



**SEISMIC RESILIENCE AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECT
(SREEPB PROJECT)**

HATAY MUSTAFA KEMAL UNIVERSITY (HMKU) TAYFUR SÖKMEN CAMPUS

**DESSUP 02 1ST STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MEETING
SATISFACTION SURVEY EVALUATION REPORT**

NOVEMBER

2024



Table of Contents

- ABBREVIATIONS..... 3
- SREEPB Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings..... 3
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
- INTRODUCTION..... 4
- 1. METHODOLOGY..... 4
- 2. FINDINGS 5
 - 2.1 Bar Graphs for Frequency Data5
 - 2.2 Findings Related to Gender Dependent Variable8
- CONCLUSION 12
- APPENDICES..... 14
 - 1. Survey questions14
 - 2. Frequency tables15

Bar Chart List

- Bar Chart 1: Gender 4
- Bar Graph 2: Satisfaction with information on energy efficiency..... 5
- Bar Graph 3: Satisfaction with information shared on environmental, social, occupational health and safety..... 5
- Bar Graph 4: Satisfaction with information about the place, time and duration of the meeting 6
- Bar Graph 5: Adequacy of the answers to the questions asked..... 7
- Bar Graph 6: Satisfaction with presentation performances 7

Table List

- Table 1: The relationship between gender and satisfaction with shared information on energy efficiency 8
- Table 2: Relationship between gender and shared knowledge of the project's potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety impacts 9
- Table 3: The relationship between gender and satisfaction with information shared about the meeting, place, time and content 10
- Table 4: The relationship between gender and satisfaction with the answers to the questions 11
- Table 5: The relationship between gender and satisfaction with presentation performance. 12

ABBREVIATIONS

HMKU: Hatay Mustafa Kemal University

SREEPB Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The general purpose of the Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Project; is to strengthen public buildings (educational buildings, dormitories, hospitals and administrative buildings) that are inefficient in terms of energy use and have a high earthquake risk, against earthquakes and to ensure energy efficiency.

The aim of the project is to determine the behavior of the ground and structural systems of existing public buildings with different uses against earthquakes and to eliminate the risks by structurally strengthening them, as well as to make improvements in terms of energy efficiency, to reduce energy consumption and CO2 emissions, to monitor and control energy consumption, to close the current deficit due to energy, and to develop the sector and raise awareness by creating a model for making all public buildings in Türkiye energy efficient after the project. SREEPB Project ensures that existing buildings are strengthened against earthquakes and made more efficient, as well as increasing social awareness about earthquakes and energy efficiency.

Throughout the project, structural strengthening works include building load-bearing system improvements and additions, as well as soil improvement if needed (limited only to the floors of the buildings in scope). Studies focused on energy efficiency include facade and roof insulation, replacement of facade components such as windows and doors, mechanical system revisions, air conditioning system replacements, ventilation system revisions and replacements, integration of building energy monitoring and automation systems into the existing electrical system, electricity generation through solar panel installation.

In this context, this project with reference number DES-SUP-02; Hatay Mustafa Kemal University (HMKU) covers structural retrofitting and energy efficiency focused improvement works within its campus. On May 13, 2024, the activities to be carried out for the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Units and Faculty of Sports Sciences were shared at the stakeholder engagement meeting. After the meeting, 46 people participated in the survey distributed at the end of the meeting. The surveys were administered physically and online via google drive in May 2024. Participants found the information shared on all topics satisfactory at the level of 90% and above. Around 22 % of them were women.

Önder YURDAKUL

Project Coordinator

INTRODUCTION


Earthquake Resistance and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Project focuses on seismic retrofitting and energy efficiency in public buildings such as higher education buildings, dormitories, social service institutions, hospitals and government mansions which are under high seismic risk and have low energy efficiency. In this context, this project with reference number DES-SUP-02; Hatay Mustafa Kemal University (HMKU) covers structural retrofitting and energy efficiency focused improvement works within its campus. On May 13, 2024, a stakeholder engagement meeting was held to share the activities to be carried out for the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Units and Faculty of Sports Sciences. After the meeting, 46 people (28 online and 18 physical) participated in the survey distributed at the end of the meeting.

1.METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire was prepared by the Project Implementation Unit. It consists of a total of closed-ended questions. The last question is an open-ended question including comments and opinions. The questionnaires were administered online via google drive by 28 people in May 2024. In addition, participants who attended the meeting (18 people) physically completed the questionnaire. The closed-ended questions were analyzed as frequencies, percentages and cross-tabulations with the SPSS data analysis program.


2. FINDINGS

2.1 Bar Graphs for Frequency Data




Of the respondents, 69.6% were male (32 people) and 26.1% were female. 4.3% of the respondents did not want to specify their gender.

Bar Graphic 2 Satisfaction with the information provided on structural restoration and energy efficiency




89.1% of the participants found the information shared on structural restoration and energy efficiency sufficient. The rate of those who did not find it sufficient was 10.9%.

Bar Graphic 3 Satisfaction with shared information on environmental, social, occupational health and safety




89.1% of the participants stated that sufficient information was provided on the measures to be taken regarding the potential environmental, social, occupational health and safety and environmental impacts of the project. 10.9% of the participants found the information shared insufficient.

