

POST-CONFERENCE EVALUATION
The Built Environment, Social Capital and Human Health Conference
May 19, 2003 – Brook Lodge, Augusta Michigan

Stephen R. Pennington
Evaluation Research Collaborative
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Conference Sponsors
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research
Center for Global Change and Earth Observations
Urban Affairs Programs
Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Purpose and Methodology | 1 |
| Quality of Conference..... | 1 |
| To the Future: Indication of Commitment and Research Questions..... | 2 |
| <i>SESSION 1: THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND HUMAN HEALTH</i> | 3 |
| <i>SESSION 2: BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL CAPITAL</i> | 3 |
| <i>SESSION 3: SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HUMAN HEALTH</i> | 4 |
| Conclusion | 5 |
| Appendix A – Evaluation Form..... | 6 |
| Appendix B – Cross-tabs | 8 |
| Appendix C – Responses to Open-Ended Questions..... | 27 |
| Appendix D – URIG Invitation for Proposals | 34 |
| <i>SECTION 1: DESCRIPTION OF WHITE PAPERS</i> | 34 |
| <i>SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF APPLIED PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH GRANTS</i> | 35 |
| <i>SECTION 3: SPONSORS</i> | 36 |
| Appendix E – List of Attendees..... | 38 |

The author wishes to acknowledge Julie Ford, Graduate Assistant to the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research for entering data and a preliminary summary of it.

Purpose and Methodology

The purpose of the conference on the Built Environment, Social Capital and Human Health was to bring Michigan State University (MSU) Faculty from departments throughout the university together with practitioners in order to develop interdisciplinary white papers and research proposals in the areas outlined in the conferences' title. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine participant perceptions of both the conference and subject matter, as well as to gauge interest towards pursuing white papers and research proposals. The basis of the evaluation was a questionnaire requiring both open-(6) and close-ended (16) responses (see Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire). The questionnaire was administered immediately at the conclusion of the conference. Thirty-five of forty-three participants responded, resulting in an 81% response rate.

Quality of Conference

The quality of the registration process, support staff, information provided, program content, and of the keynote speaker and presenters were rated by participants on a five point scale (needs improvement, acceptable, excellent). Responses ranged from 42.9% to 74.3% of the participants indicating the quality was excellent for the categories named above. If the good and excellent responses are summed, then the quality rating ranges from 77.1% to 88.6% (see Appendix B for cross-tabs analyzing study results). A preponderance of the comments support these statistics (see Appendix C for open-ended question responses). Comments such as “excellent in every respect” and “not a concern – good” prevailed. Two types of negative comments that fell into the overall content and conference information categories were that there was a “lack of focus” (mentioned 6 times) and that more “best management examples” and/or “information” and “research related to the topic would have facilitated discussion” (mentioned 3 times).

One hundred percent of the people said they either agreed or strongly agreed that they felt welcome at the conference. Eighty-eight percent of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the conference met their expectations and 97.2% said it was worth their time. Ninety-one point four percent of the people said there was adequate opportunity to network. Ninety-four point three percent of the people said they enjoyed the conference.

Of the participants, 37.3% said they either had expert or advanced levels of knowledge about the built environment with only one of these coming from off campus. Twenty-two point nine percent of participants claimed to possess either expert or advanced knowledge in the area of social capital. And, 22.9% of the participants had either expert or advanced knowledge about human health.

Importantly, from a research standpoint, 94.2% of the participants said that the conference stimulated research ideas they may pursue in the future. A full 100% of the participants said they met at least one potential new colleague whom they would consider collaborating with on future research.

When asked to name the best part of their experience in attending the conference, the answer was overwhelmingly networking (15 of the 31 responses). The working group discussions and the

intellectual interaction were mentioned by 14 people while 2 people referred to the keynote speaker as being the best part of the experience.

There were 24 responses to the open-ended question “Was there anything you found disappointing about the conference?” Ten people said they could find nothing disappointing about the conference or had something positive to add such as “great location.” As was mentioned above, most of the comments concentrated on the lack of focus in the discussion groups. Other comments worthy of note were comments about “time pressure” (2 people) and notions around the how to better involve everyone (2 people).

Respondents were also asked to comment on what could be done to improve the conference. While several participants indicated that nothing should be changed (4 people), the most common response was a request for advance reading and reference material for group leaders and attendees (5 people). The responses will be useful for planning of future conferences (see Appendix C for the complete set of suggestions).

To the Future: Indication of Commitment and Research Questions

This section provides a review of participants’ interest in authoring a white paper. It also summarizes the research questions produced at the conference by the three breakout groups.

Twenty-nine point four percent (ten participants) said they would be interested in being a sole author of a white paper based on the conference theme. Four of these were experts in the built environment, one in social capital, one in human health, and one in the built environment and social capital. Two had intermediate knowledge of human health and one had intermediate knowledge of the built environment and social capital.

Forty-one point two percent (14 participants) said they would co-author a white paper. Four participants were experts in the built environment, one in social capital, four in human health and one was an expert in both the built environment and human health. One person said they had intermediate knowledge in the built environment and social capital, while one person said they had intermediate knowledge in all three areas covered by the conference.

Twenty-nine point four percent either did not respond or did not wish to author a paper. One person did not indicate their level of expertise for the three interest areas and did not respond to the authorship question.

At the conference, participants broke into three groups: (1) Environment and Human Health; (2) Built Environment and Social Capital; and (3) Social Capital and Human Health. They were tasked with developing research questions in each of the respective groups. The intention was to have these questions form a foundation for developing a more in-depth research agenda. The questions developed were:

SESSION 1: THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND HUMAN HEALTH

- 1) What are the characteristics of the built environment that lead to improvement in human health, including mental health?
- 2) What is the relationship between inequities in access to health care and the nature of the built environment?
- 3) How do you influence policy at the local level relative to health (land use, location of services, et cetera)?
- 4) What do people want – both the people who can afford to move out into the suburb, and the people who cannot afford to move out of the inner city? Get out of the whole “we know what is good for you” mindset.
- 5) How do the various systems (culture, education, fuel, food, transportation, land development, environment, et cetera) intersect/interact to impact health? How do the cultural and the physical environments intersect/interact to impact health?
- 6) Are there cultural differences in the definition of a healthy community?
- 7) How do transportation investments in urban and metro environments affect health?
- 8) How do changes in density of development in urban and metro environments affect health?
- 10) How does the process of decentralization in urban and metro environments affect health? At what health variables are we looking?
- 11) What are the mental health externalities of sprawl (depression, suicide, safety, anxiety, aggression, fear, social isolation)?
- 12) What is a good social/cultural model for explaining health outcomes associated with the built environment?
- 13) What is the affect of architectural design and the indoor environment on human health in our urban and metropolitan areas (stairs versus elevators, building beautification, putting the garage in the back of the house)?
- 14) What is the role of institutions in changing urban environments and their affect on health (clubs, community activities, social groups, universities, churches, et cetera)?

