving work unpublished (Boice & Jones, 1984; Dunn Butterfoss, 2011; Gray et al., 2018; Hayden, 2000; Novick & Moore, 2018; Rathore et al., 2019; Redelfs et al., 2019; Salas-Lopez et al., 2012). Lack of practitioner perspectives can hamper progress in public health research and practice. Namely, it can create literature gaps and limit opportunities to inform future research to address the gaps, hinder education of partners and decision makers, limit knowledge translation, and yield an incomplete evidence base for addressing public health challenges. Virtual offerings, conference presentations, and poster abstracts fail to fill the gap because they have limited audience reach and impact and remain accessible only to those with the time or resources to attend (Fischer-Carlidge, 2020).

Journal publication allows for a broader, enduring dissemination of content to practitioners, decision-makers, and others, particularly when published open access. It also allows practitioners to build upon prior progress in the field. The need for more practice-based evidence was identified during the meeting “The Health Education Profession in the Twenty-First Century” in 1995 in Atlanta, Georgia (Schima & Ames, 1996). Of note, the meeting report highlighted the need to assure the translation of research to practice and promote the acceptance of applied research in health education journals (Schwartz & Goodman, 2000). SOPHE (<https://www.sophe.org>) launched the practice-based journal *Health Promotion Practice* (HPP; <https://journals.sagepub.com/home/hpp>) in 2000 to “advance the application of health promotion and education through the stimulation and publication of articles detailing the applied work of health promotion and practice and policy” (Schwartz &

Goodman, 2000, p. 5). The journal recognized the need to link research to practice: the two best understood as a partnership (Lancaster & Roe, 2000).

Today, this call to action remains relevant and critical to advancing public health practice (Green, 2008; Roe, 2021). Writing workshops, retreats, and peer support can increase contributions to the literature by academics and practitioners that may include librarians, college students, nurses, community members, and teachers (Bullion & Brower, 2017; Fischer-Carlidge, 2020; Gray et al., 2018; Kempenaar & Murray, 2019; Komaie et al., 2018; Novick & Moore, 2018; Rathore et al., 2019; Redelfs et al., 2019; Salas-Lopez et al., 2012). Writing workshops can promote functioning program infrastructure by building staff capacity to work with data to promote action and facilitate public health goals through greater dissemination (Lavinghouze et al., 2014). Publishing evidence-based practice can help both build the broader literature on which the important recommendations of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Guide to Community Preventive Services are based (Truman et al., 2000) and then may also be used to further advance practice. Moreover, effective dissemination enhances public health leadership and achievement, bolstering program sustainability (Lavinghouze et al., 2014; Valladares et al., 2019).

To address the need for practice-based evidence, the CDC, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity (CDC/DNPAO; <https://www.cdc.gov/>; <https://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpao/index.html>) partnered with SOPHE to launch a Writing for Publication workshop project. We, the authors of this manuscript (CDC/DNPAO, SOPHE, and consultants), co-developed and facilitated this project for CDC/DNPAO's recipients to promote publishing practice evidence and sharing lessons learned. All volunteer workshop participants were in programs that received funding through the State Physical Activity and Nutrition (SPAN; <https://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpao/state-local-programs/span-1807/index.html>), Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH; <https://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpao/state-local-programs/reach/index.htm>), or High Obesity Program (HOP; <https://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpao/state-local-programs/hop1809/high-obesity-program-1809.html>) opportunities. Recipient programs implement public health strategies in their states or communities to support healthy eating, active living, clinical-community linkages, and breast-feeding.

METHOD

CDC/DNPAO and SOPHE developed a comprehensive writing support project, setting it apart from singular writing retreats or other writing workshops. This project included a three-part Introduction to Publication webinar series (open to all funded recipients on an individual participation basis), along with two in-depth team-based Writing for Publication workshops. The workshop framework, developed specifically for public health practitioner writing teams, was structured and held virtually over several weeks. The workshop provided extensive coaching and focused on the journal submission of an article for peer-reviewed publication. Workshops took place virtually May–July 2021 for spring and September–November 2021 for fall. We will first describe the webinars and selection of workshop participants and then present workshop design, modifications, and evaluation methods and results.