Bar Graphic 4 Satisfaction with the information regarding the place, time and date of the meeting




93.5% of the participants stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time. 6.5% of the participants stated that they were not adequately informed about the topics.

Bar Graphic 5 Adequacy of answers to the questions asked



84.8% of the participants stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient. 15.9% of the participants stated that the answers were not sufficient.

Bar Graphic 6 Satisfaction with presentation performances



95.7% of the participants were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenters. 4.3% of the participants were not satisfied with the presentation performance.

2.2 Findings Related to Gender Dependent Variable

Table 1 The relationship between gender and satisfaction with shared information on energy efficiency

Crosstab

		Gender			Total	
		Female	Male	No comment		
Is the information given about structural restoration and energy efficiency at the meeting sufficient?	Yes	Count	10	29	2	41
		% Question	24,4%	70,7%	4,9%	100,0%
		% Gender	83,3%	90,6%	100,0%	89,1%
		% of Total	21,7%	63,0%	4,3%	89,1%
	No	Count	2	3	0	5
		% Question	40,0%	60,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% Gender	16,7%	9,4%	0,0%	10,9%
		% of Total	4,3%	6,5%	0,0%	10,9%
Total	Count	12	32	2	46	
	% Question	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	
	% Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	

Table 2:

In this section, the relationship between the dependent variable of gender and each question asked to the participants in the survey is analyzed. Of the respondents, 69.6% were male (32 people) and 26.1% were female. 4.3% of the participants did not want to specify their gender.

89.1% of the participants found the information shared on structural restoration and energy efficiency sufficient . Of those who gave this response, 63% were male, 21.7% were female and 4.3% did not want to specify their gender. The rate of those who did not find the shared information sufficient is 10.9%. Of those who gave this response, 6.5% were male, 4.3% were female.

Table 2 Relationship between gender and shared knowledge of the project's potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety impacts

Crosstab

		Gender			Total	
		Female	Male	No comment		
Has there been sufficient sharing regarding the precautions to be taken regarding the possible environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?	Yes	Count	10	30	1	41
		% Question	24,4%	73,2%	2,4%	100,0%
		% Gender	83,3%	93,8%	50,0%	89,1%
		% of Total	21,7%	65,2%	2,2%	89,1%
	No	Count	2	2	1	5
		% Question	40,0%	40,0%	20,0%	100,0%
		% Gender	16,7%	6,3%	50,0%	10,9%
		% of Total	4,3%	4,3%	2,2%	10,9%
Total	Count	12	32	2	46	
	% Question	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	
	% Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	

89.1% of the participants stated that sufficient information was provided on the measures to be taken regarding the potential environmental, social, occupational health and safety and environmental impacts of the project. Of those who gave this response, 65.2% were male, 21.7% were female and 2.2%

did not want to specify their gender. 10.9% of the participants found the information shared insufficient. Of those who gave this response, 4.3% were male and 4.3% were female.

Table 3 The relationship between gender and satisfaction with information shared about the meeting, place, time and content

Crosstab

		Gender			Total	
		Female	Male	No comment		
Was information about the meeting place, time and content provided in a timely manner?	Yes	Count	12	31	0	43
		% Question	27,9%	72,1%	0,0%	100,0%
		% Gender	100,0%	96,9%	0,0%	93,5%
		% of Total	26,1%	67,4%	0,0%	93,5%
	No	Count	0	1	2	3
		% Question	0,0%	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
		% Gender	0,0%	3,1%	100,0%	6,5%
		% of Total	0,0%	2,2%	4,3%	6,5%
Total	Count	12	32	2	46	
	% Question	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	
	% Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	

93.5% of the participants stated that they were informed about the place, time and content of the meeting on time. Of those who gave this response, 67.4% were male and 26.1% were female. 6.5% of the participants stated that they were not adequately informed about the topics. Of those who gave this response, 2.2% were male and 4.3% did not want to specify their gender.

Table 4 The relationship between gender and satisfaction with the answers to the questions

Crosstab

		Gender			Total	
		Female	Male	No comment		
Are the answers to the questions asked during the meeting sufficient?	Yes	Count	10	27	2	39
		% Question	25,6%	69,2%	5,1%	100,0%
		% Gender	83,3%	84,4%	100,0%	84,8%
		% of Total	21,7%	58,7%	4,3%	84,8%
	No	Count	2	5	0	7
		% Question	28,6%	71,4%	0,0%	100,0%
		% Gender	16,7%	15,6%	0,0%	15,2%
		% of Total	4,3%	10,9%	0,0%	15,2%
Total	Count	12	32	2	46	
	% Question	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	
	% Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	

84.8% of the participants stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient. Of those who responded, 58.7% were male, 21.7% were female and 4.3% did not want to specify their gender. 15.2% of the participants stated that the answers were not sufficient. Of those who gave this response, 10.9% were male, 4.3% were female.

Table 5 The relationship between gender and satisfaction with presentation performance.

