REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND URBANIZATION

SEISMIC RESILIENCE AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECT (SREEBP)

DESSUP 01 SUB-PROJECTS STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MEETINGS SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULT REPORT

June 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bar Chart List

Table List

Abbreviations

ESS	Environmental and Social Standards
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
SREEPB	Seismic Resilience Enegy Efficiency Public Buildings

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The General Directorate of Construction Affairs of the Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change received a loan from the World Bank for the costs of the Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Project. The project loan will support earthquake and disaster resilience and energy efficiency improvements in public buildings through retrofitting and repair or demolition and reconstruction. The proposed Project Development Objective is to improve disaster resilience and energy efficiency in public buildings and to strengthen the policy framework and institutional capacity for the development, financing and implementation of resilient and sustainable public buildings in Turkey.

In World Bank investments, environmental and social management plans are prepared to identify the environmental and social risks and impacts of sub-projects and to mitigate/prevent these risks. These plans are shared with stakeholders in meetings held within the scope of stakeholder engagement standard (ESS 10), one of the environmental and social requirements of the World Bank.

The data of the satisfaction surveys conducted at the end of the stakeholder participation meetings held in 11 different campuses/buildings affiliated to Kocaeli Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Rectorate, Istanbul Technical University and Marmara University within the scope of SREEPB Project DESSUP 01 were analyzed by the Project Implementation Unit and a Final Report was prepared.

As a result of the survey evaluations; It is pleasing that the satisfaction rates regarding the meeting presentation contents, the adequacy of the answers to the questions and the techniques used are high and that the performance targets of the Project are mainly achieved.

Önder YURDAKUL

Project Coordinator

INTRODUCTION

Within the scope of the Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Project DESSUP-01, a survey was conducted in order to determine the satisfaction of the building users regarding the stakeholder participation. Survey data of 167 participants were entered into “SPSS Statistics 25 Program”. The survey was applied face-to-face between 20.09.2023-29.04.2024 to the beneficiaries and users of student dormitories affiliated to universities and Credit Dormitories Institution in Kocaeli and Istanbul provinces.

In the Pre-retrofitting Awareness Survey Report, frequency bar charts for all questions were created and evaluated, and these were transferred to the report in the form of a “Bar Table” with percentage calculation. Within the scope of the study, the relationship between the dependent variables of gender and institution/campus name and the data of all questions asked to the participants were examined..

The first section of the report discusses the methodology used during the survey (data collection and analysis process); the second section includes bar charts and interpretations based on frequency and cross tabulations.

1. METHODOLOGY

This survey aims to measure the satisfaction of the participants in the Stakeholder Participation Meetings held at 11 campuses for the Environmental and Social Management Plans prepared within the scope of the Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Project.

1.1.Data Collection and Analysis

This survey was conducted face-to-face with the users who attended the Stakeholder Engagement Meetings in the buildings where retrofitting and energy efficiency works will be carried out within the scope of SREEPB DESSUP-01 Subproject (See Annex -1 for survey questions).

This survey was conducted between September 2023 and April 2024 at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Rectorate, Marmara University, Istanbul Technical University in Istanbul province; and Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory and Kandıra Student Dormitory in Kocaeli province. The data of 167 participants who participated in the survey were entered into the "SPSS Statistics 25" program and data analysis was conducted. In the questionnaire, a total of 7 closed-ended questions and 1 open-ended question were asked to the participants. During the data analysis, firstly, bar charts showing the frequency distribution of each question were created. Subsequently, gender and institution name variables were determined as dependent variables and the relationship between these two dependent variables and each question posed to the participants was examined. In order to make the document reader-friendly, bar charts are included in the document, frequency tables are given in Annex-2, cross tabulations for the dependent variable of institution/campus name are given in Annex-3 and cross tabulations for the dependent variable of gender are given in Annex-4.

2. FINDINGS

In the Stakeholder Participation Meeting Satisfaction Survey Report, frequency tables were created and interpreted for all questions and these were shown in the report as 7 separate "Bar Charts" together with percentage calculations. Within the scope of the study, a total of 12 bar graphics were created with the dependent variables of gender and institution (campus) name. Cross tabulations of the bar charts are given in Annex 2.

2.1.Bar Charts for Frequency Data

Bar Chart 1. Institution (Campus) Name



A total of 167 people participated in the survey. Of the respondents, 18% were from Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory, 15.6% from Kandıra Student Dormitory, 11.4% from Boğaziçi Kilyos Campus, 11.4% from Istanbul University CerrahpaşaBüyükçekmece Campus (Girls' Dormitory), 8.4% from Marmara University Göztepe Campus, 7.8% from Boğaziçi University Square Block, 7. 8% from Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus, 6.6% from Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building), 6.6% from Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus, 3.6% from Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) and 3% from Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (2nd Stage Faculties).

Bar Chart 2. Gender Distrubition



61.7% of the participants were male and 34.1% were female. 4.2% of the participants stated that they did not want to specify their gender.

Bar Chart 3. Providing Adequate Information on Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Renovation Works at the Meeting



84.4% of the participants stated that sufficient information about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building was provided during the meeting,

while 13.8% stated that sufficient information was not provided (1.8% of the participants did not answer this question).

