

“Connecting Place: Environment and Health”
An Evaluation Report for the 2016 Public Health Conference

By: Alicia E. Carey

Presented to the Health Education Faculty
at the University of Michigan-Flint
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Science in Health Education

June 30, 2017

First Reader:



Lisa M. Lapeyrouse, PhD

Second Reader:



Shan Parker, PhD

Table of Contents

Dedication	4
Acknowledgement	5
Background	6
Conference Overview	7
Keynote Presentations	8
Individual Breakout Sessions	10
Methods	14
Measures	15
Results	17
Discussion	30
Appendix 1- General Conference Survey	34
Appendix 2- Supplemental Online Conference Survey	37
Appendix 3- Individual Breakout Sessions Evaluation	39
Appendix 4- Evaluation Results	40
Table 1- General Conference Survey	42
Table 2- The Practice of One Health	43
Table 3- Health and Equity in All Policies: The Crossroads of Policy and Public Health	44
Table 4- Public Health and Climate Change	45
Table 5- Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit	46
Table 6- Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication	47
Table 7- Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality and Health	48
Table 8- Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan	49
Table 9- The 5A's of Tobacco Intervention and the Michigan Tobacco Quit Line	50
Table 10- The Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience	51

Table 11- Pediatric Environmental Health- Children Are not Just Small Adults	52
Table 12- Food Access and Food System	53
Table 13- Supplemental Online Conference Survey	54
References	55

Dedication

This project is dedicated to the residents of Flint, Michigan. The Flint Water Crisis has affected Flint's community and I am hoping for a brighter future for all the families in Flint. Providing education to the community is not enough. It is important to provide all the necessary resources in order to have a healthy community.

Acknowledgement

This project would not have been possible without Genesee County Health Department's Public Health Supervisor, Suzanne Cupal, M.P.H and their Community Health Analyst, Brad Snyder M.P.H. They are dedicated to helping the community and devote a lot of time to organizing the annual Public Health Conference for Genesee County and assisting with programs that will benefit the community. Thank you for allowing me to be a part of the 2016 Annual Public Health Conference.

Special thanks to Dr. Lisa M. Lapeyrouse whose patience and dedication made this project successful. Dr. Lapeyrouse has always been a great mentor, providing me with many useful resources to undertake and complete this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Shan Parker, who also offered her assistance and motivated me throughout my Master's program.

To the faculty and staff in the Department Public Health and Health Sciences at the University of Michigan-Flint, thank you for all the encouragement and time that you dedicate to helping students, such as myself, become successful. I am very excited to have the opportunity to work with the Genesee County Health Department and provide this report to assist with future conference planning efforts.

Sincerely,

Alicia E. Carey.

I. **Background**

The Genesee County Health Department (GCHD) is a non-profit government entity designed to help Genesee County residents. GCHD strives to “improve the quality of life in Genesee County by preventing disease, promoting health, and protecting the public from environmental hazards to health” (Valacak, 2015). The organization continues to accomplish their mission of promoting health and improving quality of life among local residents by developing community partnerships and providing education and services related to emergency preparedness, environmental health, and maternal/infant health.

The Genesee County Health Department has created a “Healthy Genesee County 2020” is strategic plan to empower neighborhoods and to reduce health disparities related to: heart disease, type-2 diabetes, lowering the high rates of preventable health conditions, zoning laws for liquor stores, preventing too many fast food outlets, etc. In addition, the Genesee County Health Department collaborates with different agencies and sponsors to prevent diseases and promote health by hosting an annual Public Health Conference.

For the past nine years, the annual Public Health Conference has addressed changing community needs and areas of concern as they relate to health and healthcare. The annual Public Health Conference allows health professionals to analyze and discuss health challenges in the community. Each year, GCHD choose topics of national and/or local concern. There are many health professionals and residents who attend the conference to collaborate and educate themselves on current and emerging health issues. The 10th annual Public Health Conference focused primarily on the relationship between one’s Environment and Health”. As communicated by email from the Genesee County Health Department, Community Health Analyst, Brad Synder, M.P.H, the learning objectives for the 2016 conference were to: “(1)

educate the community about the relationship between where one lives and their health status; (2) to explore the different avenues that affect community health and wellbeing; and (3) to learn how the different avenues i.e., chemicals, toxins, animal life, and social conditions have a complex relationship with environment”.