SESSION 2: BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

- 1) What is "positive" social capital? What are the "dysfunctional" characteristics of social capital? How can we quantitatively define social capital? What are the ranges of social capital?

- 2) How does the built environment influence positive social capital? Can the built environment both enhance and prevent social capital?
- 3) How has our changing use of the built environment affected social capital?
- 4) What are some best-practices examples of changing the built environment and positively affecting social capital?
- 5) Does traditional neighborhood design (or conservation subdivisions) really positively affect social capital?
- 6) We keep assuming that it is the built environment that drives the changes in social capital. But does social capital drive changes in the built environment?
- 7) How do changes in demographics affect both changes in the built environment and in social capital (and their interplay)?
- 8) What are some comparative case studies we can look at, in terms of different built environment designs and their different effects on social capital? For instance, does different neighborhood design really affect social capital differently?
- 9) What causes a "re-birth" of social capital in neighborhoods?
- 10) How does crisis - such as a community being completely destroyed - play into social capital and community re-design?
- 11) How can we better obtain data to help in our analyses of the built environment and social capital? What data do we in fact need?
- 12) What do people really think about when buying a home? Is it a decision based on social capital? On public policy? Etc?

SESSION 3: SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HUMAN HEALTH

- 1) What indicators of social capital predict health outcomes in urban built environments?
- 2) What models predict successful innovations at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels for improved health (mental and physical)?
- 3) What policies or procedures should be undertaken at the university level in order to sustain the programs that we have discussed today?/What systems reforms are necessary to sustain the interaction of the university with state policymakers to address these issues?
- 4) How do economic and political institutions pose barriers (or what can be done by them to positively impact) the formation of social capital?

- 5) How does urban sprawl fit into social connectedness (or positively impact fragmentation)? How do we incorporate this into our research questions related to transportation, education, urban inner-city decay, prisons, health, and social capital in general?
- 6) How do we balance healthful socio-emotional needs with the needs of entrepreneurs and the business community?

Next Steps

As a follow-up to the conference, the Urban Research Interest Group is seeking proposals in which it will fund two types of products: 1) short white papers of 10-15 pages focused on an important public policy issue in Michigan, and 2) applied policy research grants involving original research which can help inform public policy issues in Michigan.

Both white papers and applied policy research grants will seek to build on discussions at the May 19th Brook Lodge session by helping to link two or more of these elements: 1) built environment 2) social capital 3) human health. The work should have relevance to Michigan policymakers and should deal at least in part with urban areas (see Appendix D for the invitation to submit proposals).

Conclusion

The goals of the conference were to stimulate interdisciplinary research ideas, to provide an opportunity for networking among different interest groups and to act as a catalyst for research in the emerging area of the built environment, social capital and human health. The survey responses together with informal feedback indicate that the conference succeeded in stimulating interest and encouraging lateral thinking by the participants. The list of research questions generated by each discussion group is evidence to this effect. The survey also indicated the conference was successful at providing opportunities for networking and interacting with people the participants would not ordinarily meet. One area where there might have been improvement was that more focus could have been provided in the breakout groups, possibly through the use of illustrative examples.

Determining the success of the conference in terms of it being a catalyst for generating future research is difficult to determine at this early stage. There was a clear indication of commitment to author white papers. It was not as clear that there was a commitment towards applying for applied research grants. This may have occurred because there was not an opportunity on the questionnaire for participants to indicate an interest in applying for this type of funding. As indicated by a few of the feedback comments, the success of the conference in terms of generating research will depend largely on the follow-up by conference organizers.

Appendix A – Evaluation Form

Evaluation Form

The Built Environment, Social Capital and Human Health



We would like to ask you to take a few moments to complete this important survey. This information will allow us to understand your conference experience and will be used to evaluate its overall impact and to improve future conferences.

1. Please rate the following conference components in terms of quality (please select NA for not applicable).

| | Needs Improvement | | Acceptable | | Excellent | NA |
|---|----------------------|---|------------|---|-----------|----|
| a. Registration process | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑨ |
| b. Conference support staff | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑨ |
| c. Conference information | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑨ |
| d. Overall program content | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑨ |
| e. Quality of keynote speaker & presenters. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑨ |

2. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following:

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| a. I felt welcome at the conference. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| b. The conference met my expectations. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| c. The conference was worth my time. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| d. I had adequate opportunity to network. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| e. The conference stimulated research ideas I may pursue in the future. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| f. Overall, I enjoyed the conference. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

3a. Did you meet at least one potential new colleague whom you would consider collaborating with in future research?

Yes No

3b. If you answered "Yes" to 3a, please indicate how many new potential collaborators you met. _____

4. Would you be interested in producing a white paper based on your conference discussions?

Sole Author Co-Author No Thank You

If you marked either Sole Author or Co-Author may we please have your name and the topic area you are interested in writing about: _____

Please Turn Over

5. What was the best part of your experience in attending the conference?

6. Was there anything you found disappointing about the conference?

7. What could have been done to improve the conference?

8. How would you describe your level of knowledge in the three interest areas?

| | No Background | Novice | Intermediate | Advanced | Expert |
|----------------------|------------------|--------|--------------|----------|--------|
| a. Built Environment | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| b. Social Capital | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| c. Human Health | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

Please answer 9a if you're an academic and 9b if you're a practitioner outside the university.

9a. In what area do you currently conduct research and outreach (please be more specific than the categories above)?

9b. In what area do you currently work (please be more specific than the categories above)?

