

# EVALUATION REPORT

---

## CRAFTING RICHER MESSENGERS: THE PUBLIC HEALTH ADVANTAGE

April 25 & 26, 2018, Chapel Hill, N.C.



UNC  
GILLINGS SCHOOL OF  
GLOBAL PUBLIC HEALTH

THE NORTH CAROLINA  
*Institute for Public Health*

## Table of Contents

Overview .....	1
Evaluation Methods.....	2
Evaluation Findings.....	4
Evaluation Findings: Hopes and Hesitations .....	4
Evaluation Findings: Overall Workshop .....	6
Evaluation Findings: Sessions.....	8
History of Moral Foundations Theory and the Public Health Advantage .....	8
Looking Inward: Self-Assessment and Exploring Mental Models.....	9
Case Study: North Carolina Needle Exchange Program & Opioid Considerations .....	10
Looking Outward: Exploring How Stakeholders Resonate with Moral Foundations.....	11
Unexpected Messengers and Messaging Alignment (Council for a Strong America).....	11
Incorporating Civil Discourse Components into Public Health Efforts (Better Angels) .....	12
Triad Practice Sessions.....	13
The Public Health Advantage – Looking to the Future .....	14
Exploring Our Personal Bias .....	15
Case Study – Millennials and the Public Health Advantage .....	16
Evaluation Findings: Key Take Aways .....	16
Analysis .....	17
Summary.....	20
Appendices.....	21
Appendix A: Participant Agenda.....	21
Appendix B: List of Co-creators .....	24
Appendix C: Participant Directory .....	25

*Two additional appendices, Observation Form and Survey Instrument, are available upon request.*

## Overview

Effective communication with diverse audiences is essential to public health practice, especially when it comes to crafting policy and legislation. When the ever-changing health needs of a community shift, it is fundamentally important to systematically select the right solution, build community support for that solution, and then implement & defend the change often required in a law, regulation, policy or appropriation in order to remedy the problem identified.

An interdisciplinary approach to accomplish such systematic change is what some are now calling The Five Essential Public Health Law Services. Yet in polarized environments, reaching decision makers and their constituents across the political spectrum can be daunting.

A recent workshop, “Crafting Richer Messengers: The Public Health Advantage,” hosted by leaders at the North Carolina Institute for Public Health (NCIPH) at the UNC Gillings School of Global Public Health in April 2018, sought to transform this challenge into an opportunity to improve community health and explore deeper methods for communicating our public health messages. See *Appendix A: Participant Agenda*. This is the latest in a series of public health workshops and articles about crafting richer messages developed by a group of thought-leaders from North Carolina and across the country. See *Appendix B: List of Co-creators*.

The workshop intentionally brought together an audience that was diverse politically, geographically, generationally and racially. Also included were public health and organizational leaders at the local, state and national levels, leadership development experts from the private sector and elected officials. In all, 38 participants attended. See *Appendix C: Participant Directory*.

Led by Gene Matthews, J.D., a senior investigator at NCIPH and the Southeastern Regional Director for the Network for Public Health Law, the workshop sought to build these diverse leaders’ skills for future public health workforce training. Participants were introduced to the principles of Moral Foundations Theory and how this framework may be used to improve public health messaging. Regardless of geographic and cultural boundaries, the Moral Foundations Theory framework posits that six moral values underlie much of human decision making. These are *care, liberty, fairness, loyalty, authority and sanctity*. While these six values are universal, American liberals and conservatives tend to weigh these values differently when making moral judgements.

Although public health practitioners historically seemed to have relied more upon liberal moral values (care, liberty and fairness) to frame their messages, the thought-leaders of this body of work believe that much of the public health workforce also resonates with the “conservative” moral values (loyalty, authority and sanctity). By recognizing and exploring our public health workforce’s potentially broader span of inherent values, the profession has what can be called

a “Public Health Advantage,” pointing toward a new opportunity to earn public trust and better serve communities.

The workshop sought the assistance of the attendees to help vet this evolving mind-set of the “Public Health Advantage” and to test related skill-building techniques that could be used for future public health workforce training.

The most affirming aspect of this workshop was that this new content and the related skill-set exercises resonated in a practical and deep way with a very diverse cohort of participants. This resonance was similar to sentiments shared at many earlier presentations and workshops in front of public health audiences. Participants in this April event were encouraged to be candid throughout the workshop and as well as in a post-event confidential survey. Their feedback reflects thoughtful comments and recommendations that will inform the development of future iterations of this content.

*Civil discourse is worth the time and effort it takes! [I gained] a greater appreciation for the importance of speaking to others’ moral foundations while still reflecting on your own.*

*Understanding values/moral foundations of others is absolutely essential to connect with them to engage in constructive and civil discourse.*

This body of work is developing at a critical point in time in our nation’s history; messaging plays a pivotal role in what public health efforts get traction and which do not. There is tremendous interest in both the public health community and with our partners to further develop these tools. More importantly, there is a priority need to further develop a supporting network of leaders and stakeholders to facilitate opportunities for wide dissemination across a multitude of topical areas.

## Evaluation Methods

As this workshop was a pilot, the design included many opportunities for reflection and feedback.

### Observer Forms

Six individuals were selected based on their training and facilitation experience to complete Observation Forms throughout the workshop for all the sessions and the Q&A/discussion portions. Fifty-five completed Observation Forms for 12 sessions were received. See *Appendix D: Observation Form*.

Key Questions from the Observation Form included:

1. From the participants' perspective, what worked well within the session? For example: what content/tools did the participants really engage with? What seemed to be most useful?
2. From the participants' perspective; what did not work well within the session? For example: what did the participants struggle with? What caused confusion amongst participants?
3. Overall, how effective was the presenter? Highly effective, Effective, Neither Effective nor Ineffective, Highly Ineffective.
4. How effective was the conveying of specific session content? Highly effective, Effective, Neither Effective nor Ineffective, Highly Ineffective.
5. Please give two to three examples of why you answered the way you did for the above two questions

### Hopes, Hesitations and Key Takeaways

At the start of the workshop, individual responses were collected related to participants' hopes and hesitations. At the close of the workshop, individual responses were collected related to participants' takeaways.