Bar Chart 4. Adequate Disclosure of Information on Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Effects of the Project and Measures to be Taken



90.4% of the participants stated that they were provided with sufficient information on the potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety (OHS) risks/impacts of the Project during the meeting, while 8.4% stated that they were not provided with sufficient information (1.2% of the participants did not answer this question).

Bar Chart 5. Timely Notification of the Place and Time of the Meeting



94% of the participants stated that they were informed in a timely manner about the time and place of the stakeholder engagement meeting, while 6% stated that they were not informed in a timely manner.

Bar Chart 6. Adequacy of Responses to Questions Asked During the Meeting



88.6% of the respondents stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were adequate, while 7.2% stated that these answers were inadequate. 1.8% of the respondents stated that no questions were asked during the meeting.

Bar Chart 7. Satisfaction with the Performance of the Person(s) Making the Presentation



85% of the participants were satisfied with the performance of the presenters during the meetings, while 13.8% were not satisfied. 1 person (0.6%) stated that they were partially satisfied with their presentation performance.

2.2. Findings Related to the Dependent Variable of Institution (Campus) Name

In this section, the relationship between the dependent variable of the name of the institution (campus) and each question asked to the participants in the survey is analyzed. Cross tabulations of the bar charts are given in Annex 3.

Bar Chart 8. The Relationship Between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and the Sufficiency of the Information Provided on Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Performed in the Building during the Meeting



The relationship between the institution (campus) in which the participants were involved in the study and the adequacy of the information provided about the structural repair and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building is given below (2 people in the sample did not answer the question):

- More than half (about 58%) of the respondents at Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus stated that there was an enough response, while about 37% stated that there was not an enough response (about 5% of the respondents did not answer the question).

- Approximately 73% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus stated that there was an sufficient response, while about 27% stated that there was not sufficient response.
- 92.3% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Square Block stated that there was an adequate response (7.7% of the participants did not answer the question).
- About 82% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus stated that there was an sufficient response, while about 18% stated that there was not a sufficient response.
- Around 87% of the participants in Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory stated that there was an sufficient response, while 13% stated that there was not a sufficient response.
- Approximately 92% of the participants in Kandıra Student Dormitory stated that there was an adequate response, while 8% stated that there was not an adequate response.
- All (100%) of the participants at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) stated that there was an sufficient response.
- In Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus Phase 2 (Faculties), 80% of the participants stated that there was an enough response (20% of the participants did not answer the question).
- Approximately 95% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus 15 Temmuz Şehitleri Girls' Dormitory stated that there was an adequate response, while about 5% stated that there was no satisfactory response.
- 69.2% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus stated that there was an sufficient response, while 30.8% stated that there was not a sufficient response.
- All (100%) of the participants of Marmara University Göztepe Campus stated that a satisfactory response was given.

Bar Chart 9. The Relationship between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and Providing Sufficient Information on the Measures to be Taken Regarding the Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Effects of the Project



- 47.4% of the respondents at Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus stated that sufficient information was provided on the environmental, social and OHS risks/impacts of the project, while 42.1% stated that sufficient information was not provided (10.5% of the respondents did not answer the question).
- Approximately 91% of the respondents at Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus stated that satisfactory information was provided on the environmental, social and OHS risks/impacts of the project, while around 9% stated that satisfactory information was not provided.
- All (100%) of the participants at Boğaziçi University Square Block stated that there was an sufficient response.
- All (100%) of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus stated that an sufficient response was provided.
- In Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory, 93.3% of the participants stated that sufficient information was provided on the environmental, social and OHS risks/impacts of the project, while 6.7% stated that sufficient information was not provided.
- About 96% of the participants in Kandıra Student Dormitory stated that they were provided with sufficient information on the environmental, social and OHS

risks/impacts of the project, while approximately 4% stated that they were not provided with sufficient information.

- All (100%) of the participants at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) stated that there was an sufficient information.
- All (100%) of the participants in Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus Phase 2 (Faculties) stated that a satisfactory information was given.
- All of the participants (100%) at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus 15 Temmuz Şehitleri Girls' Dormitory stated that sufficient information was provided.
- 84.6% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus stated that they were provided with sufficient information on the environmental, social and OHS risks/impacts of the project, while approximately 15.4% stated that they were not provided with sufficient information.
- All (100%) of the participants at Marmara University Göztepe Campus stated that satisfactory information was provided.

Bar Chart 10. The Relationship Between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and Timely Information About the Place, Time and Content of the Meeting



- Approximately three-quarters (73.7%) of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus stated that they were informed about the meeting place, time and

content in a timely manner, while nearly one-quarter (26.3%) stated that they were not informed about the meeting place, time and content in a timely manner.