Thank You! Please return this survey to the one of the conference organizing staff upon leaving. If you run out of time during the conference, please mail the form to: **The Evaluation Research Collaborative, 321 Berkey Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1111**

Conducted by the **Evaluation Research Collaborative,**
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Appendix B – Cross-tabs

Cross-tabs

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| 1.a. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 1.b. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 1.c. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 1.d. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 1.e. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 2.a. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 2.b. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 2.c. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 2.d. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 2.e. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 2.f. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 3.a. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 4. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 8.a. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 8.b. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |
| 8.c. * On or Off | 35 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 35 | 100.0% |

1.a. * Registration Process by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 1.a. | Acceptable | Count | 1 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| | | % within 1.a. | 12.5% | 75.0% | 12.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 23.1% | 20.0% | 22.9% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 17.1% | 2.9% | 22.9% |
| Good | Count | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | |
| | % within 1.a. | 14.3% | 57.1% | 28.6% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 15.4% | 40.0% | 20.0% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 11.4% | 5.7% | 20.0% | |
| Excellent | Count | 2 | 16 | 2 | 20 | |
| | % within 1.a. | 10.0% | 80.0% | 10.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 61.5% | 40.0% | 57.1% | |
| | % of Total | 5.7% | 45.7% | 5.7% | 57.1% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 1.a. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.734 ^a | 4 | .785 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.558 | 4 | .816 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .019 | 1 | .891 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

1.b. * Conference Support Staff by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 1.b. | Acceptable | Count | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within 1.b. | 50.0% | 50.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 3.8% | | 5.7% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 2.9% | | 5.7% |
| | Good | Count | | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| | | % within 1.b. | | 85.7% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 23.1% | 20.0% | 20.0% |
| | | % of Total | | 17.1% | 2.9% | 20.0% |
| | Excellent | Count | 3 | 19 | 4 | 26 |
| | | % within 1.b. | 11.5% | 73.1% | 15.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 73.1% | 80.0% | 74.3% |
| | | % of Total | 8.6% | 54.3% | 11.4% | 74.3% |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 1.b. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.999 ^a | 4 | .406 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.904 | 4 | .419 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .567 | 1 | .451 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 7 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .23.

1.c. * Conference Information by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 1.c. | Acceptable | Count | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 |
| | | % within 1.c. | 28.6% | 57.1% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 15.4% | 20.0% | 20.0% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 11.4% | 2.9% | 20.0% |
| | Good | Count | 1 | 7 | | 8 |
| | | % within 1.c. | 12.5% | 87.5% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 26.9% | | 22.9% |
| | Excellent | Count | 1 | 15 | 4 | 20 |
| | | % within 1.c. | 5.0% | 75.0% | 20.0% | 100.0% |
| % within On or Off | | 25.0% | 57.7% | 80.0% | 57.1% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 1.c. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 4.598 ^a | 4 | .331 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.363 | 4 | .252 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.251 | 1 | .134 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

1.d. * Overall Program Content by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|------------|-------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 1.d. | No Response | Count | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within 1.d. | | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | 20.0% | 5.7% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | 2.9% | 5.7% |
| Acceptable | Count | Count | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within 1.d. | 50.0% | 50.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 3.8% | | 5.7% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 2.9% | | 5.7% |
| Good | Count | Count | 2 | 8 | 2 | 12 |
| | | % within 1.d. | 16.7% | 66.7% | 16.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 30.8% | 40.0% | 34.3% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 22.9% | 5.7% | 34.3% |
| Excellent | Count | Count | 1 | 16 | 2 | 19 |
| | | % within 1.d. | 5.3% | 84.2% | 10.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 61.5% | 40.0% | 54.3% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 45.7% | 5.7% | 54.3% |
| Total | Count | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 1.d. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.723 ^a | 6 | .347 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.509 | 6 | .480 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .381 | 1 | .537 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .23.

1.e. * Quality of Keynote Speaker & Presenter by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|-----------|-------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 1.e. | No Response | Count | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| | | % within 1.e. | 50.0% | | 50.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | | 20.0% | 5.7% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | | 2.9% | 5.7% |
| Good | | Count | 3 | 9 | 2 | 14 |
| | | % within 1.e. | 21.4% | 64.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 34.6% | 40.0% | 40.0% |
| | | % of Total | 8.6% | 25.7% | 5.7% | 40.0% |
| Excellent | | Count | | 14 | 1 | 15 |
| | | % within 1.e. | | 93.3% | 6.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 53.8% | 20.0% | 42.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 40.0% | 2.9% | 42.9% |
| NA | | Count | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within 1.e. | | 75.0% | 25.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 11.5% | 20.0% | 11.4% |
| | | % of Total | | 8.6% | 2.9% | 11.4% |
| Total | | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 1.e. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 11.124 ^a | 6 | .085 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 12.670 | 6 | .049 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .821 | 1 | .365 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .23.

2.a. * "I Felt Welcome at the Conference" by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|----------------|--------------------|--------|------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 2.a. Agree | Count | 1 | 9 | 2 | 12 | |
| | % within 2.a. | 8.3% | 75.0% | 16.7% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 34.6% | 40.0% | 34.3% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 25.7% | 5.7% | 34.3% | |
| Strongly Agree | Count | 3 | 17 | 3 | 23 | |
| | % within 2.a. | 13.0% | 73.9% | 13.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 65.4% | 60.0% | 65.7% | |
| | % of Total | 8.6% | 48.6% | 8.6% | 65.7% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 2.a. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | .227 ^a | 2 | .893 |
| Likelihood Ratio | .233 | 2 | .890 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .208 | 1 | .649 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.37.

2.b. * "The Conference Met my Expectations" by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------|------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 2.b. Disagree | Count | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within 2.b. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% | |
| | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% | |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Count | 1 | 2 | | 3 | |
| | % within 2.b. | 33.3% | 66.7% | | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 7.7% | | 8.6% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 5.7% | | 8.6% | |
| Agree | Count | 3 | 13 | 3 | 19 | |
| | % within 2.b. | 15.8% | 68.4% | 15.8% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 50.0% | 60.0% | 54.3% | |
| | % of Total | 8.6% | 37.1% | 8.6% | 54.3% | |
| Strongly Agree | Count | | 10 | 2 | 12 | |
| | % within 2.b. | | 83.3% | 16.7% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | | 38.5% | 40.0% | 34.3% | |
| | % of Total | | 28.6% | 5.7% | 34.3% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 2.b. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 4.043 ^a | 6 | .671 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.619 | 6 | .467 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.688 | 1 | .194 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