Introduction to Publication Writing Webinar Series

In February 2021, SOPHE hosted the complimentary three-part Introduction to Publication webinar series, open to all 62 CDC/DNPAO-funded programs. Experienced authors from CDC/DNPAO, SOPHE, and *HPP* served as subject matter experts (SMEs) during the 60-minute webinars. Topics included an overview of the publishing process, manuscript components, and translation and dissemination of published work (see supplemental material, Figure 1 for curriculum outline). Attendance was voluntary to one or more live webinars, which were recorded and provided open access for free viewing by CDC/DNPAO recipients on the SOPHE training website. Facilitators informed participants about the purpose, content, and application process for the more intensive Writing for Publication workshop during all three webinars. The spring workshop application process was opened after the third webinar. Participants were also informed that there would be a forthcoming journal supplement sponsored by CDC/DNPAO with *HPP* (see Supplemental Material). The purpose of the supplement would be to showcase innovative community-centered interventions, implementation, adaptation, and evaluations of CDC/DNPAO SPAN, REACH, and HOP programs to advance nutrition and physical activity among priority populations in various settings. CDC/DNPAO chose to partner with *HPP* because of its focus on articles relevant to practitioners, flexible article formats, commitment to transparency in the peerreview process, support of new author development, and diversity and inclusion. This supplement aims to increase understanding and dissemination of effective public policies and environmental interventions to improve nutrition and physical activity in practice settings. All funded recipients, regardless of writing workshop participation, were invited to submit their funded work to *HPP* for consideration for the journal supplement. It was made clear that participation in the Writing for Publication workshops would not guarantee supplement acceptance but could help facilitate a stronger submission through access to writing coaches and dedicated writing time.

Workshop Participants

SOPHE staff and its consultants and CDC subject matter experts (SMEs) assessed each applying team's application in terms of basic components needed for a publishable manuscript and which could be further developed or refined by the team during the workshop (see Supplemental Material Figure 2 for review criteria score sheet). The application included questions on experience writing for publication; potential manuscript title; manuscript purpose and objectives; methods, results, and findings; and the manuscript implications for the field. Reviewers chose eight teams, with 22 total participants, to participate in the spring workshop and six teams, with 25 total participants, for the fall workshop. The 14 teams spanned all CDC/DNPAO-funded programs with three SPAN, three REACH, and eight HOP teams. Writing for Publication workshop participants had varied program roles (e.g., graduate research assistants, program managers, evaluators, active transportation managers, community engagement coordinators) and varying experience levels in writing for journal publication.

Upon acceptance, workshop facilitators sent participants electronic calendar invitations for all sessions to help them plan time commitments for successful workshop completion. There was no charge for voluntarily participating in the Writing Workshops, and participation

was considered technical assistance and support offered by CDC/DNPAO through the cooperative agreement. Upon acceptance, each team was assigned a coach (often an SME experience) who reviewed the team's application prior to the first workshop session.

Workshop Design

SOPHE and CDC/DNPAO facilitators hosted each workshop over 9 weeks, organized into eight sessions (i.e., four training sessions and four dedicated team writing sessions). The workshop curriculum is outlined in Table 1. Key topics included: (1) manuscript types (e.g., research; implementation) and how they contribute to the literature; (2) understanding the *HPP* journal's author requirements; (3) how to conduct a background literature review; (4) how to outline a manuscript according to *HPP* requirements; (5) how to draft all the required components of a manuscript; and (6) how to effectively respond to reviewers' comments.

Creating a virtual platform for the workshop was critical to supporting the webinars and workshops. SOPHE created a password-protected platform on its learning management system. On the platform, faculty, SMEs, SOPHE/CDC/DNPAO staff, and participants could securely attend virtual online sessions throughout the training, view resources to support their manuscript development, work on their manuscripts in a Google Doc, and access recordings of the three Introduction to Publication pre-workshop webinars and presentation slides. The platform included an assignment submission link and a public Google drive folder for collaborative file sharing and development. The resource section included *HPP* submission documents, tools and resources on peer-reviewed publication writing and review processes, and documents on how to critique data and statistical techniques.

The workshop faculty and writing team coaches were experienced, published authors on staff or contracted with SOPHE or CDC/DNPAO staff. Coaches also included active members of *HPP*'s editorial board. Each team was paired with a writing coach for the entire workshop. Some teams were paired with DNPAO strategy SMEs per the teams' request on the application form. During each training session, teams broke into small groups to discuss the material presented in the large group training session and how it might inform their manuscript. Workshop staff organized the agenda and weekly assignments around *HPP*'s submission guidelines for each section: Introduction and Background, Conceptual Framework, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications for Public Health Practice. Coaches worked with teams to structure their manuscripts around *HPP*'s submission guidelines because of the opportunity to submit their manuscripts for consideration for the *HPP* supplement sponsored by CDC/DNPAO. Coaches provided feedback to the teams on their assignments before the next training session. Each team used their dedicated Google Drive folder to archive and maintain their working draft files.

After the last session for both the spring and fall workshops, every team needed more time to finalize their manuscripts and requested their coach(es)' continued assistance. All coaches volunteered to work with the teams outside the structured workshops until the manuscripts were submitted to *HPP* for publication. Writing teams set up their mutually agreed-upon schedules and made use of social networking technologies to collaborate.