There are three different types of evaluation: impact, outcome and process. Impact Evaluation measures the objectives and the immediate effect of the program. Outcome Evaluation measures long term effects of the program (My-Peer Toolkit, 2017). Process Evaluation measures the activities of the program, program quality and who the program is reaching. In this report, the Student Evaluator will use the process evaluation method to assess the quality of the conference. This report will give a descriptive background into the “2016 Public Health Conference”. **The purpose of this report is to analyze process evaluation data and to inform future conference planning.**

II. Conference Overview

On May 3rd, 2016, the Genesee County Health Department held the 10th annual Public Health Conference at the Flint Institute of Arts. The theme for the 10th annual Public Health Conference was “Connecting Place: Environment and Health.” The GCHD encourages community organizations, health professionals and local residents to register online. The 2016 Public Health Conference was free of charge, lasted eight hours and included breakfast and lunch for all attendees.

The conference had three keynote speakers that focused on national health issues, such as, *One Health*, *Health in all Policies* and *Climate Change*. Each keynote lecture lasted one hour and was designed for all conference participants to attend. In addition, local health topics were presented as breakout sessions, including: Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit; Crisis

and Emergency Risk Communication; Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality and Health; Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan; Tobacco Use; The Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience; Pediatric Environmental Health- Children Are not Just Small Adults; and Food Access & Food Systems. Each breakout session was thirty minutes in duration. Attendees registered for three breakout sessions prior to the conference using the online registration form, which helped to GCHD ensure that each session had adequate accommodations. The conference sponsors consisted of Hurley Medical Community, Aetna, Molina Healthcare, Community Foundation of Greater Flint, Genesee Health System, Hamilton Community Health Network, UM-Flint Public Health and Health Sciences Department, McLaren Health Plan and Genesee Health Plan.

III. Keynote Presentations

The Practice of One Health

“The Practice of One Health” session was presented by Kimberly Signs, DVM. Dr. Signs is an epidemiologist employed at Michigan’s Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). One Health is an inclusive collaboration that “more than 850 prominent scientists, physicians and veterinarians worldwide have endorsed” (“One Health Initiative,” 2008). The initiative’s purpose is to unite human and veterinary medicine. The One Health mission is to evaluate how human, animal, and environmental health is interconnected. Learning objectives for “The Practice of One Health” session were as follows:

- (1) To explore the concept of one health;
- (2) Describe examples of the one health concept in action; and
- (3) Apply the one health concept to current threats to health.

Health and Equity in All Policies: The Crossroads of Policy and Public Health

The “Health and Equity in All Policies: The Crossroads of Policy and Public Health” session was presented by Robert Jennings, B.S. The presentation focused on health and equity in all policies. Mr. Jennings is employed with Ohio Public Health Association (OPHA) and the organization’s efforts are to promote a healthy community and to improve the wellbeing of the entire population by reducing health disparities. In policy-making, health and equity needs to be considered for transportation, education, access to healthy food and economic opportunities (Jennings, 2016). Learning objectives for the “Health and Equity in All Policies: The Crossroads of Policy and Public Health” were as follows:

- (1) Understand the strategic reasons for integrated health considerations into public policy making;
- (2) Identify opportunities to incorporate health and equity in all policies and in state and local decision making processes;
- (3) Build collations that provide diverse knowledge and skills; and
- (4) Recognize the public health and political hot button issues.

Public Health and Climate Change

The “Public Health and Climate Change” session was presented by Patricia D. Koman, MPP, PhD Candidate. Ms. Koman is employed at University of Michigan- School Of Public Health. Climate Change “is a change in the Earth’s usual temperature. Weather can change in just a few hours. Climate take hundreds or even millions of years to change” (“NASA”, 2015). Climate Change is believed to have increased the temperature of the Earth’s atmosphere and the oceans. These altering have contributed to global warming and are believed to be permanently changing the Earth’s climate (“Lives Science,” 2016). Learning objectives for the “Climate Change” session were as follows:

- (1) Sharpen analytical skills related to climate change and human health and critically evaluate the role for public health professionals related climate change adaptation; and
- (2) Be aware of the need to develop leadership and communication skills in addition to technical competencies regarding climate change health impacts to ensure that the Michigan public health workforce is prepared to meet tomorrow's challenges.