2.c. * "The Conference was Worth my Time" by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 2.c. | Neither agree nor disagree | Count | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within 2.c. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% |
| | Agree | Count | 3 | 10 | 2 | 15 |
| | | % within 2.c. | 20.0% | 66.7% | 13.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 38.5% | 40.0% | 42.9% |
| | | % of Total | 8.6% | 28.6% | 5.7% | 42.9% |
| | Strongly Agree | Count | 1 | 15 | 3 | 19 |
| % within 2.c. | | 5.3% | 78.9% | 15.8% | 100.0% | |
| % within On or Off | | 25.0% | 57.7% | 60.0% | 54.3% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 42.9% | 8.6% | 54.3% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 2.c. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.155 ^a | 4 | .707 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.388 | 4 | .665 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .779 | 1 | .378 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 7 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

2.d. * "I had Adequate Opportunity to Network" by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 2.d. | Neither agree nor disagree | Count | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| | | % within 2.d. | 33.3% | 66.7% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 7.7% | | 8.6% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 5.7% | | 8.6% |
| | Agree | Count | 1 | 12 | 3 | 16 |
| | | % within 2.d. | 6.3% | 75.0% | 18.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 46.2% | 60.0% | 45.7% |
| | Strongly Agree | Count | 2 | 12 | 2 | 16 |
| | | % within 2.d. | 12.5% | 75.0% | 12.5% | 100.0% |
| % within On or Off | | 50.0% | 46.2% | 40.0% | 45.7% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 2.d. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.364 ^a | 4 | .669 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.416 | 4 | .660 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .106 | 1 | .745 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 7 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

2.e. * “The Conference Stimulated Research Ideas I May Pursue in the Future” by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 2.e. | No Response | Count | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within 2.e. | | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | | 20.0% | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | | 2.9% | 2.9% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Count | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | % within 2.e. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% | |
| | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% | |
| Agree | Count | 3 | 9 | 1 | 13 | |
| | % within 2.e. | 23.1% | 69.2% | 7.7% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 34.6% | 20.0% | 37.1% | |
| | % of Total | 8.6% | 25.7% | 2.9% | 37.1% | |
| Strongly Agree | Count | 1 | 16 | 3 | 20 | |
| | % within 2.e. | 5.0% | 80.0% | 15.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 61.5% | 60.0% | 57.1% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 45.7% | 8.6% | 57.1% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 2.e. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 9.148 ^a | 6 | .165 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 7.207 | 6 | .302 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .731 | 1 | .393 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

2.f. * "Overall I Enjoyed the Conference" by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 2.f. | No Response | Count | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within 2.f. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Count | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within 2.f. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% |
| Agree | Agree | Count | 1 | 7 | 2 | 10 |
| | | % within 2.f. | 10.0% | 70.0% | 20.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 26.9% | 40.0% | 28.6% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 20.0% | 5.7% | 28.6% |
| Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Count | 3 | 17 | 3 | 23 |
| | | % within 2.f. | 13.0% | 73.9% | 13.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 75.0% | 65.4% | 60.0% | 65.7% |
| | | % of Total | 8.6% | 48.6% | 8.6% | 65.7% |
| Total | Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 2.f. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.041 ^a | 6 | .984 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.512 | 6 | .959 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .033 | 1 | .857 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

3.a. * Met at Least One Potential New Colleague Whom I Would Consider Collaborating With in Future Research by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|----------|--------------------|--------|------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 3.a. Yes | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 3.a. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 | |
| | % within 3.a. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |
| | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | . ^a |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 |

a. No statistics are computed because 3.a. is a constant.

4. * Interest in Producing a White Paper Based on Conference Discussions by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|-------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 4. | No Response | Count | | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % within 4. | | 75.0% | 25.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 11.5% | 20.0% | 11.4% |
| | | % of Total | | 8.6% | 2.9% | 11.4% |
| | Co-Author | Count | 2 | 10 | 2 | 14 |
| | | % within 4. | 14.3% | 71.4% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 38.5% | 40.0% | 40.0% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 28.6% | 5.7% | 40.0% |
| | Sole Author or Co-Author | Count | | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| | | % within 4. | | 80.0% | 20.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 30.8% | 40.0% | 28.6% |
| | | % of Total | | 22.9% | 5.7% | 28.6% |
| | No Thank You | Count | 2 | 5 | | 7 |
| | | % within 4. | 28.6% | 71.4% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 19.2% | | 20.0% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 14.3% | | 20.0% |
| Total | | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 4. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 5.117 ^a | 6 | .529 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 7.089 | 6 | .313 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.613 | 1 | .204 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .46.

8.a. * Level of Knowledge of Built Environment by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|--------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 8.a. | No Background | Count | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | % within 8.a. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 7.7% | | 5.7% |
| | | % of Total | | 5.7% | | 5.7% |
| Novice | | Count | 2 | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| | | % within 8.a. | 18.2% | 63.6% | 18.2% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 26.9% | 40.0% | 31.4% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 20.0% | 5.7% | 31.4% |
| Intermediate | | Count | 1 | 6 | 2 | 9 |
| | | % within 8.a. | 11.1% | 66.7% | 22.2% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 23.1% | 40.0% | 25.7% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 17.1% | 5.7% | 25.7% |
| Advanced | | Count | 1 | 7 | | 8 |
| | | % within 8.a. | 12.5% | 87.5% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 26.9% | | 22.9% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 20.0% | | 22.9% |
| Expert | | Count | | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| | | % within 8.a. | | 80.0% | 20.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 15.4% | 20.0% | 14.3% |
| | | % of Total | | 11.4% | 2.9% | 14.3% |
| Total | | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 8.a. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.931 ^a | 8 | .863 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.994 | 8 | .648 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .068 | 1 | .795 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 12 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .23.