- All of the participants (100%) at Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting in a timely manner.
- All participants (100%) at Boğaziçi University Square Block stated that they were informed in a timely manner about the place, time and content of the meeting.
- All (100%) of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus stated that they were informed in a timely manner about the location, time and content of the meeting.
- Approximately 97% of the participants in Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time, while about 3% stated that they were not informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time.
- 88.5% of the participants in Kandıra Student Dormitory stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time, while 11.5% stated that they were not informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time.
- All respondents (100%) at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) stated that they were informed about the location, time and content of the meeting in a timely manner.
- All participants (100%) at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus Phase 2 (Faculties) stated that they were informed in a timely manner about the place, time and content of the meeting.
- Approximately 95% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus 15 Temmuz Şehitleri Girls' Dormitory stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time, while about 5% stated that they were not informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time.
- All of the participants (100%) at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time.
- All participants (100%) at Marmara University Göztepe Campus stated that they were informed about the location, time and content of the meeting in a timely manner.

Bar Chart 11. The Relationship between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and Satisfaction with the Sufficiency of Answers to Questions Asked During the Meeting



- 47.4% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient, while 31.6% stated that the answers given were insufficient (21.1% of the participants did not answer the question).
- About 91% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were satisfactory (about 9% of the participants did not answer the question).
- All (100%) of the participants at Boğaziçi University Square Block stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were adequate.
- Approximately 91% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient, while approximately 9% stated that the answers given were insufficient.
- About 97% of the participants at Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were satisfactory, while approximately 3% stated that the answers given were unsatisfactory.
- Approximately 92% of the participants in Kandıra Student Dormitory stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient, while around 8% stated that no questions were asked during the meeting.

- All participants (100%) at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient.
- All (100%) of the participants at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus 2nd Stage (Faculties) stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were satisfactory.
- About 95% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus July 15 Martyrs Girls' Dormitory stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient, while about 5% stated that the answers given were insufficient.
- Approximately 77% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were adequate, while approximately 23% stated that the answers given were inadequate.
- All participants (100%) at Marmara Univesrity Göztepe Campus stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient.

Bar Chart 12. The Relationship between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and Satisfaction with the Presentation Performance of the Presenter(s)



- Approximately 37% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), 53%

were not satisfied, and 1 person (approximately 5%) was partially satisfied (1 person did not answer the question).

- 63.6% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), while 36.4% were not satisfied.
- 92.3% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Square Block stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), while 7.7% were not satisfied.
- All (100%) of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s).
- 93.3% of the participants at Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), while 6.7% were not satisfied.
- In Kandıra Student Dormitory, 92.3% of the participants were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), while 7.7% were not satisfied.
- All participants (100%) at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s).
- All (100%) of the participants at Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus 2nd Stage (Faculties) stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s).
- Approximately 84% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus July 15 Martyrs Girls' Dormitory were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), while about 16% were not satisfied.
- Approximately 92% of the participants at Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s), while around 8% were not satisfied.
- All of the participants (100%) at Marmara University Göztepe Campus stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s).

2.3. Findings on Gender-related Dependent Variable

In this section, the relationship between the gender-related dependent variable and each question asked to the participants in the survey is analyzed. Cross tabulations of the bar charts are presented in Annex-4.

Bar Chart 13. The Relationship between Gender and Institution (Campus) Name



The relationship between the gender of the participants and the institution (campus) in which they were involved in the study is presented below:

- In Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus, 26.3% of the participants were women and 68.4% were men (1 participant did not want to share their gender).
- Approximately 18% of the participants at Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus were female and 81% were male.
- In Boğaziçi University Square Block, 7.7% of the participants were women and 76.9% were men (2 participants did not want to specify their gender).
- In Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus, 18.2% of the participants were women and 72.7% were men (1 participant did not want to specify their gender).
- Approximately 37% of the participants in Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory were female and 60% were male (1 participant did not want to state their gender).
- About 69% of the participants in Kandıra Student Dormitory were female and 31% were male.

- In Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories), 16.7% of the participants were female (1 person) and 83.3% were male.
- At Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus 2nd Stage (Faculties), 20% of the participants were female (1 person) and 80% were male.
- Approximately 37% of the participants in Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus July 15 Martyrs Girls' Dormitory were female and 58% were male (1 participant did not want to specify their gender).
- At Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus, 38.5% of the participants were female and 53.8% were male (1 participant did not want to specify their gender).
- In Marmara University Göztepe Campus, 28.6% of the participants were female and 71.4% were male (1 participant did not want to declare their gender).

Bar Chart 14. The Relationship Between Gender and Satisfaction with the Sufficiency of Information Provided During the Meeting Regarding Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Performed in the Building



Approximately 88% of the female respondents, 84.5% of the males and 57% of the respondents who did not want to specify their gender stated that the information provided at the meeting regarding structural repairs and energy efficiency in the building was sufficient. It is seen that those who answered yes to this question are predominantly (61.7%) males. There are 3 people who did not answer the question (all males). Of those who answered "yes" to this question, 61.7% were males and 35.5% were females.

Bar Chart 15. The Relationship between Gender and the Assessment of the Disclosure of Adequate Information on the Measures to be Taken Regarding the Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Effects of the Project



89.5% of females, 91% of males and 86% of those who did not want to specify their gender stated that sufficient information on the environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project was shared at the meeting. Of those who answered "yes" to this question, 62.3% were males and 33.8% were females.