### Post-Workshop Survey

We asked pilot participants to complete a confidential survey related to the overall workshop and session objectives. Thirty-four out of 38 participants responded. Of the 34 respondents, 28<sup>1</sup> attended both workshop, three attended only April 25<sup>th</sup> and another three attended only April 26<sup>th</sup>. The presenters and facilitators for select sessions were also considered participants and were asked to complete the survey. The two lead facilitators were not asked to complete the survey. See *Appendix E: Survey Instrument*.

### Comment Cards

Participants were told there was a box for confidential comment cards which would be confidential located at the registration table throughout the workshop. No one made use of this option.

---

<sup>1</sup> One respondent who attended both days checked strongly disagree for the majority of responses. We believe this to be an error and that this individual intended to check strongly agree. We have removed this respondent's responses from the analysis of the workshop and sessions objectives. His/her responses are included in the questions not related to objectives.

## Evaluation Findings

### Evaluation Findings: Hopes and Hesitations

At the start of the workshop, we asked participants to write their hopes or hesitations on post-it notes which we collected and displayed. All of the comments were focused on hopes. The facilitator reviewed the highlights of the hopes and showed where there was agreement. Then she elicited hesitations out loud from the group and facilitated some short discussion about a few. These remained posted throughout the workshop. Summaries of each are listed below:

#### Hopes

- New people, new language, who knows?
- A better understanding of communications strategies.
- Reactions and advice for Crafting Richer Messengers approach.
- Knowledge and expert subject matter contacts.
- Learning more about how to cross the bipartisan divide to improve the health and well-being of all.
- Learn more about North Carolina and others who are going to “cross party lines” to make a difference.
- I am hoping to gain knowledge on topics I am expected to be an expert in. Besides that, I love learning perspectives from all stakeholders in any arena.
- That new perspective/insight I have never thought of before!
- How to recruit REDS to workshops.
- Framework that allows me to open up to listening to others who are not like me.
- Ways to best communicate public health messages.
- Gain perspective on the much wider topic of balance in politics, culture and direction. Listening also for venues to fund and expand this process.
- A better understanding of what aspects of public health ideas/policies/priorities trigger conflict and how to overcome those conflicts. How do we unite in furtherance of public health?
- New tools for communicating key public health messages that reach everyone in my community, not just the normal supporters; ways to share impact of public health services/programs/policies.
- New skills and best practices for building a political imperative for legal and policy intervention to improve the health of vulnerable and sometimes socially excluded/politically oppressed populations.
- A better understanding of strategies to communicate public health policy to audiences.
- Develop skills to communicate a well-rounded vision to improve public health on our border, in our community and the state of Texas.

- Education tools to assist me in my position to facilitate a vehicle to curb infectious diseases.
- Better skills that will increase awareness of public health at all levels and audiences.
- The future direction of crafting richer messages and how to incorporate it into my work!
- Make public health a first thought, not an afterthought, through communication bridges.
- To gain a better understanding of public health and how to reach the conservative community to support initiatives in this arena.
- A broader, more thorough understanding of how to communicate with various ideological audiences.

### Hesitations

- Where will the money come from?
- Work with diseases of despair when they focus (only) on white men.
- Emphatic emphasis on “selling” instead of *listening*.
- How/worried to come together to find best solutions that are not divisive.
- Challenge the assumption to move to the “middle.”
- Concerned that this could be about mastering the art of manipulation which could be disconnected from public health’s values.
- Focus should be on the emotional intelligence/civil discourse (but it’s not – across the country).
- Data is no longer an ultimate truth anymore — concerned about manipulations.
- How we incorporate empowering the voices we serve into both crafting and co-creating messages and delivery/dissemination.
- Concerned about understanding there is strength in being transparent in our methods.

### Observer Feedback

*[It was] helpful to have a description of the purpose including evaluation — I think this helped participants’ understanding of their role. Participants expressed concern that the focus could be on convincing, selling, art of manipulation. Perhaps (reassurance) on this could be addressed up front? Some said — they were concerned it could be incompatible with public health. Hopes and Hesitations: I think the group was very engaged for this. Hesitations really resonated with the group — great exercise for drawing out discussion. The intro’s/bridge building question was excellent — drew out details that are relevant and served as an icebreaker.*

*Post-it notes far better than individual introductions. Individuals contributing, nodding heads, interactive, asking questions and dialogue. When we filled out*

*our post-its, were we asked for hopes and hesitations or only hopes (responses focused mainly on hopes)? Resiliency is defined differently by liberals and conservatives. Great introduction but impossible to stay within time parameters.*

## Evaluation Findings: Overall Workshop

We did not collect Observer forms for the overall workshop, only session-specific ones.

### Survey Results

The vast majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the overall workshop and each session met their specific learning objectives. Participants were asked to provide written recommendations to improve the delivery of the content which resulted in an abundance of suggestions; these are presented in the Evaluation Findings: Sessions and Analysis section of this report.

The vast majority of respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the following statements:

- 94% were satisfied with the on-site workshop overall.
- 97% felt the workshop used effective teaching and facilitation techniques.
- 85% felt that the workshop provided content that is relevant to their daily job.
- 94% said they would recommend the workshop to others.
- 91% report that the gains received were worth the time invested.
- 94% report that the training enhanced their knowledge of the subject matter.