8.b. * Level of Knowledge of Social Capital by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|--------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 8.b. | No Background | Count | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within 8.b. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% |
| Novice | | Count | 1 | 6 | 4 | 11 |
| | | % within 8.b. | 9.1% | 54.5% | 36.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 23.1% | 80.0% | 31.4% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 17.1% | 11.4% | 31.4% |
| Intermediate | | Count | 2 | 12 | 1 | 15 |
| | | % within 8.b. | 13.3% | 80.0% | 6.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 46.2% | 20.0% | 42.9% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 34.3% | 2.9% | 42.9% |
| Advanced | | Count | 1 | 6 | | 7 |
| | | % within 8.b. | 14.3% | 85.7% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 23.1% | | 20.0% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 17.1% | | 20.0% |
| Expert | | Count | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within 8.b. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% |
| Total | | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 8.b. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.971 ^a | 8 | .540 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 7.534 | 8 | .480 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.240 | 1 | .134 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 12 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

8.c. * Level of Knowledge of Human Health by On or Off Campus

Crosstab

| | | | On or Off | | | Total |
|--------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| | | | Don't Know | On Campus | Off Campus | |
| 8.c. | No Background | Count | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | % within 8.c. | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 3.8% | | 2.9% |
| | | % of Total | | 2.9% | | 2.9% |
| Novice | Novice | Count | 1 | 14 | 2 | 17 |
| | | % within 8.c. | 5.9% | 82.4% | 11.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 53.8% | 40.0% | 48.6% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 40.0% | 5.7% | 48.6% |
| Intermediate | Intermediate | Count | 2 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| | | % within 8.c. | 22.2% | 66.7% | 11.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 50.0% | 23.1% | 20.0% | 25.7% |
| | | % of Total | 5.7% | 17.1% | 2.9% | 25.7% |
| Advanced | Advanced | Count | | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| | | % within 8.c. | | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | | 15.4% | 40.0% | 17.1% |
| | | % of Total | | 11.4% | 5.7% | 17.1% |
| Expert | Expert | Count | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | % within 8.c. | 50.0% | 50.0% | | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 25.0% | 3.8% | | 5.7% |
| | | % of Total | 2.9% | 2.9% | | 5.7% |
| Total | Total | Count | 4 | 26 | 5 | 35 |
| | | % within 8.c. | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within On or Off | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of Total | 11.4% | 74.3% | 14.3% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 7.384 ^a | 8 | .496 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.918 | 8 | .545 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .064 | 1 | .800 |
| N of Valid Cases | 35 | | |

a. 13 cells (86.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

Descriptive

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|------|-------------------|
| 1.a. | 35 | 3 | 5 | 4.34 | .838 |
| 1.b. | 35 | 3 | 5 | 4.69 | .583 |
| 1.c. | 35 | 3 | 5 | 4.37 | .808 |
| 1.d. | 35 | 0 | 5 | 4.26 | 1.221 |
| 1.e. | 35 | 0 | 9 | 4.77 | 1.926 |
| 2.a. | 35 | 4 | 5 | 4.66 | .482 |
| 2.b. | 35 | 2 | 5 | 4.20 | .719 |
| 2.c. | 35 | 3 | 5 | 4.51 | .562 |
| 2.d. | 35 | 3 | 5 | 4.37 | .646 |
| 2.e. | 35 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | .948 |
| 2.f. | 35 | 0 | 5 | 4.51 | .951 |
| 3.a. | 35 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | .000 |
| 3.b. | 35 | 0 | 10 | 3.71 | 2.283 |
| 4. | 35 | 0 | 4 | 2.46 | 1.172 |
| 8.a. | 35 | 1 | 5 | 3.09 | 1.173 |
| 8.b. | 35 | 1 | 5 | 2.89 | .867 |
| 8.c. | 35 | 1 | 5 | 2.74 | .980 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 35 | | | | |

Cross-tabs

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|----------|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| EXP * 4. | 34 | 97.1% | 1 | 2.9% | 35 | 100.0% |

EXP * 4. Crosstabulation

| | | | 4. | | | | Total |
|------------------|-------------|--------|-------------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------|-------|
| | | | No Response | Co-Author | Sole Author or Co-Author | No Thank You | |
| EXP BE | Count | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 11 | |
| | % within 4. | 33.3% | 28.6% | 40.0% | 28.6% | 32.4% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 11.8% | 11.8% | 5.9% | 32.4% | |
| SC | Count | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | |
| | % within 4. | 33.3% | 7.1% | 10.0% | 28.6% | 14.7% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 5.9% | 14.7% | |
| HH | Count | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | |
| | % within 4. | .0% | 28.6% | 10.0% | 28.6% | 20.6% | |
| | % of Total | .0% | 11.8% | 2.9% | 5.9% | 20.6% | |
| BE & SC | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| | % within 4. | .0% | 7.1% | 10.0% | .0% | 5.9% | |
| | % of Total | .0% | 2.9% | 2.9% | .0% | 5.9% | |
| SC & HH | Count | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| | % within 4. | 33.3% | .0% | .0% | .0% | 2.9% | |
| | % of Total | 2.9% | .0% | .0% | .0% | 2.9% | |
| INT BE | Count | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| | % within 4. | .0% | 14.3% | .0% | .0% | 5.9% | |
| | % of Total | .0% | 5.9% | .0% | .0% | 5.9% | |
| INT HH | Count | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | |
| | % within 4. | .0% | .0% | 20.0% | .0% | 5.9% | |
| | % of Total | .0% | .0% | 5.9% | .0% | 5.9% | |
| INT BE & SC | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | |
| | % within 4. | .0% | 7.1% | 10.0% | 14.3% | 8.8% | |
| | % of Total | .0% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 8.8% | |
| INT BE & SC & HH | Count | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| | % within 4. | .0% | 7.1% | .0% | .0% | 2.9% | |
| | % of Total | .0% | 2.9% | .0% | .0% | 2.9% | |
| Total | Count | 3 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 34 | |
| | % within 4. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % of Total | 8.8% | 41.2% | 29.4% | 20.6% | 100.0% | |

Appendix C – Responses to Open-Ended Questions

QUESTION 4: WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN PRODUCING A WHITE PAPER BASED ON YOUR CONFERENCE DISCUSSION?

| Name | Topic Area |
|-------------------------|--|
| Sheila Taylor | Minority Health and Public Policy -- How to Make a Difference |
| Bob von Bernuth | Built Environment Characteristics |
| Jim Pivarnik | Built environment and physical activity behaviors |
| Jodi Holtrop | What works in influencing policy/ decision-makers in this area? How built environment affects physical activity. Public perception of desire for the built environment -- what do people want? |
| Lindon Robison | Connection between provision of socio-emotional goods and human health. |
| Larry Libby | Social capital is embedded in comprehensive land use planning -- compare communities with and without comprehensive planning. |
| Rex Lamore | Building communities that increase social capital. Or co-author with someone -- effect of sprawl in social capital. |
| Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore | Local policies impacting built environment and human health and strategies for influencing local decision making (e.g. process of decentralization of governance zoning/land use. Co-Author with Jodi Holtrop, Sissi Foster, Igor Vojnovich -- Intersection between land use issues and physical activity. |
| Igor Vojnovic | What are the specific characteristics of the built environment that lead to improvements in human health? |
| Annalie Campos | Urban sprawl and its impacts upon communities. |
| Terry Link | Interested in collaborating on white paper on indicators for built environment and social capital. |
| Mohammad Najafi | Effects of infrastructure on human health. Use of GIS and GPS in improving urban services. |
| Risa Wilkerson | Transportation systems and physical activity. |
| Bob Glandon. | |
| Jack Rozdilsky | Social capital and built environment. |
| Jehoon Lee | |
| Terrie Wehrwein | Issues from the Health and Built Environment area. We had so many questions not really sure what would be moving along and the best fit. Issues around density and health and transportation and health would be of great interest. |
| John Warbach | Institutional impacts on activity/health. |
| Hi Fitzgerald | |
| Sissi Foster | Policies that affect the built environment that result in an effect on health (How do you influence policy?). Characteristics of a healthy community. Social Capital and Built Environment. |