Bar Chart 16. The Relationship Between Gender and Timely Disclosure of Information on the Place, Time and Content of Meetings



When the relationship between gender and timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting was examined; It is seen that approximately 91% of females, approximately 96% of males, and approximately 86% of those who do not want to share their gender are of the opinion that timely information is provided. Of those who answered "yes" to this question, approximately 63% were males and about 33% were females.

Bar Chart 17. The Relationship between Gender and the Evaluation of the Adequacy of Answers to Questions Asked During the Meeting



Approximately 88% of females, 90% of males and 71% of those who did not want to state their gender stated that the questions asked during the meeting were sufficiently answered. Of those who answered “yes” to this question, 33.8% were females, 62.8% were males and 3.4% did not want to indicate their gender.

Bar Chart 18. The Relationship Between Gender and Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenter(s)



Nearly 88% of females, 83.5% of males and 86% of those who did not want to share their gender stated that they were satisfied with the performance of the presenter(s) during the meeting. 1 person (male) stated that they were partially satisfied. Of those who answered "yes" to this question, 60.6% were males, 35.2% were females and 4.2% did not want to state their gender.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this survey is to measure the satisfaction with the stakeholder engagement meeting for environmental and social management plans within the scope of SREEPB Project DESSUP 01. In the SREEPB Project performance targets, the stakeholder engagement meeting satisfaction indicator was set as 90% for general satisfaction and women's satisfaction separately. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that approximately 89% of the participants were satisfied with the meeting content, technique and presentation performance. The satisfaction rate of women is approximately 90%[1].

When the institutions/campuses are analyzed individually, it is seen that Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory had the highest interest in the meetings (30 people, constituting 18% of the sample). Again, the meeting with the highest number of female participants in the institutions/campuses was held in Kandıra Student Dormitory (18 women, constituting 69.2% of the participants in this group).

Female participants stated the highest level of satisfaction with the fact that they were informed in a timely manner about the meeting, its location, time and content.

All participants (100%) at Marmara University Göztepe Campus and Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) answered “yes/satisfied” to all questions regarding satisfaction. However, it is possible that the low number of participants in Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories) may have led to this result.

All participants from seven (7) institutions/campuses[2] stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time.

It is also noteworthy that all participants in the stakeholder engagement meeting held in six (6) institutions/campuses[3] stated that sufficient information was shared about the measures to

[1] Overall satisfaction among all participants is %88.48, while satisfaction among women is %89.12.
[2] Boğaziçi University Square Block, Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus, Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus, Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories), Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Faculties), Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus, Marmara University Göztepe Campus.
[3] Boğaziçi University Square Block, Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus, Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Vadi Dormitories), Istanbul Technical University Ayazağa Campus (Faculties), Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus 15 Temmuz Şehitleri Girls Dormitory, Marmara University Göztepe Campus.

be taken regarding the possible environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the sub-projects. However, to the same question, less than half of the participants at Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus were of the opinion that information sharing was insufficient.

In the survey study, one (1) open-ended question received concerns/requests/opinions/suggestions from participants at Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory, Marmara University Göztepe Campus, Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus, Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus, Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus, Boğaziçi University Square Block, Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus. The responses to this question were categorized:

- Meeting presentation performance and visual material
  - Presentation catalog request (Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus)
  - Inadequate performance of the presenting consultant company (Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus)
- Housing
  - Concerns about housing due to the evacuation of student dormitories (Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory)
- Construction process
  - Request to be informed in advance about the construction process and work plan (Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus, Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus)
  - Request to share projects with the beneficiaries (Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus, Marmara University Göztepe Campus)
  - Request for information on equipment and materials to be used during the project
  - Concern that nearby buildings not within the scope of the project may be damaged by retrofitting activities (Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus)
  - Request for rebuilding instead of retrofitting (Marmara University Göztepe Campus)
  - Concern about damage to (internet) cables under the building (Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Avcılar Campus).

- Environment and OHS Issues
    - Concerns about noise and dust (Boğaziçi University Square Block)
    - Concerns about disposal of environmental waste (Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus)
    - Request for special measures for flammable and combustible materials (Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus)
    - Request for supervision and follow-up of OHS issues during the project (Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus, Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus).

All opinions, requests, grievances and suggestions submitted to the PIU through the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Satisfaction Survey were recorded in the grievance log.

ANNEXES

Annex 1- Survey Form

Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Evaluation Survey

This survey aims to measure satisfaction with the stakeholder engagement meetings organized within the scope of SREEPB Project. **Please do not share any information about your identity information (name, surname, ID number, etc.) in the survey.** The data collected through the survey will only be used to measure the performance of the engagement meetings and will not be shared with any third party.

In order for the survey results to contribute effectively to project implementation, it will be critical that you answer all the questions.

Your answers to the questions in this survey will be analyzed, reported and disclosed anonymously on the project's official website (https://kamuguclendirme.csb.gov.tr/)

Thank you.

1. In which of the following organizations are you working/studying/temporarily residing?

( ) Boğaziçi University Kilyos Campus

( ) Boğaziçi University Uçaksavar Campus

( ) Boğaziçi University Square Block

( ) Boğaziçi University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)

( ) Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory

( ) Kandıra Student Dormitory

( ) İstanbul Technical University Vadi Dormitories

( ) İstanbul Teknik University Faculties

( ) İstanbul University Cerrahpaşa Büyükçekmece Campus 15 Temmuz Şehitleri Girl's Student Dormitory.