Similarly, the vast majority of respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the workshop addressed the following learning objectives:

- 90% state that they understand key concepts related to the six values of Moral Foundations Theory and its application to developing public health messengers
- 87% report that they gained effective communication skills for civil discourse with those of opposing perspectives to collectively further gains in public health efforts
- 93% report developing a deeper understanding of the Public Health Advantage and the its application related to the future of public health
- 91% report that they were provided opportunities to give feedback on the delivery of content and skill building opportunities throughout this workshop

Survey respondents report that important gains made from participating in the workshop include:

*It was nice to speak with other people in public health and acknowledge that we need to be doing something different.*

*Reminder of looking at challenges from multiple perspectives and consider/describe issues from a conservative moral foundations perspective.*

*Understanding that listening can be someone's biggest accomplishment when 'winning' an argument. Also, when we adapt to a 'give and take' mentality rather than an 'all or none' mentality, we truly accomplish a lot more.*

Survey respondents report that the workshop could have been more helpful in content or learning methods in the following ways:

*I prefer modeling effective practices that demonstrate effective practices as well as revealing efforts that failed or fell short. Perhaps need extended effort to analyze why some approaches work better than others. Good stories are powerful and will motivate richer messaging.*

*It was a lot of material — I know this is the first iteration, but I would have benefited from a deeper refresher on moral foundations and a clearer transition between the moral foundations work, the virtues of public health and the skills portions.*

*More time is needed for the practice sessions. Content and learning methods are going to require additional time.*

Survey respondents report that the workshop could be improved in the following ways:

*More time on explaining moral foundations by mapping them to current and emerging public health threats.*

*(Bringing) additional partners outside of public health, fewer but deeper sessions and I liked Mellissa's comment about bringing at least two people per organization so that it would be easier to take back and practice.*

*... It would be helpful to include examples of how we can craft richer messages tied to specific public health topics. I'd also want to know whether how we craft messages changes depending on medium and audience. I'd also include more small-group exercises on how we talk about issues to apply this information ...*

## Evaluation Findings: Sessions

### History of Moral Foundations Theory and the Public Health Advantage

Participants overwhelmingly indicated a desire for a more in-depth version of *History of Moral Foundations Theory and the Public Health Advantage*, presented by Gene Matthews. Expansion ideas include connecting to the practice session scenarios, showcasing specific examples of how messaging can be reframed for challenging public health problems and demonstrating how policies have failed without adequate consideration for moral values resonance.

### Observer Feedback

*Personal component from Gene was powerful. Fast but good, nice examples. Public Health Advantage is complicated — Gene did a great introduction. Effective, excellent.*

*Audience was very engaged with the Moral Foundations Theory presentation — succinct presentation, still very effective — perhaps more so given the background of participants/personal invitations to the event. Gene is a bridge builder in presentation style — seems very important to putting people at ease and helping them resonate with content and the group. The wheelchair parable seemed to really set a good tone also. Highly effective.*

### Survey Results

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 93% state they can summarize key concepts from the Arc of Moral Universe.
- 90% state they can understand key concepts related to the background of applying moral foundations to public health messaging.
- 90% report that they can list and explain the six values of Moral Foundations Theory.
- 90% report they recognize the value of applying moral foundations to public health.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*I would appreciate more opportunities to hear about the Public Health Advantage and additional applications. Content delivery was excellent!*

*It would be helpful to have more time dedicated to this topic. In particular, I would love to see specific examples and then be able to practice how we can reframe discussions around, e.g., gun violence as a public health issue, safe injection sites and other potentially contentious public health issues. I think more time and depth could be dedicated to this topic.*

*One thing I am curious about is the distribution of the six values by culture/demographic rather than by liberal/conservative. Although I live in a very liberal area, our culture does tend to have very conservative values.*

### **Looking Inward: Self-Assessment and Exploring Mental Models**

In the session *Looking Inward: Self-Assessment and Exploring Mental Models*, facilitated by Vaughn Upshaw and Jeannine Herrick, participants saw value in completing a self-assessment related to moral foundations followed by two engaging activities that further highlighted the importance of looking inwards to develop self-awareness of “automatic thinking” and understanding that we as humans we are “hardwired for empathy.”

Participants indicated that they would like to see this section developed further to encompass values clarification and deconstruction. There is recognized value in understanding automatic thinking and how it affects our own messaging and decision making.

### **Observer Feedback**

*Participants were willing and cooperative in taking the self-assessment. The discussion was rich and centered around how context matters, as does age and experience in how these are answered. Most went with their gut reactions (this was easier for some than others). Group process was affirming and pushed participants a little. Went very well. Highly effective.*

*The Nine dots activity — [participants were] very engaged. Participants seemed riveted to the group processing discussion, lots of nodding. Resonance with “there is a default in our own heads that is automatic. We need to be aware of that.*

### **Survey Results**

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 83% report recognizing the value in differences in how problems are approached.
- 88% report understanding how the motivation to relate to others influences action, i.e. smiling.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*I enjoyed the delivery of this content. I thought the trainers did a great job in demonstrating these concepts. More time is needed to communicate this content.*

*Offer a version to the General Assembly.*

*It was interesting that I happened to read a short piece on LinkedIn just a few days ago about seven ways to lose trust. A lot of that was verified by the content.*

### **Case Study: North Carolina Needle Exchange Program & Opioid Considerations**

Participants referred back to *Case Study: N.C. Needle Exchange Program & Opioid Considerations*, presented by Sue Lynn Ledford, throughout the workshop. The delivery was a combination of storytelling and interactive lecture and was very well received.

One participant indicated that an important gain from the overall workshop was learning how to “(r)ebbrand a phrase regarding public health dealing with 1) stigma and 2) name. Example: Needle exchange program. Now: Infectious Disease and Harm Mitigation.”

Participants would have preferred some pre-work or additional background information presented as well as thinking through how this case study could evolve as in some contexts the focus has shifted from the state legislature level to local community ownership.