QUESTION 5: WHAT WAS THE BEST PART OF YOUR EXPERIENCE IN ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE?

Awareness of new possibilities. New approaches.

Networking. Learned different points of view on similar topics.

These forums, white papers, overall process is a great thing! I hope you keep it up. Networking. Learned a lot from others with different expertise from mine. Dr. Dannenberg was very good too.

Clearly the working group discussions.

Networking. Thinking past my desk.

Intellectual stimulation -- good ideas.

Networking.

Networking/opportunity to hear and think about different perspectives on the issues.

Interaction with human health experts. Getting input on the considerations involved in assessing human health impacts was rather useful.

Different perspectives about social capital.

Meeting people and discussing urban health issues.

Networking informally with folks I don't normally work with.

Learning about the built environment from key note; interest group discussion.

Network. Linking health/social capital/built environment -- conceptually and practically.

Came up with new research areas.

Networking with researchers.

Networking. Hearing different perspectives.

Small group discussion.

Interact with other academic discipline areas.

Viewing research questions from multiple perspectives.

Interaction -- formal and informal -- with many folks of like mind who I don't positively interact with.

Networking. Opportunity to interact/meet some like-minded folks (i.e. increase social capital!).

Opportunity to discuss issues and research ideas.

Discussion of ideas from a diverse group of researchers.

Meeting persons from very varied backgrounds.

Being able to measure the level of understanding of other professionals in this topic area(s).

Networking with people I've wanted to meet.

A variety of new ideas and linkages.

Focus group discussions.

Seeing colleagues, interacting informally.

Brainstorming on ideas.

Meeting other researchers and learning about new research ideas.

QUESTION 6: WAS THERE ANYTHING YOU FOUND DISAPPOINTING ABOUT THE CONFERENCE?

No.

Mostly pretty good.

No. Great. Great location!

Follow-up will tell.

Keynote didn't really add much information -- but was a good presentation.

Topics were so broad it was at times hard to focus the small group discussions.

Time pressure.

Not really.

Discussion groups during interest group sometimes lacked focus.

Limited to one discussion area.

None.

No. Great. Great location!

No.

None.

Initially, my work group had difficulty focusing on the task at hand, however, after we started listing our "discussion" points on a chart, the process accelerated.

I would have liked to attend Sunday as well (personal scheduling prevented) -- my experience of the Monday portion was quite satisfying.

The discussion got bogged down somewhat on defining social capital -- A newer, more "amorphous" construct.

It seems like more thought could have been put into how best to use the policy people. For example, maybe breaking them out into their own group to report back on research needs. They were a bit quiet in our group.

No.

Limited number of people from health backgrounds participating. Would have liked more emphasis on Detroit rather than Lansing as urban.

People were not as far along in their understanding of the topics as I expected.

Small group discussions -- lack of focus, although a very interesting discussion.

Not enough time -- I would have liked one more day!

I was pleased with this conference.

QUESTION 7: WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE TO IMPROVE THE CONFERENCE?

A "bit" more focus.

Group leaders should be given some resources before hand to be prepared with background work to lead the discussion.

Not sure. Would like follow-up on what papers result -- how questions are narrowed down.

Perhaps sending out reading material to prepare participants for discussion.

Depends on follow-up.

Not a concern -- good!

Turn out lights when not in use. Car-pooling next time or mass transit. Use of duplex printing on conference handouts.

Small interest groups.

Thought the presenters needed to provide better context for conference questions. We spent most of session on definitions and basic concepts.

Excellent in every respect.

Bring in representatives of development, auto industry, "the other ride."

None.

More "Best Practices" examples.

Perhaps if we had all read key papers related to this topic prior that would have facilitated discussion.

Reference #6. Maybe also more information about research areas/interest of participants.

No.

Concepts were very broad. We seemed to have difficulty getting to specific areas to study.

Perhaps a primer session. However, it may be that this just has to evolve farther over time -- and the lit reviews and research will help.

Develop a systems diagram!

Researcher as keynoter. Having workshop leaders pre-define some possible research areas.

Use sticky back poster paper so it is easy to put up. Have all eat in the same room so announcements can be heard by all.

More case study presentation and actual research findings.

QUESTION 9A (ACADEMIC): IN WHAT AREA DO YOU CURRENTLY CONDUCT RESEARCH AND OUTREACH?

Air and water quality issues.

Human health

Built environment -- Housing, construction project management, interaction between community and social aspects and technological aspects of the built environment. Housing -- Affordable, urban, factory build.

Health behavior change -- strategies for encouraging healthy behaviors -- especially as it relates to primary care practice and ways to support that.

I research social capital related issues.

Land use policy.

Housing, community development, economic development.

Local governance issues linked to regional governance (fiscal regionalism) -- policy impacts and influencing policy.

The economics of the built environment. Environmental impacts of the built environment.

Sense of community in Lansing neighborhoods.

Sustainability indicators.

Mental health of minority communities.

Underground infrastructure and urban planning.

Urban neighborhood health.

Community and economic development.

Extension/regional planning.

How to adapt -- reinventing government work into developing countries.

Research focus is brownfield issues in urban areas.

Community development, organizational change, mental health.

Determinants of social discount rates. Land use. Local economic development policy.

Research on the neighborhood effects of concentrated poverty and concentrated race or health and other social outcomes.

Education/Role development for nurses.

Etiology of alcoholism and psychopathology. Community and university partnership models. Prevention programs for 0-5 year olds.

Citizen participation -- role of local government decision-making. Mixed-income neighborhoods -- current trends. Outreach in neighborhood development in Michigan's distressed cities.