IV. Individual Breakout Sessions

Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit

The "Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit" session was presented by Dr. Lyke Thompson. Dr. Thompson is employed as a Professor at Wayne State University. The Green and Healthy Home Initiative (GHHI) is to protect families from the dangers that can happen within their home, such as reducing: accidental injury, asthma from dust and/or mold, lead poison found in paints, and promoting indoor testing air quality for carbon monoxide and making homes more energy efficient. GHHI's objectives are to create green, healthy and safe homes to improve health, safety and well-being of children and families ("Detroit Workers Environmental Justice," 2016). Learning objectives for the "Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit" session were as follows:

- (1) By the end of the session the participant will know the mission and purpose of the Detroit Green and Healthy Homes Initiative; and
- (2) By the end of the session the participant will understand healthy home conditions in Detroit.

Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication

The "Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication" session was presented by Matthew Seeger, Ph.D. Dr. Seeger is the Dean and Professor at Wayne State University. Crisis communication is the process of preparing, developing, and broadcasting information and/or persuasive messages. The purpose of broadcasting this information is to avoid a crisis (Seeger

& Sellnow, 2016). Furthermore, risk communication is an exchange of information and opinions among individuals and institutions to assess threats and/or risks (Palenchar, McKinney, & Heath, 2005). The learning objectives for the “Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication” session were as follows:

- (1) Understand the dynamics of crisis and risk communication; and
- (2) To understand the five stages of crisis (i.e. Pre-crisis, Initial event, Maintenance, Resolution, and Evaluations).

Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality and Health

The “Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality” session was presented by Joan B. Rose Ph.D. Dr. Rose is a professor at Michigan State University and works with water quality and health. Dr. Rose’s presentation focused on pathogens that are found in common sources of water which contribute to the spread of different viruses such as E. coli, legionella, rotavirus, hepatitis A and E, and norovirus (Rose, 2016). Learning objectives for the “Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality and Health” session were as follows:

- (1) Introduce the risk framework;
- (2) Learn how qPCR is used; and
- (3) Understand how pathogens occur in water.

Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan

The “Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan” session was presented by Guy Williams, B.S. Mr. Williams is the President and CEO of Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice and has worked for 25 years in environmental policy. The mission of the organization “is to create clean, healthy, and thriving communities in Michigan by tackling environmental

problems close to home” (“Detroiters working for environmental justice,” 2016). The organization intends to provide fair treatment to all Detroit residents regardless of race, color, national origin, or income as it relates to environmental laws, regulations, and guidelines (“Detroit Workers Environmental Justice,” 2016). Learning objectives for the “Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan” session were as follows:

- (1) Give an introduction and overview to the concept of environmental justice;
- (2) Identify some specific situations where environmental justice applies to Michigan and the potential for improving public health;
- (3) Explain the environmental justice movement; and
- (4) Be able to relate their role to potential solutions.

The Michigan Tobacco Quit line and Clinical Practice. Guidelines for treating Tobacco dependence

“The Michigan Tobacco Quit Line and Clinical Practice. Guidelines for treating Tobacco Dependence” session was presented by Ann Golden, B.A.A. Ms. Golden is a Health Educator at the Genesee County Health Department. Tobacco use and second hand smoke is one of the leading causes of death in the US as well as locally. Over 25% of Genesee County residents are smokers (Golden, 2009). Learning objectives for “The Michigan Tobacco Quit Line and Clinical Practice. Guidelines for treating Tobacco Dependence” session were as follows:

- (1) Understand availability of the MI tobacco quit line;
- (2) Use the 5A’s tobacco intervention in a clinic setting (i.e. Ask, Advise, Assess, Assist and Arrange);
- (3) Use the fax referral form to refer patients to the quit line; and
- (4) Understand all pregnant women are eligible for the quit line regardless of insurance.

The Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience

“The Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience” session was presented by Mark Valack, MPH. Mr. Valack is a Health Officer and Director of the Genesee County Health Department. In October 2015, the GCHD declared a public health emergency and advised the community not to drink the water. Since the Public Health Emergency, numerous cases of legionella and lead poisoning have been reported. Learning objectives for the “Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience” session were as follows:

- (1) Describe what lead up to issuing the public health emergency declaration on October 1, 2015;
- (2) Diagram the incident command structure of the GCHD used to respond to the emergency; and
- (3) Describe roles, responsibilities, jurisdiction and authority of various units of government in the flint water emergency.