( ) İstanbul University Cerrahpaş Avcılar Campus

( ) Marmara University Göztepe Campus

2. Please indicate your gender

( ) Female

( ) Male

( ) I don't want to share

3. Is the information provided at the meeting about the structural retrofitting and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?

( ) Yes

( ) No

4. Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding the potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?

( ) Yes

( ) No

5. Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?

( ) Yes

( ) No

6. Are the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?

( ) Yes

( ) No

( ) Meeting participants did not ask any questions

7. Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter?

( ) Yes

( ) No

8. Please indicate if there is anything you would like to convey to the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change r**egarding the project subject to the meeting**……
……
…..……
……

Annex 2- Frequency Tables

Table 1. Name of Institution

Institution (Campus) Name					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	19	11,4	11,4	11,4
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	11	6,6	6,6	18,0
	Bogazici University Squre Block	13	7,8	7,8	25,7
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	11	6,6	6,6	32,3
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	30	18,0	18,0	50,3
	Kandira Student Dormitory	26	15,6	15,6	65,9
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	6	3,6	3,6	69,5
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	5	3,0	3,0	72,5
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Buyukcekmece Campus-Girls Dormitory	19	11,4	11,4	83,8
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	13	7,8	7,8	91,6
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	14	8,4	8,4	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Table 2. Gender Distribution

Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	57	34,1	34,1	34,1
	Male	103	61,7	61,7	95,8
	Does not want to be shared	7	4,2	4,2	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Table 3. Adequacy of the Information Provided at the Meeting on Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Performed in the Building

Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not answered	3	1,8	1,8	1,8
	Yes	141	84,4	84,4	86,2
	No	23	13,8	13,8	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Table 4. Adequate Information Sharing on Measures to be Taken Regarding Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Effects of the Project

Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not answered	2	1,2	1,2	1,2
	Yes	151	90,4	90,4	91,6
	No	14	8,4	8,4	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Table 5. Timely Notification of the Place, Time and Content of the Meeting

Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	157	94,0	94,0	94,0
	No	10	6,0	6,0	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Table 6. Adequacy of Responses to Questions Asked During the Meeting

Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not answered	4	2,4	2,4	2,4
	Yes	148	88,6	88,6	91,0
	No	12	7,2	7,2	98,2
	No questions were asked at the meeting	3	1,8	1,8	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Table 7. Satisfaction with the Performance of the Person(s) Making the Presentation

Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not answered	1	,6	,6	,6
	Yes	142	85,0	85,0	85,6
	No	23	13,8	13,8	99,4
	Partly	1	,6	,6	100,0
	Total	167	100,0	100,0	

Annex 3- Cross Tabulations Related to Institution Name (Campus)

Table 8. Relationship between Gender and Institution/Campus

Institution (Campus) Name * Gender Crosstabulation						
			Gender			
			Female	Male	Does not want to be shared	Total
Institution (Campus) Name	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	Count	5	13	1	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	26,3%	68,4%	5,3%	100,0%
		% within Gender	8,8%	12,6%	14,3%	11,4%
		% of Total	3,0%	7,8%	0,6%	11,4%
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	Count	2	9	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	18,2%	81,8%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,5%	8,7%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	1,2%	5,4%	0,0%	6,6%
	Bogazici University Squre Block	Count	1	10	2	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	7,7%	76,9%	15,4%	100,0%
		% within Gender	1,8%	9,7%	28,6%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,6%	6,0%	1,2%	7,8%
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	Count	2	8	1	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	18,2%	72,7%	9,1%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,5%	7,8%	14,3%	6,6%
		% of Total	1,2%	4,8%	0,6%	6,6%
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	Count	11	18	1	30
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	36,7%	60,0%	3,3%	100,0%
		% within Gender	19,3%	17,5%	14,3%	18,0%
		% of Total	6,6%	10,8%	0,6%	18,0%
	Kandira Student Dormitory	Count	18	8	0	26
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	69,2%	30,8%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	31,6%	7,8%	0,0%	15,6%
		% of Total	10,8%	4,8%	0,0%	15,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	Count	1	5	0	6
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	16,7%	83,3%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	1,8%	4,9%	0,0%	3,6%
		% of Total	0,6%	3,0%	0,0%	3,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	Count	1	4	0	5
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	20,0%	80,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	1,8%	3,9%	0,0%	3,0%
		% of Total	0,6%	2,4%	0,0%	3,0%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Buyukcekmece Campus-Girls Dormitory	Count	7	11	1	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	36,8%	57,9%	5,3%	100,0%
		% within Gender	12,3%	10,7%	14,3%	11,4%
		% of Total	4,2%	6,6%	0,6%	11,4%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	Count	5	7	1	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	38,5%	53,8%	7,7%	100,0%
		% within Gender	8,8%	6,8%	14,3%	7,8%
		% of Total	3,0%	4,2%	0,6%	7,8%
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	Count	4	10	0	14
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	28,6%	71,4%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	7,0%	9,7%	0,0%	8,4%
		% of Total	2,4%	6,0%	0,0%	8,4%
Total		Count	57	103	7	167
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%

