

From: David at Roominate
Sent: Tuesday, November 6, 2018 1:45 PM
To: Amy Hagopian
Cc: Joel D Kaufman
Subject: Re: This letter was sent to your office by certified mail.

Thanks, Amy. I'll check that out. For the record, I wasn't concerned about the possibility of human subjects being harmed as a direct result of your study. The reason I asked about whether you submitted a study design for review was because I wanted to determine what steps you took to make sure the study was rigorous and objective, in keeping with the School of Public Health's mission statement.

Apparently no one at SPH reviewed the study design for that purpose and no one asked you about your relationship with the SHARE organization before you undertook the study. Please correct me if I'm wrong in that conclusion.

–David

From: Amy Hagopian
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2018 6:23 AM
To: David at Roominate
Cc: Joel D Kaufman
Subject: Re: This letter was sent to your office by certified mail.

David,

You may be interested in the UW's guidance on what constitutes research for purposes of obtaining human subjects review. It is detailed here:
<https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/do-i-need-irb-review/is-your-project-considered-research/>

Amy Hagopian, PhD
Associate Professor
Director, Community Oriented Public Health Practice
University of Washington School of Public Health
Box 357660, Seattle WA 98195-7660
Office: 206.616.4989 | Health Sciences H-690E
Cell: 206.551.5313
hagopian@uw.edu



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

From: David at Roominate
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 8:56 PM
To: Amy Hagopian
Cc: Joel D Kaufman
Subject: Re: This letter was sent to your office by certified mail.

Thanks for responding quickly, Dr. Hagopian. My article will be appearing within the next two weeks. If you wish to add anything to your responses in the meantime, please don't hesitate to do so. Thanks.

–David Preston

From: Amy Hagopian
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2018 3:48 PM
To: David at Roominate
Cc: Joel D Kaufman
Subject: This letter was sent to your office by certified mail.

Dear Mr. Preston,

Thank you for your note yesterday to my former dean regarding your concerns about my work on the Licton Springs project.

I am extremely busy right now and will be out of town next week, but wanted to get back to you in a timely manner.

My students' evaluation of the Licton Springs Tiny House Village was for completion of a winter quarter class on public health evaluation. We define evaluation as "activity devoted to collecting, analyzing and interpreting information on the need for implementation of and effectiveness and efficiency of intervention efforts to better the lot of humankind by improving social conditions and community life." We use a textbook, "The Practice of Health Program Evaluation," by David Grembowski. We adhere to principles of Community-Based Participatory Research, which is defined by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation as a "*collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings. CBPR begins with a research topic of importance to the community, has the aim of combining knowledge with action and achieving social change to improve health outcomes and eliminate health disparities.*"

I was grateful to the folks at SHARE and LIHI for offering the site and the project so that my students could have a hands-on learning opportunity. I maintain relationships with several community-based organizations so as to provide opportunities for my students to do projects.

None of us were paid for this work (or any other work we've done with these partner organizations). Shaina's characterization of her work on her Linked In page as a "consultant" to SHARE was accurate in this context, although she was not paid.

This was an EVALUATION project, not involving “research” in the sense that our Human Subjects office would define it. We obtained full consent, using standard UW ethical protocols, from all the people we interviewed. Students used systematic, conventional survey/evaluation methods, with continual faculty oversight. We did not retain interviewee transcripts, as is typical practice for researchers who hope to protect the privacy of their subjects.

My class is a six credit class, and there were eight students in the class. That amounts to about 18 hours per week per student over ten weeks.

Our analysis of the crime data asked different questions than you did, and therefore we found different answers. We consulted with a “big data” expert and interacted with city officials on that aspect of our work.

Good luck with your blog,
Amy

From: David at Roominate
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 8:48 PM
To: Amy Hagopian
Cc: Joel D Kaufman
Subject: This letter was sent to your office by certified mail.

Dr. Hagopian

I’m writing a story for my blog and I look forward to your response to my questions. The main document is “Certified Letter to Amy Hagopian.” The other files attached to this document are attachments to that main document

Thanks.

–David Preston, editor
Safe Seattle (fb: safeseattle.org)
The Blog Quixotic (<https://roominate.com>)