Pediatric Environmental Health: Children Are Not Just Small Adults

The “Pediatric Environmental Health: Children Are Not Just Small Adults” session was presented by Nicholas C. Newman, D.O, M.S.. Dr. Newman is the Director of Pediatric Environmental Health at the Cincinnati, Ohio Children’s Hospital. Pediatric Environmental Health focuses on infants, children, adolescents and young adult’s health. The goal of pediatric environmental health is to prevent and control the spread of illness and diseases among children (Newman, 2016). Learning objectives for “Pediatric Environmental Health: Children Are Not Just Small Adults” session were as follows:

- (1) Educate on the five key concepts in pediatric environmental health: Window of vulnerability, Breathing zones, Oxygen, Food and Water consumption, and Hand-Mouth behaviors;

- (2) Describe the elements of a pediatric environmental health history; and
- (3) Identify pediatric environmental health resources.

Food Access & Food Systems

The “Food Access & Food Systems” session was presented by Professor Rick Sadler, Professor Judith Barry and Professor Terry McClean from Michigan State University. In the City of Flint, there is limited access to grocery stores. Several grocery stores have permanently closed in the Flint area. These stores closings have limited local residents’ ability to access healthy food options. The Flint bus system “Mass Transportation Authority” (MTA) has limited routes throughout the city of Flint. Currently, there is not a major grocery store on the MTA route. Learning objectives for the “Food Access & Food Systems” session were as follows:

- (1) To consider food gardening as one aspect of healthy food access and food security;
- (2) Learn that lead in soil is a management risk in food production;
- (3) Identify the relationship between the built environment and health behaviors;
- (4) Define a range of social and environmental variables important in planning for a mobile market;
- (5) Describe the local food system; and
- (6) Identify good food products that support food access in their community.

V. Methods

Evaluation Instrument Development

The Student Evaluator worked with staff from the GCHD to create an instrument to evaluate the 2016 Public Health Conference. Evaluation tools from previous conferences were reviewed. The Student Evaluator determined the most relevant questions to be included in the current instrument based on 4 competencies: Program Content, Program Quality, Speaker

Presentation Quality and Facilities and Accommodations. Community Health Analyst, Brad Snyder, MPH assisted with revising the evaluation instrument and Public Health Supervisor, Susan Cupal, MPH completed the final edits and approval.

Data Collection

Participants were asked to complete surveys *after* each presentation and submit to conference staff.

VI. Measures

General Conference Survey

The general conference survey measured different aspects of the annual the Public Health Conference. The general conference survey was composed of three sections and had a total of seventeen questions. The first section of the survey was composed of five statements assessing the **program content**, including whether: the conference program was well organized; speakers presented new information; the speaker did a great job presenting the information; the content that was presented was helpful; and whether registering for the conference was an easy process. Response options for each of these five statements were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not applicable).

The second section of the general conference survey included seven statements concerning **program quality**. The conference attendees were asked whether: the information presented met their expectations; the information was clearly understood; the conference met my expectations; time allotted for each session was sufficient; conference materials were useful; speakers were well prepared; and whether the participant would like to attend the conference

next year. Response options for each of these seven statements were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not applicable).

The third and final section of the general conference survey assessed the conference **facilities and accommodations** and included five statements, including whether: the conference venue met their expectations; the room set up and accommodations were satisfactory; the venue was easily accessible; the lunch provided was satisfying; and whether the lunch provided enough options to meet everyone's needs. Response options for each of these five statements were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not applicable).

Individual Breakout Session Evaluation Forms

For the individual breakout sessions, each evaluation form included the individual breakout session speaker's name and the title of their presentation. These evaluation forms were composed of four different sections, consisting of a total of thirteen questions. Each presenter was responsible for distributing and collecting a paper evaluation form after their presentation.

The first section of the evaluation form was composed of two statements assessing **program content**, including whether: the content met the stated objectives and the information presented was clearly understood. The second section of the evaluation form included four statements concerning **speaker's** presentation. The conference attendees were asked whether: the speaker spoke clearly; the speaker was knowledgeable; the speaker was well organized; the speaker answered questions in great detail and the speaker did a great job in projecting their voice. The third section of the breakout session evaluation form assessed the **program quality** and included the following three statements: there was a sufficient amount of time at the

end for questions; visual aids enhanced the presentation; and the information presented met my expectations. Finally, the fourth section of the breakout session evaluation form consisted of three statements assessing the **session presentation**. This included whether: participants enjoyed the presentation; the presentation topic was a new concept to me; and if the participant would recommend this session to others. Response options for each section were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not applicable).