Workshop Modifications

Although CDC/DNPAO and SOPHE staff initially planned for the Writing for Publication workshops to be in-person, the COVID-19 pandemic prompted a shift to virtual, synchronous delivery. We developed the workshop curriculum based on the best practices of distance learning. The fall workshop curriculum was modified based on facilitator/participant feedback from the spring offering. Of note, facilitators extended the fall workshop by one hour to add more breaks during the live lecture session, provided more time in breakout rooms, and incorporated more physical activity breaks. Multiple spring participants suggested that the more complex content, such as instruction on how to write methods and statistical results, required greater concentration during online classes than during in-person sessions. So, for the fall 2021 workshop, this “heavier” content was divided into shorter sections with scheduled breaks. In addition, two spring workshop participants shared their experiences in a fall workshop session called Guidelines for Writing Teams: Tips for Success. Project staff revised the application for the fall cohort to better assess the applicants’ experience in writing for publication and to reduce redundant questions (see supplemental material Figure 3 for application). Table 2 shows a summary comparison between the spring and fall workshop hours of instruction, number of coaches, and team work session.

Evaluation Methods

Workshop staff sent process evaluation questionnaires to attendees after each content lecture session via Google Forms. Staff used attendees’ responses to debrief with coaches and faculty and to modify future sessions in accordance with feedback. Workshop staff sent an overall final evaluation survey at the conclusion of each workshop and SOPHE collected the data. This survey assessed participants’ experiences during the current session (see Table 3; for further details on the final evaluation survey questions and items).

We used feedback from the spring overall evaluation to enhance the fall workshop, as described earlier.

Participants from both Writing for Publication workshops received a brief, final follow-up survey in December 2021. Questions focused on participants’ self-assessment of their pre- and post-writing workshop skill levels, intent to submit their manuscript to the *HPP*/CDC/DNPAO journal supplement, and the likelihood they would write future manuscripts for publication. Responses were anonymous. The only identifier captured was from which writing team the respondent was a member.

RESULTS

Our assessment yielded data from the webinars and workshops, with a focus on evaluation findings, participant comments and feedback, writing skills, and manuscript submission and publication.

Evaluation Results From Introduction to Publication Writing Webinar Series

Attendance at the three Introduction to Publication writing webinar series was $n = 89$, $n = 70$, and $n = 61$, respectively. We polled recipients, during the first webinar only, related to their experience with writing for publication, with 50/89 participants responding to the online “pop-up” survey. Fifty-two percent ($n = 26$) stated they had little experience writing for publication, 44% ($n = 22$) moderate experience, and 4% ($n = 2$) stated a high level of experience.

Evaluation Results From the Writing for Publication Workshops

Sixty-two percent of workshop participants completed the postevaluations from the spring and fall workshops ($n = 14$ and $n = 15$; see Table 3). Except for one team, all others (teams = 3 writing members) had at least one member complete the survey. Most rated their workshop experience as above average or excellent (97%, $n = 28$). All agreed or strongly agreed that the resources, session topics, and breakout sessions were to their satisfaction.

Participants had varying experience levels with the publication process. Motivations for workshop participation varied yet aligned with the reasons for not publishing presented earlier: lack of dedicated time, opportunities to develop writing skills, or low confidence (Dunn Butterfoss, 2011; Gray et al., 2018; Novick & Moore, 2018; Rathore et al., 2019; Redelfs et al., 2019; Salas-Lopez et al., 2012). Participants expressed being motivated by wanting to contribute to the evidence base, share important insights that could assist others in the field, and increase their teams’ capacity for writing and collaboration. Participants also indicated how sharing and disseminating their learning and knowledge could help other practitioners and organizations, stating their desire to increase their writing capacity so that their work could improve the field (see Table 4).

Participants’ expectations from the workshops included guidance, dedicated time to write, enhanced confidence, direction, improvement in their skills, encouragement, motivation, and teamwork. The Writing for Publication workshops, with dedicated time for writing and coaching incorporated into the workshops, helped meet these expectations. Participants tended to describe the “best thing” about the Writing for Publication workshops as: having dedicated time, ability to work with their teams, the presentations, the process, and the coaches. They also noted that assignments with due dates encouraged them to stay on track, prioritize their work, and remain accountable.

Participants provided several suggestions for workshop improvements. They wanted more learning about formatting references and submitting to journals beyond *HPP*. Some suggested splitting the 4-hour block of each session into two sessions during the same day or week. Most participants also indicated they wanted more dedicated writing time.