Table 9. The Relationship Between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and the Assesssing of the Adequacy of the Information Provided on Structural Retrofitting and Energy Efficiency Studies to be Conducted in the Building at the Meeting

Institution (Campus) Name * Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient? Crosstabulation						
			Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?			
			Not answered	Yes	No	Total
Institution (Campus) Name	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	Count	1	11	7	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	5,3%	57,9%	36,8%	100,0%
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	33,3%	7,8%	30,4%	11,4%
		% of Total	0,6%	6,6%	4,2%	11,4%
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	Count	0	8	3	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%

		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	5,7%	13,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	4,8%	1,8%	6,6%
	Bogazici University Squre Block	Count	1	12	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	7,7%	92,3%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	33,3%	8,5%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,6%	7,2%	0,0%	7,8%
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	Count	0	9	2	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	81,8%	18,2%	100,0%

		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	6,4%	8,7%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	5,4%	1,2%	6,6%
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	Count	0	26	4	30
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	86,7%	13,3%	100,0%
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	18,4%	17,4%	18,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	15,6%	2,4%	18,0%
	Kandira Student Dormitory	Count	0	24	2	26
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	92,3%	7,7%	100,0%

		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	17,0%	8,7%	15,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	14,4%	1,2%	15,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	Count	0	6	0	6
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	4,3%	0,0%	3,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,6%	0,0%	3,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	Count	1	4	0	5
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	20,0%	80,0%	0,0%	100,0%

		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	33,3%	2,8%	0,0%	3,0%
		% of Total	0,6%	2,4%	0,0%	3,0%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Buyukcekmece Campus-Girls Dormitory	Count	0	18	1	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	94,7%	5,3%	100,0%
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	12,8%	4,3%	11,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	10,8%	0,6%	11,4%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	Count	0	9	4	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	69,2%	30,8%	100,0%

		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	6,4%	17,4%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	5,4%	2,4%	7,8%
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	Count	0	14	0	14
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	9,9%	0,0%	8,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	8,4%	0,0%	8,4%
Total		Count	3	141	23	167
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	1,8%	84,4%	13,8%	100,0%

	% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	1,8%	84,4%	13,8%	100,0%

Table 10. The Relationship between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and the Assessment of the Disclosure of Adequate Information on the Measures to be Taken Regarding the Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Effects of the Project

Institution (Campus) Name * Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project? Crosstabulation						
			Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?			
			Not answered	Yes	No	Total
Institution (Campus) Name	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	Count	2	9	8	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	10,5%	47,4%	42,1%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	100,0%	6,0%	57,1%	11,4%
		% of Total	1,2%	5,4%	4,8%	11,4%
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	Count	0	10	1	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	90,9%	9,1%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	6,6%	7,1%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,0%	0,6%	6,6%
	Bogazici University Squre Block	Count	0	13	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	8,6%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	7,8%	0,0%	7,8%
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	Count	0	11	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	7,3%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,6%	0,0%	6,6%
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	Count	0	28	2	30
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	93,3%	6,7%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	18,5%	14,3%	18,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	16,8%	1,2%	18,0%
	Kandira Student Dormitory	Count	0	25	1	26
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	96,2%	3,8%	100,0%

		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	16,6%	7,1%	15,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	15,0%	0,6%	15,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	Count	0	6	0	6
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	4,0%	0,0%	3,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,6%	0,0%	3,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	Count	0	5	0	5
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	3,3%	0,0%	3,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,0%	0,0%	3,0%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Buyukcekmece Campus-Girls Dormitory	Count	0	19	0	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	12,6%	0,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	11,4%	0,0%	11,4%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	Count	0	11	2	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	84,6%	15,4%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	7,3%	14,3%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,6%	1,2%	7,8%
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	Count	0	14	0	14
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	0,0%	9,3%	0,0%	8,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	8,4%	0,0%	8,4%
Total		Count	2	151	14	167
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	1,2%	90,4%	8,4%	100,0%

	% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	1,2%	90,4%	8,4%	100,0%

Table 11. The Relationship Between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and the Assessment of Timely Information About the Place, Time and Content of the Meeting

Institution (Campus) Name * Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided? Crosstabulation					
			Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?		
			Yes	No	Total
Institution (Campus) Name	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	Count	14	5	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	73,7%	26,3%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	8,9%	50,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	8,4%	3,0%	11,4%
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	Count	11	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	7,0%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	6,6%	0,0%	6,6%
	Bogazici University Squre Block	Count	13	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	8,3%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	7,8%	0,0%	7,8%
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	Count	11	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	7,0%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	6,6%	0,0%	6,6%
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	Count	29	1	30
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	96,7%	3,3%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	18,5%	10,0%	18,0%
		% of Total	17,4%	0,6%	18,0%
	Kandira Student Dormitory	Count	23	3	26
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	88,5%	11,5%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	14,6%	30,0%	15,6%
		% of Total	13,8%	1,8%	15,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	Count	6	0	6
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	3,8%	0,0%	3,6%
		% of Total	3,6%	0,0%	3,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	Count	5	0	5
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	3,2%	0,0%	3,0%
		% of Total	3,0%	0,0%	3,0%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Buyukcekmece Campus-Girls Dormitory	Count	18	1	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	94,7%	5,3%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	11,5%	10,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	10,8%	0,6%	11,4%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	Count	13	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%