Data Analysis

A dataset was developed where data from the general conference survey and individual breakout sessions evaluations were entered into SPSS version 23. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency statistics, where responses are reported in the form of percentages. During data analysis, multiple responses to a single question and ambiguous responses were coded as missing/Not Applicable (N/A). In addition, to aid in interpretation, response categories were collapsed so that strongly agree and agree and strongly disagree and disagree composed two (vs four) response categories. Qualitative data gathered from the supplemental online conference survey was reviewed for themes. Responses representative of major themes are reported using direct quotes.

VII. Results

General Conference Survey

As indicated in Table 1 of Appendix 4, for the general conference survey, approximately 23% (n = 39) attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 97.4% (N=38) agreed/strongly agreed that the program was well organized, that speakers presented new information, and the speakers did a great job presenting information. In addition, 100% or

(N=39) agreed/strongly agreed that the content presented was helpful and that registering for the conference was an easy process.

In regards to **program quality**, general conference survey responses (N=39) revealed that of participants agreed/strongly agreed that the information presented met their expectations. Likewise, 100% or (N=39) of survey respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the conference materials provided were useful, the information presented was clearly understood, the conference met their expectations, and that they would like to attend the annual public health conference next year. The only program quality item that did not receive a 100% or (N=39) agreed/strongly agreed endorsement was time allotted for individual presentation sessions was sufficient 97.4% (N=38).

The third section of the general conference survey focused on conference **facilities and accommodations**, revealing that 97.4% (N=38) of those who completed the survey agreed/strongly agreed that the conference venue met their expectations. However, only 89.7% (N=35) agreed/strongly agreed that the room set-up and accommodations were satisfactory. In contrast, 100% or (N=39) of general conference survey respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the conference venue was easily accessible. Lastly, concerning the conference lunch, 94.9% (N=37) of general conference survey respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the lunch provided different options to meet everyone's needs and 97.4% (N=38) agreed/strongly agreed that the lunch was satisfying.

Individual Breakout Keynote Evaluations Sessions

The Practice of One Health

As indicated in Table 2 of Appendix 4, for the keynote session, approximately 28% (n =47) of conference participants completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference

attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=47) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** to explore the concept of one health; describe examples of the one health concept in action; and apply the one health concept to current threats to health) and 95.7% (N=45) of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed that information presented was clearly understood. In regards to the speaker, evaluation responses revealed that 100% or (N=47) of those who completed the session agreed/strongly agreed that the speaker spoke clearly and the speaker was knowledgeable. In contrast, 97.9% (N=46) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that speaker was well organized and 91.5% (N=43) respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the speaker answered questions in great detail.

Regarding **program quality**, the keynote evaluation form responses revealed that 100% or (N=47) of participants agreed/strongly agreed there was a sufficient amount of time for questions and that visual aids enhanced the presentation. The only program quality item for the Practice One Health presentation that did not receive a 100% or (N=47) agreed/strongly agreed was for the presenter meeting the participant's expectations 85.2% (N=40). Finally, the responses to the **general section** of the keynote evaluation form revealed that 89.4% (N=42) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation, 74.5% (N=35) of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the presentation topic was a new concept and 91.5% (N=43) would recommend this session to others.

Health and Equity in All Policies: The Crossroads of Policy and Public Health

As indicated in Table 3 of Appendix 4, for the keynote session, approximately 25% (N=43) of the conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=43) agreed/strongly agreed the presentation content met the stated objectives

(**objectives:** understand the strategic reasons for integrated health considerations into public policy making, identify opportunities to incorporate health and equity in all policies and in state and local decision making processes, build coalitions that provide diverse knowledge and skills and recognize the public health and political hot button issues) and that the information presented was clearly understood. Likewise, 100% or (N=43) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the speaker was well organized, the speaker was knowledgeable, and the speaker spoke clearly. The only statement that did not receive a 100% or (N=43) agreed/strongly agreed was "the speaker answered questions in great detail" 92.8% (N=39).

Regarding **program quality**, responses revealed that 97.7% (N=42) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed there was a sufficient amount of time for questions; 95.4% (N=41) agreed/strongly agreed that visual aids enhanced the presentation; and 93.1% (N=40) agreed/strongly agreed the information presented met participant's expectations. In the responses to the **general section** of the keynote evaluation, 100% or (N=43) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation. Yet, only 69.8% (N=30) of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the presentation topic was a new concept. Finally, 90.7% (N=39) of participants agreed/strongly agreed that they would recommend this session to others.