### **Observer Feedback**

*Participants were engaged/riveted with the storytelling component. Cannonball – ship analogy was well received. Asking the group to raise hands was a great way to keep it interactive. The group liked conversation about the “moral values” application to needle exchange with legislators. Great use of examples. Presenter points that resonated include:*

- *Example of bi-partisan support of such a magnitude is success in and of itself.*
- *Use “common sense/ well thought out reasons” for framing. For example, many years of scientific research, evidence, homework.*
- *You don’t waste a good problem on a bad problem.*
- *Success was having new language embedded in the legislation for something else.*
- *Incremental success is still success.*

### **Survey Results**

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 87% of respondents report understanding an example of how opposing views dynamics were overcome through positive communication strategies to influence a public health approach to a complex problem
- 93% of respondents report understanding how storytelling on the individual level can be a persuasive communication strategy to “set the stage”

A survey respondent commented:

*It was excellent having Sue Lynn and Representative Clampitt in the room to share their experiences in this effort. Varying perspectives that have been a part of that sort of process would be key to include in future sessions of this nature.*

### Looking Outward: Exploring How Stakeholders Resonate with Moral Foundations

While participants valued the exercise in *Looking Outward: Exploring How Stakeholders Resonate with Moral Foundations*, facilitated by Vaughn Upshaw, they also realized that a deeper dive into Moral Foundations Theory towards the beginning of the workshop would have built a stronger foundation for this session. While participants were very engaged with this session, having some small group practice time would be valuable.

### Observer Feedback

*Interactive — good!! Got some dissention ... but in a good way! Effective. Controversial issues raised, created opportunity for discussion and to raise really big issues. This is a really difficult process and was well led. But I think strategizing to make it more audience-led would be more helpful. Great audience engagement.*

### Survey Results

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 90% report understanding how drivers of public health problems can be viewed from multiple perspectives.
- 77% report being able to identify stakeholders for various drivers.
- 83% report they can brainstorm how various stakeholders connect with moral foundations in different ways.

A survey respondent commented:

*“My recommendation would be to dive into this deeper. How does communication strategy change when we consider culture, demographics, state/regional differences, etc.?”*

### Unexpected Messengers and Messaging Alignment (Council for a Strong America)

*Unexpected Messengers and Messaging Alignment*, presented by Tom Garrett from the Council for a Strong America, received an overwhelmingly positive response and resonated deeply with public health participants in particular. Recommendations include expanding this content,

allowing for more time to engage with the material and building in some practice opportunities. Participants indicated that they would like specifics on tactics employed to create communication strategies with descriptive hypotheticals.

#### Observer Feedback

*Participants were engaged throughout the presentation. Great presentation skills. Bubble Problem resonated. Highly Effective.*

#### Survey Results

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 97% report being able to identify messaging challenges.
- 97% can summarize key concepts related to messaging effectively to broad audiences.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*I thought this presentation was outstanding. I would continue to have the Council for a Strong America partner with you on this initiative.”*

*I thought this presentation was great. It was great to see that there are people out there putting this type of messaging into action already and achieving public health goals.*

#### Incorporating Civil Discourse Components into Public Health Efforts (Better Angels)

In the session *Incorporating Civil Discourse Components into Public Health Efforts*, presented by Herman Sperling, participants agree that civil discourse is a priority skill development area to advance public health. Participants would have preferred to hear more about the lessons learned by Better Angels that could apply to day-to-day conversations.

#### Observer Feedback

*People were responding to the difficulty of civil discourse and depolarization. Really good at the end of the conversation.*

*Participants enjoyed the presenter’s entertaining nature and use of humor. The examples of how Best Buy changed from a training department to a learning department and how that was transformational. The idea of applying marriage counseling techniques resonated.*

#### Survey Results

Eighty-seven percent of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the objective: Identify the four main components of civil discourse.

A survey respondent commented:

I loved the model and the testimony of where it came from and why they think it important in this particular moment in public time.

### **Triad Practice Sessions**

Participants were appreciative to have an opportunity to practice civil discourse skills in the *Triad Practice Session*, facilitated by Jeannine Herrick. Recommendations for improvements include combining civil discourse with messaging around moral foundations more intentionally and providing scripted “positions” so that conversations would be framed as oppositional. Connecting practice scenarios to examples that could be highlighted in *History of Moral Foundations* session is preferred.

### Observer Feedback

*Demos are helpful — good energy. The roles should be a little more prescriptive so the roles are clearer. It should be a little more difficult in terms of finding disagreement. The feedback form should be less literal. Great opportunity to practice. People want this piece to be further developed. Can moral foundations be brought back here? There is a need for more practice time.*

*Paired activities seemed very engaging. Assigned seating and partners were very good ideas – eliminated negotiation time and made it easy to connect with a variety of people. Lack of explanation/unpacking of values in ladder of inference.*

*There was interest in a tool around values clarification (in response to Gary Gunderson’s suggestion that values can be deconstructed and are not always fair/helpful).*

*Great engagement in the activities!! Presenter/Observer/Responder activity was excellent and seemed really effective for the application of skills.*

### Survey Results

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 83% report being able to effectively set a tone for conversation that feels safe and welcoming to all participants using key strategies.

- 83% report being able to effectively demonstrate positive listening skills.
- 83% report being able to effectively use positive speaking skills that model presented key strategies.
- 73% feel that they can make effective use of strategies presented for handling difficult moments in conversations.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*Well — this is an area EVERYONE in public office should be exposed to. Suggestion that this course should be required in the orientation of ALL newly elected General Assembly members and all other boards and commissions.*

*The other two participants in my group agreed that my feedback to them was very valuable. While the two role plays were very good, that's no substitute for the student-centered opportunity.*

### **The Public Health Advantage – Looking to the Future**

The session *The Public Health Advantage — Looking to the Future*, presented jointly by Gary Gunderson and Scott Burris, was received exceptionally well. Observers and survey respondents agreed that this content both validated this body of work and inspired them in a future-oriented way. While the delivery was recorded, it will be important to think through how to best capture and deliver this information in a way that sustains that compelling factor. In addition, having more clarity between moral values and virtues would be helpful.