Crosstab

		Gender			Total	
		Female	Male	No comment		
Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	Yes	Count	11	31	2	44
		% Question	25,0%	70,5%	4,5%	100,0%
		% Gender	91,7%	96,9%	100,0%	95,7%
		% of Total	23,9%	67,4%	4,3%	95,7%
	No	Count	1	1	0	2
		% Question	50,0%	50,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% Gender	8,3%	3,1%	0,0%	4,3%
		% of Total	2,2%	2,2%	0,0%	4,3%
Total	Count	12	32	2	46	
	% Question	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	
	% Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	26,1%	69,6%	4,3%	100,0%	

95.7% of the participants stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenters. Of these responses, 67.4% were male and 23.9% were female. 4.3% of the participants were not satisfied with the presentation performance. Of those who gave this response, 2.2% were male and 2.2% were female.

CONCLUSION

When the general satisfaction with the meeting is examined, it is seen that the satisfaction rate is over 90% and around 22 % of them are women. The satisfaction rate among women is approximately 90% (88.3%) and among men it is again over 90% (92.5%).

The satisfaction indicators of the SREEPB Project stakeholder participation meetings have been reached. The surveys were applied physically and online via Google Drive in May 2024. The analyses of the closed-ended questions were created as frequency, percentage and cross tables with the SPSS data analysis program.

69.6% of the participants in the survey were male (32 people) and 26.1% were female. 4.3% of the participants did not want to state their gender. 89.1% of the participants in the meeting found the information shared on energy efficiency sufficient. The rate of those who did not find it sufficient was 10.9%. 89.1% of the participants stated that sufficient sharing was made regarding the possible environmental, social, occupational health and safety of the project and the measures to be taken regarding its impacts.

10.9% of the participants found the information shared insufficient. 93.5% of the participants stated that they were informed about the meeting place, time and content in a timely manner. 6.5% of the participants stated that they were not informed about the topics.

84.8% of the participants stated that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient. 15.9% of the participants stated that the answers were not sufficient. 95.7% of the participants stated that they were satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenters. 4.3% of the participants stated that they were not satisfied with the presentation performance. When the general satisfaction with the meeting is examined, it is seen that the satisfaction rate is over 90%, the satisfaction rate is approximately 90% (88.3%) among women and over 90% (92.5%) among men. The satisfaction indicators of the SREEPB Project stakeholder participation meetings have been achieved.

One open-ended question was asked to the participants in the satisfaction survey applied at the end of the meeting (see Appendix 1). The responses to this question are listed below:

Among this information, it was observed that the number of complaints was considerably less than the opinions and suggestions:

Occupational safety

- ❖ The job security conditions of academic staff and of course subcontracted workers will also be a problem, it is never on the agenda.
- ❖ How long will the retrofitting process of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine take? In this process, will students and faculty members be allowed to enter and exit the buildings within the scope of "Occupational Health and Safety"?

Other

- ❖ We rely on your knowledge to ensure that the operations to be carried out in the faculty areas are carried out in accordance with the earthquake reality of the region, and I ask for your attention in this context.

- ❖ It seems that it will not be possible to open the 2024-2025 academic year with a completed campus and a motivating environment for students and staff. It is the biggest success of the project to continue with turtle speed from February 2023 to today (when students are not here) and to turn the campus into a construction site during the period when students are called.
- ❖ Will it be ready in time for the new academic year?
- ❖ Although the project is of interest to us, the details of the project, its duration and the tender process were not explained in detail. At least in writing, academic and administrative staff should be informed.
- ❖ I would like to be informed about the steps related to the project at every stage. Since we are out of the city, I would like to be informed at least one week before the procedures start so that we can take our personal belongings at our workplace before the procedures start.

APPENDICES

1. Survey questions

Please indicate your gender

1. Female
2. Male
3. I do not want to specify

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

1. Yes.
2. No.

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?

1. Yes.
2. No.

Has timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting been provided?

1. Yes.
2. No.

Are the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Meeting participants did not ask questions

Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?

1. Yes.
2. No.

If there is anything you would like to convey to the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change regarding the project subject to the meeting, please indicate

2. Frequency tables

		Gender			Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Female	12	26,1	26,1	26,1
	Male	32	69,6	69,6	95,7
	No comment	2	4,3	4,3	100,0
	Total	46	100,0	100,0	

Is the information given about energy efficiency at the meeting sufficient?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative
					Percent
Valid	Yes	41	89,1	89,1	89,1
	No	5	10,9	10,9	100,0
	Total	46	100,0	100,0	

Has there been sufficient sharing regarding the precautions to be taken regarding the possible environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the project?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative
					Percent
Valid	Yes	41	89,1	89,1	89,1
	No	5	10,9	10,9	100,0
	Total	46	100,0	100,0	

Was information about the meeting place, time and content provided in a timely manner?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative
					Percent
Valid	Yes	43	93,5	93,5	93,5
	No	3	6,5	6,5	100,0
	Total	46	100,0	100,0	

Are the answers to the questions asked during the meeting sufficient?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	39	84,8	84,8	84,8
	No	7	15,2	15,2	100,0
	Total	46	100,0	100,0	

Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	44	95,7	95,7	95,7
	No	2	4,3	4,3	100,0
	Total	46	100,0	100,0	