Post-Workshop Final Survey

Twenty-six (55.3%) participants, with at least one member from each of the 14 writing teams, completed the post-workshop final survey administered in December. Forty-six percent ($n = 12$) of these respondents rated their pre-workshop writing skills as *poor* or *neutral* and 46% ($n = 12$) as *good*. Only 8% ($n = 2$) rated their pre-workshop writing

skills as *excellent*. Post-workshop, 77% ($n = 20$) of respondents rated their writing skills as good and 15% ($n = 4$) as *excellent*. Eighty-one percent ($n = 21$) of respondents stated they were *likely* to *very likely* to write another manuscript for publication related to any CDC-funded cooperative agreement. Nineteen percent ($n = 5$) were neutral about publishing another such manuscript. Eighty-eight percent ($n = 23$) stated they were *likely* or *very likely* to write another manuscript for publication related to anything about their program other than what was funded by CDC. Ninety-two percent ($n = 24$) stated their intent to submit their manuscript to the *HPP/CDC/DNPAO* journal supplement with 8% ($n = 2$) unsure about submitting.

Workshop Completion and Manuscript Submissions

Fourteen teams, comprising 47 participants, completed the two Writing for Publications workshops. *HPP* received 35 manuscripts for consideration for the CDC/DNPAO supplement. Of these, 11 (31% of total submissions) were from workshop teams, representing 79% of the 14 teams submitting manuscripts for consideration. Participants indicated their eagerness to publish and improve writing skills after participating in the workshop (see Table 5).

DISCUSSION

Writing for publication strengthens the public health field and professionals by analyzing and documenting their work and outcomes (Hayden, 2000; Novick & Moore, 2018). “If you learn an important lesson or have a major epiphany while doing your work and don’t write about it, it doesn’t make an impact” (Dunn Butterfoss, 2011, p. 8). Most participants believed their writing skills had significantly improved from pre- to post-workshop. Most respondents who responded to the final evaluation survey believed they would submit their manuscript to the *HPP/CDC/DNPAO* journal supplement and write future manuscripts related to their work.

Publication is an essential component of making public health practice more transparent and available to advance knowledge (Valladares et al., 2019). Dissemination of practice wisdom and evaluation data is critical to building the evidence base and supporting public health practitioners. Documenting the accomplishments of evidence-based and practice-based implementation activities provides visibility for the program and fosters a culture of sharing and improvement in the work product through the process of evaluation, documentation, and dissemination (Novick & Moore, 2018; Valladares et al., 2019).

Writing workshops and writing teams do not magically create time for authors. However, this project demonstrates that workshops and coaches can help build public health practitioners’ confidence and develop writing capacity skills. Being accountable to a team and coaches also helps authors prioritize the writing process. Moreover, when funders sponsor writing workshops, it demonstrates the importance placed on sharing practice-based wisdom and the need to dedicate time to devote to this endeavor. Writing workshops can enhance program infrastructure by building staff capacity to work with data in ways that promote action and facilitate public health goals through greater dissemination (Lavinghouze et al., 2014). In addition, the skills developed during the workshops promote

public health leadership and facilitate program sustainability through effective dissemination of information (Lavinghouze et al., 2014; Valladares et al., 2019).

Lessons Learned

First, although the Writing for Publication workshops were structured to walk teams together section by section through their working manuscripts, not all teams were prepared to write when workshops began. Some teams were still collecting data and/or analyzing results; thus, teams wrote different sections at different times. In addition, the coaches' debrief session after each training session to discuss their teams' progress and receive tips from other coaches' experiences was an essential part of coaches' training. Second, expanded pre-workshop time by coaches would help them to understand in advance what data are available (variables, how collected, etc.), proposed hypotheses/study questions, and what skills in analysis the participants bring. Future writing workshops could ask participants to submit a brief outline/overview of their results for workshop planners to better tailor and organize workshop content.

Third, for public health professionals who were also dealing with COVID-19 priorities, allotting time for writing was difficult. Some participants were stretched because of organizational requirements, while others experienced burnout, leading to some incomplete manuscripts, some teams losing writers, and/or bringing on additional writers to assist with the workload.

Limitations

While at least one member of 13 out of 14 writing teams completed the postworkshop evaluation survey, not all team members completed the survey, resulting in a modest return rate (62%). We do not know if the results represent all participants' opinions about the workshops. Only 55% of participants responded to the post-workshop final survey although at least one member of all 14 writing teams responded. It could be that teams felt only one team member, possibly the lead, needed to respond to the survey. While this is not certain, we do have at least one response from every team, with each one having a designated lead. Also, time constraints prevented us from distributing the final survey during a more convenient time for teams. Instead, the survey was sent during the winter holidays and while the authors were busy with final preparations for submission to *HPP*. This was an additional burden; we appreciate the teams' willingness to respond to a survey during this busy time. To improve future writing workshops, the authors hope to review the nature and scope of the revise-and-resubmit directions and the peer-review comments from the manuscripts submitted for the *HPP* supplement.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH PRACTICE

Public Health Funders

Public health funders could develop intentional partnerships with public health organizations to support translating practice to publication and supporting writing workshops with writing coaches to encourage the writing process. CDC/DNPAO intentionally partnered with an organization (SOPHE) with subject matter expertise in health education, health promotion,

instructional design, diversity and inclusion, and the development of the public health workforce. Moreover, the project's design went beyond a singular writing retreat to include: (1) three-part webinar series open to all CDC/DNPAO recipients to introduce basic writing and publication concepts; (2) coaches with subject matter expertise and editorial experience; (3) the intensive writing experience that included instructional material, and feedback over an extended period to offer sufficient time to produce a working draft of a manuscript; (4) dedicated writing time; and (5) follow-up support until the manuscript was submitted to a journal.