		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	8,3%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	7,8%	0,0%	7,8%
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	Count	14	0	14
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	8,9%	0,0%	8,4%
		% of Total	8,4%	0,0%	8,4%
Total		Count	157	10	167
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	94,0%	6,0%	100,0%
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	94,0%	6,0%	100,0%

Table 12. The Relationship Between the Name of the Institution (Campus) and the Assessing of the Adequacy of the Answers Given to the Questions Asked During the Meeting

Institution (Campus) Name * Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate? Crosstabulation							
			Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?				
			Not answered	Yes	No	No questions were asked at the meeting	Total
Institution (Campus) Name	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	Count	4	9	6	0	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	21,1%	47,4%	31,6%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	100,0%	6,1%	50,0%	0,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	2,4%	5,4%	3,6%	0,0%	11,4%
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	Count	0	10	0	1	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	90,9%	0,0%	9,1%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	6,8%	0,0%	33,3%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,0%	0,0%	0,6%	6,6%
	Bogazici University Squre Block	Count	0	13	0	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	8,8%	0,0%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	7,8%	0,0%	0,0%	7,8%
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	Count	0	10	1	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	90,9%	9,1%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	6,8%	8,3%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,0%	0,6%	0,0%	6,6%
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	Count	0	29	1	0	30
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	96,7%	3,3%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	19,6%	8,3%	0,0%	18,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	17,4%	0,6%	0,0%	18,0%
	Kandira Student Dormitory	Count	0	24	0	2	26
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	92,3%	0,0%	7,7%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	16,2%	0,0%	66,7%	15,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	14,4%	0,0%	1,2%	15,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	Count	0	6	0	0	6
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	4,1%	0,0%	0,0%	3,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,6%	0,0%	0,0%	3,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	Count	0	5	0	0	5
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	3,4%	0,0%	0,0%	3,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,0%	0,0%	0,0%	3,0%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa	Count	0	18	1	0	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	94,7%	5,3%	0,0%	100,0%

	Buyukcekmece Campus-Girls Dormitory	% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	12,2%	8,3%	0,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	10,8%	0,6%	0,0%	11,4%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	Count	0	10	3	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	76,9%	23,1%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	6,8%	25,0%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,0%	1,8%	0,0%	7,8%
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	Count	0	14	0	0	14
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	0,0%	9,5%	0,0%	0,0%	8,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	8,4%	0,0%	0,0%	8,4%
Total		Count	4	148	12	3	167
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	2,4%	88,6%	7,2%	1,8%	100,0%
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	2,4%	88,6%	7,2%	1,8%	100,0%

Table 13. The Relationship Between Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenter and the Use of the Institutional (Campus) Name in the Presentation

Institution (Campus) Name * Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)? Crosstabulation							
			Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?				
			Not answered	Yes	No	Partly	Total
Institution (Campus) Name	Bogazici University Kilyos Campus	Count	1	7	10	1	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	5,3%	36,8%	52,6%	5,3%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	100,0%	4,9%	43,5%	100,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	0,6%	4,2%	6,0%	0,6%	11,4%
	Bogazici University Ucaksavar Campus	Count	0	7	4	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	63,6%	36,4%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	4,9%	17,4%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	4,2%	2,4%	0,0%	6,6%
	Bogazici University Squre Block	Count	0	12	1	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	92,3%	7,7%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	8,5%	4,3%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	7,2%	0,6%	0,0%	7,8%
	Bogazici University Kandilli Campus (New Geophysics Building)	Count	0	11	0	0	11
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	7,7%	0,0%	0,0%	6,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	6,6%	0,0%	0,0%	6,6%
	Gazanfer Bilge Student Dormitory	Count	0	28	2	0	30
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	93,3%	6,7%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	19,7%	8,7%	0,0%	18,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	16,8%	1,2%	0,0%	18,0%
	Kandira Student Dormitory	Count	0	24	2	0	26
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	92,3%	7,7%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	16,9%	8,7%	0,0%	15,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	14,4%	1,2%	0,0%	15,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Vadi Student Dormitories)	Count	0	6	0	0	6
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	4,2%	0,0%	0,0%	3,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,6%	0,0%	0,0%	3,6%
	İstanbul Technical University Ayazaga Campus (Faculties)	Count	0	5	0	0	5
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	3,5%	0,0%	0,0%	3,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	3,0%	0,0%	0,0%	3,0%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Buyukcekmece	Count	0	16	3	0	19
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	84,2%	15,8%	0,0%	100,0%