### **Observer Feedback**

*Incredible silence and attention in the room. People are soaking it up — ENGAGEMENT! Some hesitance eliciting engagement. Just incredible presenter. Need these notes for dissemination. A set of virtues, not a set of skills — implicates a set of skills.*

*Thoughtful and provocative regarding faith and public health.*

*Participants were listening intently to the presenters. Conservative participants especially liked the focus on virtue (not self-righteousness). We might need some slides, handouts or some new creative way to replicate this content for future iterations and translate it from conceptual to practical.*

## Survey Results

Eighty-seven percent of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the objective: Describe how communication strategies can be applied to Public Health Advantage efforts.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*“This presentation was especially informative and well done.”*

*“I thought this was a wonderful and rich conversation, but I'm not really sure how to use it/think about it. The idea of virtues first (and the cultivation of virtues) was helpful but I'm not clear on whether moral foundations and virtues are the same or different or whether moral foundations theory work is part of the skill set that derives from virtues, or something else.”*

## Exploring Our Personal Bias

The session *Exploring Our Personal Bias*, facilitated by Jeannine Herrick, was well-received as an effective way to introduce the following session: *Looking to the Future — Engaging the Millennial Workforce as Public Health Messengers*. Suggestions for improvement include shortening it and providing more time to collectively process the experience.

## Observer Feedback

*“Excellent way to get people focused on thinking about this topic! This generated disagreement in a way that seemed helpful to recognize the need for conversation.”*

## Survey Results

Eighty percent of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the objective: Become aware of their own assumptions and possible biases toward the millennial generation related to PH workforce.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*“Excellent session. The exercise before the presentation primed the participants for being receptive to the content being shared!”*

*“This is a good direction and a useful consideration. Experiential balancing is important with opportunities to discuss generational uses as well as strengths.”*

## Case Study – Millennials and the Public Health Advantage

The session *Looking to the Future — Engaging the Millennial Workforce as Public Health Messengers*, presented jointly by Colleen Healy Boufides and Elizabeth Corcoran, had a high degree of resonance with participants, and several survey respondents indicated that this could have its own workshop and a life of its own that would be separate but still connected to this larger body of work.

### Observer Feedback

*“This was my favorite, most thought provoking session. Energy of the audience was positive.”*

*“Great presentation on millennials – good information and relevant. Loved this.”*

### Survey Results

The majority of survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that this session met the following objectives:

- 93% can summarize challenges millennials face in public health.
- 93% can identify opportunities for millennials to influence the field of public health.
- 87% can understand the difference between less effective signaling versus rich public health messaging.
- 97% can identify ways to engage millennials.

Some comments from survey respondents include:

*I thought this was one of the best presentations in the workshop. The content was well thought out. Delivery was outstanding.*

*I am glad this was presented at the workshop. It truly provided the "other side" of the millennial argument and showed how impactful this generation can be on public health if we tap into their resources correctly.*

## Evaluation Findings: Key Takeaways

At the close of the workshop, each participant was asked to write their key takeaway from the overall workshop on a Post-it. The facilitator collected all the responses and posted them in the room. She read them out loud and facilitated a brief discussion about a few. The key takeaways include:

- Values prior to skills when messaging.
- Get experiential notes and questions (as with Dr. Ledford) to discuss and present real life aspects of disadvantage moving forward.

- We can go deeper and more practical ... but need to focus on task.
- Public health advantage is a set of virtues first — got me thinking about cultivation of virtues.
- The most impactful communication strategy is listening, respecting and understanding opposite perspectives.
- I've had many presentations on having millennials in the workspace, but this was the first positive presentation on this age group, and I appreciate that being in the room for decision makers.
- A greater appreciation for the importance of speaking to others' moral foundations while still reflecting on your own.
- Need for considering history of public health in trying to navigate and work using the Public Health Advantage — what does humility look like in public health?
- I have a lot to learn — or continue to learn.
- See the level of commitment by all participants to craft a richer message.
- At work: I need to mentor my millennial employees on how to handle budget issue.
- Success will depend on ability to inter-generationally connect.
- “Be the change you want to see.”
- Using all of the values of public health to effect change.
- Understanding values/moral foundations of others in absolutely essential to connect with them to engage in constructive (and civil) discourse.
- Millennials find value in the knowledge we old folks have available.
- Change how we recruit millennials — loan repayment, mentorships, negotiable vacation time, smooth out hiring process.
- The Public Health Advantage is our biggest advantage but we need to figure out how to make sure all generations and groups understand what that is and how to use it.
- Listening (active), have the thinking and approach to millennials, moral foundations-framework.

## Analysis

The following themes emerged when looking across all the evaluation findings:

### ***Additional Time for Specific Content***

The observation forms filled out by six designated facilitators/participants were consistent with many of the qualitative responses from survey respondents. Several respondents indicated that they would prefer more time dedicated to Moral Foundations Theory. Similarly, the session focused on looking outward and exploring how stakeholders resonate with moral foundations was well received, but several respondents would like to delve deeper into this content.

Respondents indicated that all the practice and skill building components would benefit from additional time as would the overall workshop.

## **Keep Several Key Features**

Participants found value and were engaged with the activities focused on looking inwards.

*Mirrored smiling – This got people moving and laughing. Very engaging. Great tie in to Harvey Response. “We are hard-wired for empathy.” Begin with that first. Building trust is the first foundational step. Tied beautifully that we all want to help and we are doomed if we can’t do that.*

The case study example focused on establishing NC’s Needle Exchange Program, which was presented using a combination of storytelling and interactive lecture, was well received and participants referred back to it throughout the workshop. Future iterations should consider including additional information about the history and evolution of the work following legislative changes.

The session dedicated to Exploring Our Personal Bias was well-received as an effective way to introduce the following session: Looking to the Future — Engaging Millennials Workforce as Public Health Messengers. It is unclear if participants recognized the adaptability of this exercise for a variety of public health/stakeholder issues.

Having non-traditional partners to public health participate in this workshop was invaluable to some participants.