Multi-component writing workshop projects like those we presented can help clarify the writing process for practitioners and encourage their interest in completing and publishing a manuscript. Venues such as sponsored journal supplements, including funds for open access, can facilitate the publication and dissemination of manuscripts with program-specific evidence. Journal editors must work within the confines of issues and page limitations; sponsoring a special issue allows for dedicated space for the funder's supported projects. Funders can develop team-based writing workshops tailored to public health professionals that are structured over multiple weeks, with extensive coaching, and a focused journal submission as an outcome to facilitate building capacity and infrastructure in their programs.

Public Health Program Leaders

Program leaders can encourage new and experienced authors to take time to publish their practice-based wisdom and seek out or develop writing teams. Leaders can intentionally pursue avenues to celebrate publications in any format including state-based and national journals. In addition, program leaders can purposefully support new authors by dedicating program funds for training and protecting resources, including time for writing.

Public Health Practitioners

Public health practitioners can successfully write manuscripts to share their practice wisdom with others. With overloaded agendas and new and emerging threats to public health, it is difficult to carve out time to write. However, public health professionalism includes the expectation that practitioners add their practice wisdom to the literature. And practitioners need to know when to ask for help. Writing teams can build team collaboration and capacity. In grant submissions, practitioners can request funders to support writing teams, their participation in writing/learning cohorts, coaching support to help build the evidence base of public health and dissemination to partners, and support for open access.

CONCLUSION

Writing for publication workshops has the potential to facilitate skill building, provide dedicated writing time, enhance team learning and collaboration, and promote public health program infrastructure development. These workshops can help the effective functioning of program infrastructure to build staff capacity and work with data in ways that prompt action to facilitate the achievement of public health goals (Lavinghouze et al., 2014). Publication provides practice wisdom to a wider audience and more opportunities to build upon successes. The Writing for Publication workshop described in this manuscript highlights the

potential benefits of such trainings. Our experience also documents that technical assistance for writing can be accomplished virtually, making learning opportunities more accessible to practitioners and their collaborators.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Authors' Note:

We thank the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity (DNPAO) program recipients who participated in the three pre-workshop webinars (n = 89, 70, and 61) as well as the 14 program recipient teams (from DNPAO State Physical Activity and Nutrition (SPAN), Racial and Ethnic Approaches for Community Health (REACH), and High Obesity Program (HOP) who participated in the spring and fall 2021 Writing for Publication workshops: (Illinois Public Health Institute, South Dakota State University, West Virginia University, Mississippi State University, DeKalb County Board of Health, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension, Clemson University, Health Research Inco/NY State Department of Health, RAO Community Health, North Dakota State University, Utah Department of Health, Louisiana State University AgriCenter, Southern Connecticut State University/CARE, and the University of Georgia). Their participation and engagement enriched the learning opportunity for all. In addition to the writing coaches and instructors who are co-authors on this manuscript, we thank all the subject matter experts Allison Chang, Stormie Israel, Sahra Kahin, Joseph G. L. Lee, and Conner Radkey for their consultation, guidance, and technical support on areas of content provided to the workshop teams' development and drafting of manuscripts. The webinar series and Writing for Publication workshops were supported by the Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under cooperative agreement OT18-1802, Strengthening Public Health Systems and Services through National Partnerships to Improve and Protect the Nation's Health, provided to the Society for Public Health Education (SOPHE) contract number 6 NU38OT000315-02-01. The findings and conclusions in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