	Campus-Girls Dormitory	% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	11,3%	13,0%	0,0%	11,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	9,6%	1,8%	0,0%	11,4%
	İstanbul University Cerrahpasa Avcilar Campus	Count	0	12	1	0	13
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	92,3%	7,7%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	8,5%	4,3%	0,0%	7,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	7,2%	0,6%	0,0%	7,8%
	Marmara University Goztepe Campus	Count	0	14	0	0	14
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	9,9%	0,0%	0,0%	8,4%
		% of Total	0,0%	8,4%	0,0%	0,0%	8,4%
Total		Count	1	142	23	1	167
		% within Institution (Campus) Name	0,6%	85,0%	13,8%	0,6%	100,0%
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	100,0%	100,0%	100,0 %	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	0,6%	85,0%	13,8%	0,6%	100,0%

Annex 4- Cross Tabulations Related to Gender

Table 14. The Relationship Between Gender and the Sufficiency of the Information Provided at the Meeting Regarding Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Carried Out in the Building

Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient? * Gender Crosstabulation						
			Gender			
			Female	Male	Does not want to be shared	Total
Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	Not answered	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	0,0%	2,9%	0,0%	1,8%
		% of Total	0,0%	1,8%	0,0%	1,8%
	Yes	Count	50	87	4	141
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	35,5%	61,7%	2,8%	100,0%
		% within Gender	87,7%	84,5%	57,1%	84,4%
		% of Total	29,9%	52,1%	2,4%	84,4%
	No	Count	7	13	3	23
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	30,4%	56,5%	13,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	12,3%	12,6%	42,9%	13,8%
		% of Total	4,2%	7,8%	1,8%	13,8%
Total		Count	57	103	7	167
		% within Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%

Table 15. The Relationship between Gender and Assessment of the Sufficiency of Information Shared at the Meeting on Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Impacts of the Project and Measures to be Taken in Relation to Gender

Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project? * Gender Crosstabulation						
			Gender			
			Female	Male	Does not want to be shared	Total
Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	Not answered	Count	1	1	0	2
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	50,0%	50,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	1,8%	1,0%	0,0%	1,2%
		% of Total	0,6%	0,6%	0,0%	1,2%
	Yes	Count	51	94	6	151
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	33,8%	62,3%	4,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	89,5%	91,3%	85,7%	90,4%
		% of Total	30,5%	56,3%	3,6%	90,4%
	No	Count	5	8	1	14
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	35,7%	57,1%	7,1%	100,0%
		% within Gender	8,8%	7,8%	14,3%	8,4%
		% of Total	3,0%	4,8%	0,6%	8,4%
Total		Count	57	103	7	167
		% within Has sufficient information been shared about the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%

Table 16. The Relationship between Gender and the Evaluation of Timely Information on the Place, Time and Content of Meetings

Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided? * Gender Crosstabulation						
			Gender			
			Female	Male	Does not want to be shared	Total
Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	Yes	Count	52	99	6	157
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	33,1%	63,1%	3,8%	100,0%
		% within Gender	91,2%	96,1%	85,7%	94,0%
		% of Total	31,1%	59,3%	3,6%	94,0%
	No	Count	5	4	1	10
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	50,0%	40,0%	10,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	8,8%	3,9%	14,3%	6,0%
		% of Total	3,0%	2,4%	0,6%	6,0%
Total		Count	57	103	7	167
		% within Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%

Table 17. The Relationship between Gender and the Assessment of the Adequacy of the Responses to the Questions Asked during the Meeting

Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate? * Gender Crosstabulation						
			Gender			Total
			Female	Male	Does not want to be shared	
Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	Not answered	Count	1	3	0	4
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	25,0%	75,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	1,8%	2,9%	0,0%	2,4%
		% of Total	0,6%	1,8%	0,0%	2,4%
	Yes	Count	50	93	5	148
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	33,8%	62,8%	3,4%	100,0%
		% within Gender	87,7%	90,3%	71,4%	88,6%
		% of Total	29,9%	55,7%	3,0%	88,6%
	No	Count	3	7	2	12
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	25,0%	58,3%	16,7%	100,0%
		% within Gender	5,3%	6,8%	28,6%	7,2%
		% of Total	1,8%	4,2%	1,2%	7,2%
		Count	3	0	0	3

	No questions were asked at the meeting	% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	5,3%	0,0%	0,0%	1,8%
		% of Total	1,8%	0,0%	0,0%	1,8%
Total		Count	57	103	7	167
		% within Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%

Table 18. The Relationship between Gender and Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenter(s)

Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)? * Gender Crosstabulation						
			Gender			
			Female	Male	Does not want to be shared	Total
Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	Not answered	Count	1	0	0	1
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	1,8%	0,0%	0,0%	0,6%
		% of Total	0,6%	0,0%	0,0%	0,6%
	Yes	Count	50	86	6	142
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	35,2%	60,6%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	87,7%	83,5%	85,7%	85,0%

		% of Total	29,9%	51,5%	3,6%	85,0%
	No	Count	6	16	1	23
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%
		% within Gender	10,5%	15,5%	14,3%	13,8%
		% of Total	3,6%	9,6%	0,6%	13,8%
	Partly	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	0,0%	1,0%	0,0%	0,6%
		% of Total	0,0%	0,6%	0,0%	0,6%
Total		Count	57	103	7	167
		% within Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	34,1%	61,7%	4,2%	100,0%