*I liked hearing from the atypical groups. For the future, it may be beneficial to have some of the other partners we need for public health (transportation/housing/police). One of my struggles with messaging in policy is that what I say and what is being heard may be very different (ex: hospital CEO once told me that he hears "cutting costs in healthcare" and translates that to "cut jobs and benefits" because 50% of his costs are salaries). Having the chance to ask what's being heard is hugely helpful. [One participant's] comment at the end of the day about trust and productivity has also sparked some internal ruminations about how and whether that can be applied to policymakers and agencies. If high productivity/creativity comes from high trust in business, does that also apply with legislative and executive branch work — if so, how do you build/maintain that trust given political turnover in both spaces and how do you leverage that trust?*

Similarly, participants expressed gratitude for the opportunity to engage in constructive conversation with individuals with different and even opposing perspectives in a safe, productive environment.

*I gained a great deal of understanding of where public health is headed and where the efforts need to be focused. It was great to have such a broad and diverse group in the room.*

*Understanding the perspectives of others across various disciplines and sectors as it relates to public health, messaging and building relationships.*

*One of the best things about the workshop was the mix of people from across the ideological spectrum and across different sectors.*

### ***Skill Building Adaptation Suggestions***

The practice session dedicated to providing participants with an opportunity to practice civil discourse strategies around three public health topics in pre-assigned triads was well received overall. It is clear that skills-based practice is valued, though both observers and respondents indicated that the structure needs to be modified so that the topics are more clearly divisive and that positions are scripted for them to “try on.”

The session dedicated to Looking Outward — Exploring How Stakeholders Resonate with Moral Foundations stretched participants’ understanding of both empathy and the application of moral foundations theory to the Public Health Advantage from both individual and systems level stakeholder perspectives. Survey respondents and observers provided suggestions for how to improve this session and transition it to more of a practice session.

### ***Considerations for Translating Content for Wider Dissemination***

The session dedicated to exploring Unexpected Messengers and Messaging Alignment was particularly interesting to public health participants.

*I think public health people found this very novel in approach – and really helpful perspective. Great attention by the audience. Need more time for questions and engagement. Highly Effective.*

*Love the ‘Don’t make someone accept Jesus Christ as a condition to receiving their support.’ Authenticity is critical. If you attack someone’s core belief, they will buckle down no matter how compelling your arguments are.*

Observers and survey respondents would like to see this content expanded and subsequently offer additional skill-building opportunities around crafting messages that resonate with different moral values.

As mentioned above, the session *The Public Health Advantage — Looking to the Future* was very well received but may be challenging to replicate in future iterations. Thinking through creative ways to convey this information while maintaining the tone and its compelling message will be important.

The session dedicated to Looking to the Future: Engaging Millennials Workforce as Public Health Messengers was very well-received. This session had a high degree of resonance with participants and several survey respondents indicated that this could have its own workshop and a life of its own separate but still connected to this larger body of work.

### ***Investment in Building a Network to Facilitate Dissemination***

The intrinsic value in bringing together well-intentioned people who come from potentially opposing viewpoints in and of itself was well received. Highlighting examples of bi-partisan public health success stories was helpful in this process of collective engagement. Participants describe important gains from the workshop as:

*Thoughtful strategies on how to approach complex and challenging issues with leaders and communities that hold different set of values/perspectives.*

*Networking opportunities; how to talk with those individuals with opposing views.*

### **Summary**

The majority of responses to our recent workshop are very positive, but there is more work to be done. While most participants appreciated learning about moral foundations theory and civil discourse, there is a clear need for more content development and skills practice centered on bringing the two together. In particular, it is evident that participants see a need for more instruction and practice opportunities to craft richer public health messages.

While this workshop offered an introduction of content and practice opportunities, participant responses point towards the need to create a more comprehensive program that could be adapted for a variety of audiences committed to advancing the field of public health. The “*Crafting Richer Messengers: The Public Health Advantage*” workshop exceeded its objectives and generated an abundance of new ideas for ways to inform future iterations of this body of work.

As mentioned above, there is a need to further develop and test this content with various audiences and its application to numerous public health challenges. Investing in efforts to obtain buy-in from leaders across the nation in public health and other sectors from both sides of the political divide will lay the important foundation to disseminate this work widely so that it ultimately benefits the population health of our communities.

# Appendices

## Appendix A: Participant Agenda

### Crafting Richer Messengers:

#### The Public Health Advantage

**AC Hotel by Marriott | Wednesday April 25 & Thursday April 26**

#### Workshop Description

This workshop is bringing together a diverse group of stakeholders to provide input into the development of a potential toolkit and series that could be used with a wide array of audiences to improve Public Health's ability to message in ways that resonate across multiple perspectives.

Our purpose is to present some new ideas and obtain your feedback in 2 main areas:

1. Your response to our team's latest iteration of what we are now calling "The Public Health Advantage"
2. Your reaction to a series of skill-building techniques that we have now developed to support these new mind-sets on such topics as Crafting Richer Messengers, Moral Foundations Theory, The Public Health Advantage, Millennials in the Public Health Workforce and Social Media Strategies

#### Workshop Objectives

By the end of the workshop participants will be able to:

- Understand key concepts related to the six values of Moral Foundations Theory and its application to developing public health messengers
- Gain effective communication skills for civil discourse with those of opposing perspectives to collectively further gains in public health efforts
- Develop a deeper understanding of the Public Health Advantage and the its application related to the future of public health
- Provide feedback on the delivery of content and skill building opportunities throughout this workshop

## AGENDA

### Wednesday April 25

**9:00-9:20**      **Welcome**

*Gene Matthews, Network for Public Health Law and UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*