REFERENCES

- Boice R, & Jones F (1984). Why academicians don't write. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 55(5), 567-582.
- Bullion JW, & Brower SM (2017). Enhancing the research and publication efforts of health sciences librarians via an academic writing retreat. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 105(4), 394-399. [PubMed: 28983203]
- Chen HT, Donaldson SI, & Mark MM (2011). Validity frameworks for outcome evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2011(130), 5-16.
- Dunet DO, Losby JL, & Tucker-Brown A (2013). Using evaluability assessment to support the development of practice-based evidence in public health. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 19(5), 479-482. [PubMed: 23287816]
- Dunn Butterfoss F (2011). Getting published: Responding to the "printing press." *Health Promotion Practice*, 12(1), 8-11. [PubMed: 21193799]
- Fischer-Carlidge E (2020). An evidence-based approach to increasing nurses' publication rates. *AJN the American Journal of Nursing*, 120(8), 50-55.
- Gray T, Madson L, & Jackson M (2018). Publish & flourish: Helping scholars become better, more prolific writers. *To Improve the Academy*, 37(2), 243-256.
- Green LW (2008). Making research relevant: If it is an evidence-based practice, where's the practice-based evidence? *Family Practice*, 25(Suppl. 1), i20-i24. [PubMed: 18794201]
- Hayden J (2000). Writing for publication 101. *Health Promotion Practice*, 1(1), 21-25.
- Kempenaar L, & Murray R (2019). Widening access to writing support: Beliefs about the writing process are key. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(8), 1109-1119.
- Komaie G, Goodman M, McCall A, McGill G, Patterson C, Hayes C, & Sanders Thompson V (2018). Training community members in public health research: Development and implementation

- of a community participatory research pilot project. *Health Equity*, 2(1), 282–287. [PubMed: 30334019]
- Lancaster B, & Roe K (2000). Observations of the past decadeTM's efforts to bridge the gaps between health education and health promotion practice and research. *Health Promotion Practice*, 1(1), 33–37.
- Lavinghouze SR, Snyder K, & Rieker PP (2014). The component model of infrastructure: A practical approach to understanding public health program infrastructure. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(8), e14–e24.
- McBride CM, Comeau DL, Mastin AE, & Cooper HL (2019). A public health of consequence: Shifting the cultural narrative from churning grants to a scholarship of consequence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 109(11), 1535–1538. [PubMed: 31536412]
- McMullen TP, Mandelbaum J, Myers K, Brightharp C, Kavanaugh K, & Hicks S (2022). Expanding opportunities for data dissemination through collaborative writing teams in public health practice settings. *Health Promotion Practice*, 23(4), 566–568. 10.1177/15248399211029343 [PubMed: 34337982]
- Novick LF, & Moore JB (2018). The importance of publications by public health practitioners: A new tool. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 24(2), 93–95. [PubMed: 29360695]
- Rathore M, Kashyap A, Kapoor P, Shirley P, & Gupta A (2019). Enhancement of scientific writing skills of medical teachers through scientific writing workshop. Paper presented at the Workshop. *MGM Journal of Medical Sciences*, 6(1), 29–31.
- Redelfs AH, Aguilera J, & Ruiz SL (2019). Practical strategies to improve your writing: Lessons learned from public health practitioners participating in a writing group. *Health Promotion Practice*, 20(3), 333–337. [PubMed: 30938187]
- Roe KM (2021). Radical practice. *Health Promotion Practice*, 22(1), 5–8. [PubMed: 33295210]
- Salas-Lopez D, Deitrick L, Mahady ET, Moser K, Gertner EJ, & Sabino JN (2012). Getting published in an academic-community hospital: The success of writing groups. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 27(1), 113–116. [PubMed: 21922155]
- Schima M, & Ames EE (1996). The health education profession in the 21st century: Setting the stage: National Commission for Health Education Credentialing, Inc., Coalition of National Health Education Organizations, USA. *Journal of School Health*, 66(8), 291–298. [PubMed: 8899587]
- Schwartz R, & Goodman RM (2000). Health promotion practice: Advancing the state of health promotion and education practice. *Health Promotion Practice*, 1(1), 5–9.
- Truman BI, Smith-Akin CK, Hinman AR, Gebbie KM, Brownson R, Novick LF, Lawrence RS, Pappaioanou M, Fielding J, Evans CA Jr., Guerra FA, & Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2000). Developing the guide to community preventive services—Overview and rationale. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 18(1), 18–26.
- Valladares LM, Riegelman RK, & Albertine S (2019). Writing in public health: A new program from the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health. *Public Health Reports*, 134(1), 94–97. [PubMed: 30521762]

TABLE 1

Writing for Publication Workshop Instruction Agenda

Session 1 Large group

- Welcome, Introductions, and Workshop Overview including Virtual Site
 - Health Promotion Practice Supplement Call for Papers and Vision for its contribution to the literature
 - Overview of HPP and its unique focus
 - Guidelines for Writing Teams: Tips for Success
 - Discuss 3 different types of journal articles and the specific formats
 - The principal components of a manuscript and what they address
 - Role of the Coach in manuscript development
 - Expectations—do and don'ts
 - Authorship acknowledgment
 - TEAM HUDDLE
 - Breakout groups
 - What type of article to be submitted?
 - Designate a lead author
 - Draft outline of Article
 - Identify citations
 - Author assignments for manuscript sections
 - Role of the Coach
 - Assignment 1A
 - Develop a detailed outline with writer assignments.
 - Draft Purpose/Aims section with key citations
 - References—Use APA Style Guide
 - Wrap-up
 - Q&A
 - Coaches Debrief
- Session 1A TEAM WORKING SESSION
- Discuss overall manuscript trajectory
 - Review draft outline, assignment of authors to manuscript sections
 - Refine draft Purpose/Aims section—identify key citations