Environmental justice, sustainability, urban design, GIS.

I am actively doing research on organizational social capital. Have a big data set on it. Other research interests are knowledge-driven work.

QUESTION 9B (PRACTITIONER OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY): IN WHAT AREA DO YOU CURRENTLY WORK?

Health policy (i.e. health disparities)

Community Level.

Michigan rank in the knowledge economy. Building resident leadership in public housing.

Increasing physical activity levels among youth through adults particularly through improved policies and infrastructure related to walking and biking.

Ingham County Health Dept. -- including land use and human health assessment (current status, major problems).

Community planning -- built environment -- institutional involvement in the patterns of development on the land.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Overall, good gathering -- thanks

Willing to participate as a partner in a NIH or NSF proposal. Bob Glandon.

Unrelated comment -- while the food was great, there is a disconnect between discussions of health and such high fat options.

Appendix D – URIG Invitation for Proposals

MSU faculty are encouraged to submit proposals to the Urban Research Interest Group (URIG) for funding of two types of products: 1) short white papers of 10-15 pages focused on an important public policy issue in Michigan, and 2) applied public policy research grants involving original research which can help inform public policy issues in Michigan. Both should build on discussions at URIG's recent Built Environment: Social Capital and Human Health Conference. They should have relevance to Michigan policymakers and should deal at least in part with urban areas. Researchers may want to formulate their proposals around key research questions from the conference breakout sessions. More information about how to submit a proposal is provided below.

SECTION 1: DESCRIPTION OF WHITE PAPERS

White papers will explore a timely public policy issue linking some aspect of the built environment, social connectedness and human health. Length of the papers should be 10-15 pages excluding any charts, graphs, appendices or references.

Timeline

June 16, 2003 - Indicate interest in authoring a white paper.

July 15 - Proposals are due.

July 21- Response to proposals forwarded.

October 15 - White paper due by closing.

November 1 - Paper reviewed and returned to authors with suggestions.

December 15 - Final paper is due by closing.

January 28, 2004 - Public forum highlighting urban issues and several white papers.

White Paper Funding Proposals

Sponsors expect to fund six to eight white papers in the amount of \$2000.00 per white paper. Printing of the individual white papers is planned for distribution to policymakers and field practitioners, as well as the campus audience. White papers will be posted on the web and forwarded to interested news media.

White paper proposals must include at least one lead author who is MSU Faculty and may include additional authors on or off campus including non-academic practitioners on the project.

Content

Papers should 1) highlight the problem to Michigan, 2) describe current Michigan policy, 3) summarize relevant research that evaluates or informs the problem and possible policy solutions, 4) describe what other states are doing in the area and 5) outline possible policy options for Michigan. Researchers may want to formulate their proposals around key research questions that were raised at the recent conference. Those questions are provided below. Proposals should include an outline for the completed white paper and should briefly inform on each of the numbered items listed above. Note that Michigan related data, mostly public opinion on important policy issues, is available for your use through [Data on Demand](#). New data sets may be created through the [State of the State Survey](#).

Format

The white paper proposal will be no more than five pages in length with 1.5 line spacing in Arial Font, size 10. This page limit does not include references or charts and graphs. If you plan to submit information in chart or graph form, the use of Microsoft Excel is the preferred format for future printing and web posting. Please number all points of reference and place them at the end of the document in the style set by the Associated Press (AP Style). Examples of references can be accessed through the IPPSR website posting of previously published [Urban](#) and [Health Policy](#) papers.

Submit Proposals Electronically

Proposals for white papers are due by closing on June 30, 2003. Please forward proposals to the following address (electronic version in Microsoft Word format is preferred): URIG Proposals, Attn: AnnMarie Schneider, 321 Berkey Hall, FAX: (517) 432-1544, Email: ippsr-action@ssc.msu.edu.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF APPLIED PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH GRANTS

Michigan Applied Public Policy Research (MAPPR) grants will be awarded to teams of researchers who will conduct original research related to a timely public policy issue linking some aspect of the built environment, social connectedness and human health. The research findings should speak to issues in Michigan. While the immediate product of these grants will be a 20-30 page paper, it is also hoped that this paper will serve as the basis for a proposal for external funding.

One resource that is available for groups seeking external funding is the scientific research agenda entitled *The Impact of Community Design and Land Use Choices on Public Health*, that was discussed by conference keynote speaker Andrew Dannenberg. To receive a copy of this paper, email a request to ippsr-action@ssc.msu.edu.

Timeline

July 15, 2003 - Indicate interest in authoring an applied policy paper.

August 15 - Proposal for funding is due.

August 29 - Response to proposal is forwarded.

April 15, 2004 - Draft one of research paper is due.

April 29 - Paper reviewed and returned to authors with suggestions.

May 15 - Final paper is due by closing.

Applied Public Policy Research Grant Proposals

Sponsors expect to fund two or three applied policy grants in the amount of \$20,000 per grant. Printing of the report from these grants is planned for distribution to policymakers and field practitioners, as well as the campus audience. Reports will be posted on the web and forwarded to interested news media.

Proposals must include at least one lead author who is an MSU faculty member and may include additional authors on or off campus including non-academic practitioners on the project. The expectation is that there will be at least two researchers, representing different disciplines, on each grant.

Content

Proposals should present an outline for the grant to include 1) description of the problem to be addressed and its importance 2) review of relevant research 3) research questions and research design 4) timetable 5) budget. Researchers may want to formulate their proposals around key research questions that were raised at the recent conference. Those questions are provided below. Note that Michigan related data, mostly public opinion on important policy issues, is available for your use through [Data on Demand](#). New data sets may be created through the [State of the State Survey](#).

Format

The MAPPR proposals should be no more than ten pages in length with 1.5 line spacing in Arial Font, size 10. This page limit does not include references or charts and graphs. If you plan to submit information in chart or graph form, the use of EXCEL is the preferred format for future printing and web posting. Please number all points of reference and place them at the end of the document in the style set by the Associated Press (AP Style). Examples of references can be accessed through the IPPSR website posting of a recently published Michigan Applied Public Policy Research paper entitled [Evaluating the Administration of Workers' Compensation and its Relationship to Program Outcomes](#) (.pdf*).

Submit Proposals Electronically

Proposals for applied policy grants are due by closing on August 15, 2003. Please forward proposals to the following address (electronic version in Microsoft Word format is preferred): URIG Proposals, Attn: AnnMarie Schneider, 321 Berkey Hall, FAX: (517) 432-1544, Email: ippsr-action@ssc.msu.edu.