- 9:20-10:00**      **Workshop Overview and Introductions**  
*Jeannine Herrick, North Carolina Institute for Public Health at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*
- 10:00-10:30**    **History of Moral Foundations Theory and the Public Health Advantage**  
*Gene Matthews, Network for Public Health Law and UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*
- 10:30-10:50**    **BREAK**
- 10:50-11:30**    **Looking Inward: Self-Assessment and Exploring Mental Models**  
*Vaughn Upshaw, Public Health Leadership Program at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*
- 11:30-12:00**    **Case Study: NC Needle Exchange Program & Opioid Considerations**  
*Sue Lynn Ledford, Wake County, North Carolina Human Services*
- 12:00-1:00**      **LUNCH**
- 1:00-1:40**      **Looking Outward: Exploring How Stakeholders Resonate with Moral Foundations**  
*Vaughn Upshaw, Public Health Leadership Program at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*
- 1:40-2:30**      **Unexpected Messengers and Messaging Alignment**  
*Thomas Garrett, Council for a Strong America*
- Incorporating Civil Discourse Components Into Public Health Efforts**  
*Herman Sperling, HJS Markets and Better Angels of America*
- Discussion & Feedback**
- 2:30-2:50**      **BREAK**
- 2:50-4:45**      **Practice Sessions**  
*Jeannine Herrick, North Carolina Institute for Public Health at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*  
*Vaughn Upshaw, Public Health Leadership Program at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*  
*Sue Lynn Ledford, Wake County Human Services, North Carolina*  
*Gene Matthews, Network for Public Health Law and UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*
- 4:45-5:00**      **Day 1 Wrap Up**

**5:45-6:30 (Optional) Guided Historic Walking Tour of University of North Carolina Chapel Hill's Old Campus**

*Gene Matthews, Network for Public Health Law and UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*

## **Thursday April 26**

**9:00-9:30 The Public Health Advantage: Looking to the Future**

*Gene Matthews, Network for Public Health Law and UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*

*Gary Gunderson, Wake Forest Faith and Health Ministries*

*Scott Burris, Temple University Public Health Law Research*

**9:30-10:00 Exploring Our Personal Bias**

*Jeannine Herrick, North Carolina Institute for Public Health at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*

**10:00-10:30 Case Study: Millennials and The Public Health Advantage**

*Colleen Boufides, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Network for Public Health Law*

*Elizabeth Corcoran, de Beaumont Foundation*

**10:30-10:45 BREAK**

**10:45-12:00 Feedback and Day 2 Wrap Up**

*Gene Matthews, Network for Public Health Law and UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*

*Jeannine Herrick, North Carolina Institute for Public Health at UNC-CH Gillings School of Global Public Health*

## Appendix B: List of Co-creators

### Co-creators of content used for Crafting Richer Messengers: The Public Health Advantage, April 25 & April 26

**Baker, Ed**  
UNC Gillings Sch of Global Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[elbaker@ad.unc.edu](mailto:elbaker@ad.unc.edu)

**Burris, Scott**  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
[scott.burris@temple.edu](mailto:scott.burris@temple.edu)

**Boufides, Colleen**  
Mid-States Region, Network for PH Law  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  
[chealyboufides@networkforphl.org](mailto:chealyboufides@networkforphl.org)

**Corcoran, Elizabeth**  
de Beaumont Foundation  
Bethesda, Maryland  
[corcoran@debeaumont.org](mailto:corcoran@debeaumont.org)

**Cutts, Teresa**  
Wake Forest School of Medicine  
Winston Salem, North Carolina  
[tcutts@wakehealth.edu](mailto:tcutts@wakehealth.edu)

**Gunderson, Gary**  
Wake Health / Wake Forest University  
Winston Salem, North Carolina  
[ggunders@wakehealth.edu](mailto:ggunders@wakehealth.edu)

**Herrick, Jeannine**  
North Carolina Institute for Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[jherrick@email.unc.edu](mailto:jherrick@email.unc.edu)

**Ledford, Ronald**  
Former Principal Cherokee County  
Schools  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[ronald.ledford@gmail.com](mailto:ronald.ledford@gmail.com)

**Ledford, Sue Lynn**  
Wake County Human Services  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[sue.ledford@wakegov.com](mailto:sue.ledford@wakegov.com)

**Matthews, Gene**  
Network for PH Law—Southeastern  
Region  
UNC Gillings Sch of Global Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[gmatthews@networkforphl.org](mailto:gmatthews@networkforphl.org)

**Upshaw, Vaughn**  
UNC Gillings Sch of Global Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[vupshaw@unc.edu](mailto:vupshaw@unc.edu)

**Wilfert, Rachel**  
NC Institute for Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[rachel.wilfert@unc.edu](mailto:rachel.wilfert@unc.edu)

## Appendix C: Participant Directory: Chapel Hill Workshop, April 25-26, 2018

Austin, Kevin  
Yadkin County Commissioner  
Yadkinville, North Carolina  
[kaustin@yadkincountync.gov](mailto:kaustin@yadkincountync.gov)

Boufides, Colleen  
Mid-States Region, Network for PH Law  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  
[chealyboufides@networkforphl.org](mailto:chealyboufides@networkforphl.org)

Bullard, Cheryl  
SC Dept of Health & Environmental  
Control  
Columbia, South Carolina  
[BULLARCH@dhec.sc.gov](mailto:BULLARCH@dhec.sc.gov)

Burris, Scott  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
[scott.burris@temple.edu](mailto:scott.burris@temple.edu)

Cheng, Albert  
Harris County Public Health  
Houston, Texas  
[Albert.Cheng@phs.hctx.net](mailto:Albert.Cheng@phs.hctx.net)

Chrysler, Denise  
Mid-States Network for PH Law  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  
[dchrysler@networkforphl.org](mailto:dchrysler@networkforphl.org)

Clampitt, Mike  
N.C. General Assembly  
N.C. House District 119  
Bryson City, N.C.  
[mikeclampitt119@gmail.com](mailto:mikeclampitt119@gmail.com)

Corcoran, Elizabeth  
de Beaumont Foundation  
Bethesda, Maryland  
[corcoran@debeaumont.org](mailto:corcoran@debeaumont.org)