Session 1 *Large group*

- Address coach's comments

Session 2 *Large group*

- Review of Session 1
- Q&A
- Manuscript Introduction
 - Introduction—key elements and drawing in the reader
- Literature Review
 - Framing your literature review
 - All sources cited in the literature review should be listed in the references; tips for keeping track of citations
 - Summarizing the review, so narrative leads to why your intervention is important
 - Common errors in literature reviews (e.g., plagiarism, outdated references, disjointed) Quick Tips for Writing Success (What I wish I had known from the start!) (*Spring Workshop*)

TEAM HUDDLE**Breakout groups**

- Identify key points for Introduction
- Refine purpose and aims of manuscript

Assignment 2A

- Introduction with citations
- Background/Literature review- with citations
- Refine purpose/aims
- Wrap-up
- Q&A
- Coaches Debrief

Session 2A *TEAM WORKING SESSION*

- Draft Introduction section, literature review/background section
- Continue to refine Purpose/Aims section

- Address coach's comments

Session 3 *LARGE GROUP*

- Review of Session 2
 - Check in with the teams—how is it going?>?
 - Coaches highlight successes

Session 1 Large group

- o Q&A
- Methods and Results
 - o Qualitative Data
 - o Tables, figures etc., guidelines
 - o Discussion of findings
- TEAM HUDDLE
- Breakout groups
 - Refinement of Methods and Result sections
- Assignment 3A
 - Preliminary—Methods and Results (including draft tables and figures)
 - Discussion and Limitations, Implications for Practice, research sections
 - Manuscript Key Takeaways
 - o Summarizing main points
 - o Importance of work
 - o Contribution to the literature in the conclusion
 - Wrap-up
 - Q&A
 - Coaches Debrief
- Session 3A TEAM WORKING SESSION
 - Preliminary—Methods and Results (including draft tables and figures)
 - Discussion and Limitations, Implications for Practice, research sections
 - Address coach's comments
- Session 4 LARGE GROUP
 - Implications for Practice/Research as a critical component of the manuscript:
 - o Description of issue being addressed
 - o Specific audience(s) for implications
 - o Recommendations on what may or may not be needed
 - o Expected outcome of recommendations, and illustrations of what that might look like
 - Responding effectively to Reviewers' comments
 - o Identifying significant flaws
 - o How do you respond to reviewer's comments?

Session 1 *Large group*

- o Can and how did you make changes

TEAM HUDDLE
Breakout groups:

- Discussion/feedback from coaches on results/tables/figures
- Feedback from coaches on discussion of results
- CDC Clearance Process
- HPP online journal submission portal
 - o Author Checklist of submission requirements
 - o What is an ORCID? How to obtain an ORCID.
- Dissemination and Promotion (*Fall Workshop*)
 - o Modes of dissemination and promotion
 - o Where do you disseminate
- Wrap-up
- Q&A

Assignment 4A

- Implications for Practice/research
- Complete draft manuscript
- Review all sections and how they holds together/tell a story as a manuscript
- Coaches Debrief

Session 4A **TEAM WORKING SESSION**

- Review and revise Implications for Practice including research and evaluation
 - Review all sections and how it holds together as a manuscript
 - Voluntary pre-submission peer review or expedited review of manuscript
 - Preparing for finalizing manuscript and submission to journal
 - Deciding to continue working with coach
-

Note. HPP = Health Promotion Practice; CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TABLE 2
Comparison Between Spring and Fall Workshop Instruction Time, Coaches, and Team Work Sessions After Evaluation Feedback

Spring writing workshop ^a	Fall writing workshop ^b
8 weeks of structured sessions (May 11, 2021-July 13, 2021, 1–4 pm EDT)	8 weeks of structured sessions (September 21, 2021–November 16, 2021, 12:00 Noon–4:00 pm EDT)
Biweekly schedule (Alternating 1-week live session, 1 week working team time)	Biweekly schedule (Alternating 1-week live session, 1 week working team time)
22 participants from 8 teams	25 participants from 6 teams
12 faculty and coaches (SOPHE and CDC)	7 faculty and coaches (SOPHE and CDC)
16 hours of live training sessions	20 hours of live training sessions
16 hours of devoted team time	20 hours of devoted team time

Note. SOPHE = Society for Public Health Education; CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; EDT = Eastern Daylight Time.

^aOne team did not have any team members complete the after-workshop survey; all other teams had at least one team member complete the after-workshop survey.

^bAt least one team member from every team completed the after-workshop survey.