SECTION 3: SPONSORS

The [Urban Research Interest Group](#) (URIG) is a research initiative sponsored by Michigan State University's Urban Affairs Programs, Center for Global Change and Earth Observations, the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research and the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. More information on each of these groups is provided below.

Urban Affairs Programs

Dozier W. Thornton, Acting Dean

Urban Affairs Programs analyzes conditions, designs policies, and seeks programmatic solutions for problems related to racial, social, economic, and political inequality. UAP's goal is to enhance the quality of urban life, to facilitate access to opportunities, and to ameliorate unfavorable conditions leading to inequalities among urban residents. To achieve this mission, Urban Affairs Programs conducts research that provides the basis of the unit's interdepartmental graduate programs and its outreach efforts. UAP's teaching and outreach activities, in turn, generate ideas for problem-solving research.

Center for Global Change and Earth Observations

David L. Skole, Director

The Center for Global Change and Earth Observations (CGCEO) is an interdisciplinary research unit administered by the College of Social Science in collaboration with the College of Natural Science, the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Michigan Agricultural Research Station. Faculty from across the university participate in research focused on the study of global environmental change using geospatial information technologies and earth observation satellites to measure, analyze and predict the human and physical processes of global environmental change. The Center strives to strengthen interdisciplinary approaches for understanding global change at all scales, from the regional to the global, using the tools of the social and physical sciences.

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Carol S. Weissert, Director

The Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR) is the nonpartisan public policy network at Michigan State University. Our staff is dedicated to connecting legislators, scholars, and practitioners through applied research, policy forums, and political leadership instruction. IPPSR applies research to pressing public policy issues and builds problem-solving relationships between the academic and policymaker communities. To this end the Institute promotes and conducts research on issues of public policy, provides survey research services, produces public policy education and training programs, and initiates discussion of society's most pressing needs among diverse audiences.

Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Robert J. Huggett, Vice President

The Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (OVPRGS) supports the scholarly activity that is fundamental to the mission of Michigan State University. The office provides seed funding for new research projects, fosters faculty's efforts to secure external funding, and supports major research facilities and instruments. It is charged with promoting safe and secure research locations and practices and assuring compliance with regulations that govern research.

For more information contact Carol S. Weissert, PhD, Professor of Political Science and Director, Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR) at 517-355-6672 or weissert@msu.edu or contact AnnMarie Schneider, IPPSR Director of Program Development at (517) 355-6672 or annmarie@msu.edu.

Appendix E – List of Attendees

| First Name | MI | Last Name | Organization | Division |
|------------|---------|------------------|--|--|
| Laura | | Appel | Michigan Health and Hospital Association | Senior Director, Legislative Policy |
| Jon | | Bartholic | MSU | Water Research Institute |
| Amy | J. | Baumer | MSU | Institute for Public Policy and Social Research |
| Janet | L. | Bokemeier | MSU | Sociology Department |
| Annalie | L. | Campos | MSU | Geography Doctoral Student |
| Greg | | Cline | Michigan Public Health Institute | |
| Israel | F. | Cuellar | MSU | Julian Samora Research Institute |
| Andrew | L. | Dannenberg | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | Associate Director for Science, Division of Emergency and Environmental Health Services National Center for Environmental Health Geography and Urban Affairs |
| Joe | T. | Darden | MSU | Geography and Urban Affairs |
| Hiram | E. | Fitzgerald | MSU | University Outreach |
| Julie | Lynn | Ford | MSU | Institute for Public Policy and Social Research |
| Sissi | P. | Foster | MSU | Landscape Architecture |
| Stuart | | Gage | MSU | Entomology |
| Robert | P. | Glandon | Ingham County Health Department | Planning and Special Services |
| F. Robert | | Godbold | Ingham Director of Environmental Health | |
| LeRoy | | Harvey | Ingham County | Michigan State University Extension |
| Gail | Gunst | Heffner | MSU | Resource Development |
| Jodi | Summers | Holtrop | MSU | Family Practice |
| Cynthia | | Jackson-Elmoore | MSU | Urban Affairs Program |
| Rex | L. | LaMore | MSU | CEDP, Urban Affairs Center |
| JeHoon | | Lee | MSU | Global Studies Initiatives |
| Larry | | Libby | MSU | CGCEO |
| Terry | P. | Link | MSU | Office of Campus Sustainability |
| Scott | T. | Loveridge | MSU | Agricultural Economics |
| Brian | M. | McGrain | MSU | Institute for Public Policy and Social Research |
| John | E. | Melcher | MSU | Urban Affairs/Center for Economic Development |
| Joseph | P. | Messina | MSU | Geography |
| Mohammad | | Najafi | MSU | Construction Management Program |
| Stephen | R. | Pennington | MSU | Institute for Public Policy and Social Research |
| James | M. | Pivarnik | MSU | Kinesiology |
| Sobha | | Ramanand | MSU | Urban Affairs Programs |
| Lindon | J. | Robison | MSU | Agricultural Economics |
| Joan | B. | Rose | MSU | Department of Fisheries and Wildlife |
| George | T. | Rowan | MSU | Department of Resource Development |
| Jack | Lewis | Rozdilsky | MSUE | Tri-county Regional Planning |
| AnnMarie | | Schneider | MSU | Institute for Public Policy and Social Research |
| John | H. | Schweitzer | MSU | Urban Affairs Program |
| David | L. | Skole | MSU | Department of Geography |
| Eric | J. | Strauss | MSU | Geography, Urban Planning |
| Faron | | Supanich-Goldner | MSU | Center for Economic Development |

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|------------------------|---|---|
| Matt Sheila | | Syal Taylor | MSU Michigan Legislative Service Bureau | Construction Management Program |
| June Dozier | M. | Thomas Thornton | MSU MSU | Urban and Regional Planning Urban Affairs |
| Ellen | M. | Velie | MSU | Epidemiology |
| Igor | Z. | Vojnovich | MSU | Geography |
| Robert John | D. | von Bernuth Warbach | MSU Planning and Zoning Center, Inc. | Construction Management Program |
| Teresa | A. | Wehrwein | MSU | College of Nursing |
| Carol | S. | Weissert | MSU | Institute for Public Policy and Social Research |
| Risa | | Wilkerson | Michigan Fitness Foundation | |