Cutts, Teresa  
Wake Forest School of Medicine  
Winston Salem, North Carolina  
[tcutts@wakehealth.edu](mailto:tcutts@wakehealth.edu)

Dobbins, Brittany  
Caldwell County Health Department  
[bdobbins@caldwellcountync.org](mailto:bdobbins@caldwellcountync.org)

Garrett, Tom  
Council for a Strong America  
Washington, District of Columbia  
[tgarrett@councilforstrongamerica.org](mailto:tgarrett@councilforstrongamerica.org)

Gonzalez, Jonathan  
Michigan Dept of Health & Human  
Services  
Lansing, Michigan  
[GonzalezJ6@michigan.gov](mailto:GonzalezJ6@michigan.gov)

Guajardo, Esmeralda  
Cameron County  
San Benito, Texas  
[equajardo@co.cameron.tx.us](mailto:equajardo@co.cameron.tx.us)

Gunderson, Gary  
Wake Health / Wake Forest University  
Winston Salem, North Carolina  
[ggunders@wakehealth.edu](mailto:ggunders@wakehealth.edu)

Henson, Rosemarie  
American Cancer Society  
Atlanta, Georgia  
[rosie.henson@cancer.org](mailto:rosie.henson@cancer.org)

Hoke, Chris  
NC DHHS/DPH  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[chris.hoke@dhhs.nc.gov](mailto:chris.hoke@dhhs.nc.gov)

Herrick, Jeannine  
North Carolina Institute for Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[jherrick@email.unc.edu](mailto:jherrick@email.unc.edu)  
Judge, Adam  
de Beaumont Foundation  
Bethesda, Maryland  
[judge@debeaumont.org](mailto:judge@debeaumont.org)

Kramer, Katheryne (K.T.)  
ASTHO  
Arlington, Virginia  
[kkramer@astho.org](mailto:kkramer@astho.org)

Ledford, Ronald  
Former Principal Cherokee County  
Schools  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[ronald.ledford@gmail.com](mailto:ronald.ledford@gmail.com)

Ledford, Sue Lynn  
Wake County Human Services  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[sue.ledford@wakegov.com](mailto:sue.ledford@wakegov.com)

Lovelace, Kay  
UNC Greensboro  
Greensboro, North Carolina  
[kalovela@uncg.edu](mailto:kalovela@uncg.edu)

Lozano, Marco  
Cameron County Public Health  
San Benito, Texas  
[marco.lozano@co.cameron.tx.us](mailto:marco.lozano@co.cameron.tx.us)

Lustig, Adam  
Trust for America's Health  
Washington, District of Columbia  
[alustig@tfah.org](mailto:alustig@tfah.org)

Matthews, Gene  
Network for PH Law—Southeastern  
Region  
UNC Gillings Sch of Global Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[gwmатthe@email.unc.edu](mailto:gwmатthe@email.unc.edu)

McIver, Jacqueline  
UNC Gillings Sch of Global Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[jkeith@email.unc.edu](mailto:jkeith@email.unc.edu)

Meyer, Graig  
N.C. General Assembly  
N.C. House District 50  
Orange County, North Carolina  
[graiqmeyer@gmail.com](mailto:graiqmeyer@gmail.com)

Morcelle, Madeline  
Network for PH Law-Western Region  
Phoenix, Arizona  
[mmorcelle@networkforphl.org](mailto:mmorcelle@networkforphl.org)

Moseley, Jeremy  
Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center  
Winston-alem, North Carolina  
[mmoseley@wakehealth.edu](mailto:mmoseley@wakehealth.edu)

Perez, Elizabeth  
Harris County Public Health  
Houston, Texas  
[Elizabeth.Perez@phs.hctx.net](mailto:Elizabeth.Perez@phs.hctx.net)

Pilkington, Phred  
Cabarrus Health Alliance  
Kannapolis, North Carolina  
[William.Pilkington@CabarrusHealth.org](mailto:William.Pilkington@CabarrusHealth.org)

Richard, April  
Orange County Health Department  
Hillsborough, North Carolina  
[arichard@orangecountync.gov](mailto:arichard@orangecountync.gov)

Rivers, Francis Mesa  
Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina  
[frivers@wakehealth.edu](mailto:frivers@wakehealth.edu)

Roberts, Judy  
Roberts Business Group  
Hillsborough, North Carolina  
[judy@robertsbq.com](mailto:judy@robertsbq.com)

Roberts, Larry  
Roberts Business Group  
Hillsborough, North Carolina  
[larry@robertsbq.com](mailto:larry@robertsbq.com)

Sager, Mellissa  
Network for PH Law—Eastern Region  
Baltimore, Maryland  
[msager@networkforphl.org](mailto:msager@networkforphl.org)

Sholar, Adam  
NC Health Care Facilities Association  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[AdamS@nchcfa.org](mailto:AdamS@nchcfa.org)

**Singleton, Tish**  
NC DHHS  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
[tish.singleton@dhhs.nc.gov](mailto:tish.singleton@dhhs.nc.gov)

**Sperling, Herman**  
HJS Markets, LLC  
Durham, North Carolina  
[herman@hjsmarkets.com](mailto:herman@hjsmarkets.com)

**Stek, Stanley**  
Kent County Commissioner  
Kent County, Michigan  
[Stek@MillerCanfield.com](mailto:Stek@MillerCanfield.com)

**Stewart, Quintana**  
Orange County Health Department  
Hillsborough, North Carolina  
[qstewart@orangecountync.gov](mailto:qstewart@orangecountync.gov)

**Truong, Charles**  
Network for PH Law—National Office  
Edina, Minnesota  
[ctruong@networkforphl.org](mailto:ctruong@networkforphl.org)

**Upshaw, Vaughn**  
UNC Gillings Sch of Global Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[vupshaw@unc.edu](mailto:vupshaw@unc.edu)

**Wilfert, Rachel**  
NC Institute for Public Health  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
[rachel.wilfert@unc.edu](mailto:rachel.wilfert@unc.edu)