TABLE 3
Session Evaluation Questions and Results: Spring and Fall Workshops

Question	Response options	Spring (n=14)	Fall (n=15)
My overall virtual writing for publication workshop experience was:	1 to 5 where 1 = <i>poor</i> and 5 = <i>excellent</i>	Excellent = 60% Above average = 40%	Excellent = 60% Above average = 40%
Were the learning objectives met for the writing for publication workshop?	Yes/No	Yes= 100%	Yes= 100%
What was your primary reason for attending the writing for publication workshop?	Open-ended		
What was the best thing about the writing for publication workshop?	Open-ended		
Overall, this event met my satisfaction in the following areas: Writing for Publication Resources, Session Topics, Engaging Educational Conversation, Breakout Sessions, Session Polls, Ability to Ask Questions Online	1 to 5 where 1 = <i>strongly disagree</i> and 5 = <i>strongly agree</i>		
	Writing for Publication Resources	Strongly agree = 73.33% Agree = 26.67%	Strongly agree = 73.33% Agree = 26.67%
	Session Topics	Strongly agree = 66.67% Agree = 33.33%	Strongly agree = 66.67% Agree = 33.33%
	Engaging Educational Conversation	Strongly agree = 60.00% Agree = 33.33% Neutral = 6.67%	Strongly agree = 60.00% Agree = 33.33% Neutral = 6.67%
	Breakout Sessions	Strongly agree = 66.67% Agree = 33.33%	Strongly agree = 66.67% Agree = 33.33%
	Session Poll	Strongly agree = 46.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%	Strongly agree = 46.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%
	Ability to Ask Questions	Strongly agree = 53.33% Agree = 26.67% Neutral = 13.33% Disagree = 6.67%	Strongly agree = 66.67% Agree = 26.67% Neutral = 6.67%
The overall quality of this writing for publication workshop was excellent	1 to 5 where 1 = <i>strongly disagree</i> and 5 = <i>strongly agree</i>	Strongly agree = 66.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%	Strongly agree = 53.33% Agree = 26.67% Neutral = 13.33%
Please list 3 steps that you are going to take in the next 90 days as a result of the writing for publication workshop?	1 to 5 where 1 = <i>strongly disagree</i> and 5 = <i>strongly agree</i>	Strongly agree = 46.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%	Strongly agree = 46.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%
The length of time was adequate for learning and engaging	1 to 5 where 1 = <i>strongly disagree</i> and 5 = <i>strongly agree</i>	Strongly agree = 46.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%	Strongly agree = 46.67% Agree = 46.67% Disagree = 6.67%
What did you value from the Breakout Sessions? What could have been improved?	Open-ended		
What content was missing, and you would have liked to have covered during the writing for publication workshop?	Open-ended		
Please let us know what additional content you would like to be included in a writing for publication workshop	Open-ended		
Please provide us with additional feedback that will help us improve our virtual event	Open-ended		

Question	Response options	Spring (n=14)	Fall (n=15)
My overall virtual writing for publication workshop experience was:	1 to 5 where 1 = <i>poor</i> and 5 = <i>excellent</i>	N/A (only asked on fall survey)	Excellent = 60% Above average = 40%

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

TABLE 4

Participant Motivations for Workshop Participation

“We would like to share the successes and lessons learned from our collaboration in the hope it can assist the journeys of other regions.”

“To have the opportunity to disseminate valuable information for similar programs to replicate by connecting with faith-based organization and to gain the appropriate knowledge and support needed to prepare a public health manuscript.”

“The writing workshop would help increase the skills and capacity of the writing team to be able to draft a quality manuscript that could benefit the public health community.”

“Our team’s motivation for participating in this writing workshop is the opportunity to have dedicated time and resources for writing, along with partnership with CDC staff.”

Note. CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TABLE 5

Participant Perception of Value of Workshop on Skill Development

“My HOP [High Obesity Program] team is deeply committed to our project, yet we have varying levels of experience writing for research publications. The SOPHE workshop sessions provided a thorough overview of manuscript components, review processes, and were not intimidating. Being selected for this workshop enabled us to prioritize time to write and discuss how we can communicate the work we are doing to an important audience-practitioners. Our assigned coach was kind and knowledgeable. We are excited to submit our manuscript for publication!”

“I valued having the opportunity to ask our SME [subject matter expert] and Writing Coach very important questions to help us along the way. I believe the breakout sessions were great and allowed us to really get to know one another . . .”

“I just want you to pass this along . . . these speakers are realistic, practical, and humble yet inspiring. I ‘did not have time’ for this opportunity but am so glad I did. I will be a better writer and a better mentor thanks to these sessions . . . I have never seen writing for publication taught or coached this well.”

Note. HOP = High Obesity Program; SOPHE = Society for Public Health Education; SME = Subject Matter Expert.