Public Health and Climate Change

As indicated in Table 4 of Appendix 4, for the keynote session, approximately 18% (N = 31) of conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=31) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** sharpen analytical skills related to climate change and human health and critically evaluate the role for public health professionals related to climate change adaptation and be aware of the need to develop leadership and communication skills in addition to technical competencies

regarding climate change health impacts to ensure that the Michigan public health workforce is prepared to meet tomorrow's challenges) and the information presented was clearly understood. Likewise, 100% or (N=31) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the speaker was well organized, the speaker was knowledgeable, the speaker answered questions in great detail, and the speaker spoke clearly. In regards to **program quality**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=31) agreed/strongly agreed there was a sufficient amount of time for questions, that visual aids enhanced the presentation, and that the information presented met participant's expectations. Finally, responses to the **general section** revealed that 100% or (N=31) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation. In contrast, 67.8% (N=21) of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the presentation topic was a new concept and 96.7% (N=30) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that they would recommend this session to others.

Individual Breakout Evaluations Sessions

Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit

As indicated in Table 5 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N=6) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=6) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** by the end of the session the participant will know the mission and purpose of the Detroit Green and Healthy Homes Initiative and by the end of the session the participant will understand healthy homes conditions in Detroit and their solutions) and the information presented was clearly understood. The responses related to the **speaker** revealed that 100% or (N=6) of participants agreed/strongly agreed the speaker spoke clearly, the speaker was knowledgeable, the speaker was well organized and answered questions in great detail. In regards to **program quality**,

responses revealed that 100% or (N=6) agreed/strongly agreed that the time allotted for individual presentation sessions were sufficient, the visual aids enhanced the presentation, and that the information met participant's expectations. Finally, responses to the **general section** revealed that 100% or (N=6) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation; the presentation was a new concept and that participants would recommend this session to others.

Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication

As indicated in Table 6 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N= 12) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=12) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** understand the dynamics of crisis and risk communication and to understand the five stages of crisis i.e. Pre-crisis, Initial event, Maintenance, Resolution, and Evaluations) and the information presented was clearly understood. Responses related to the **speaker** revealed that 100% or (N=12) of participants agreed/strongly agreed the speaker spoke clearly, the speaker was knowledgeable, and the speaker was well organized. The only program quality item that did not receive a 100% or (N=12) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the speaker answering questions in great detail 91.7% (N=11). Regarding **program quality**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=12) agreed/strongly agreed the visual aids enhanced the presentation and the information that was presented met participant's expectations; however, only 91.7% (N=11) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that there was a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions. Finally, in responses to the **general section**, 100% or (N=12) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation and would recommend this session to others. The

statement that did not receive 100% or (N=12) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the presentation topic was a new concept 91.7% (N=11).

Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality and Health

As indicated in Table 7 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N=13) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=13) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** to introduce the risk framework, learn how qPCR is used, and understand how pathogen occurs in water). Participant's responses showed that 92.4% (N=12) of participants believed that the information presented was clearly understood. In regards to the **speaker** the responses revealed that 100% or (N=13) of participants agreed/strongly agreed the speaker spoke clearly, the speaker was knowledgeable, answered questions in great detail and the speaker was well organized. In regards to **program quality**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=13) agreed/strongly agreed there was a sufficient amount of time for questions. In contrast, 92.4% (N=12) participants thought that visual aids enhanced the presentation and 84.6% (N=11) of participants agreed/strongly agreed that the information presented met participant's expectations. Finally, in responses to the **general section**, 100% or (N=13) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation, the presentation was a new concept and participants would recommend this session to others.

Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan

As indicated in Table 8 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N=10) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=10) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** to introduce and give

an overview to the concept of environmental justice, identify some specific situations where environmental justice applies to Michigan and the potential for improving public health, explain the environmental justice movement, and be able to relate their role to potential solutions) and the information presented was clearly understood. In regards to the **speaker**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=10) agreed/strongly agreed the speaker was well organized and answered questions in great detail, 70% (N=7) of participants agreed/strongly agreed the speaker did a great job in projecting their voice, 90% (N=9) of participants agreed/strongly agreed the speaker was knowledgeable and 80% (N=8) agreed/strongly agreed the speaker spoke clearly. Regarding **program quality**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=10) agreed/strongly agreed there was a sufficient amount of time for questions, visual aids enhanced the presentation and the information presented met participant's expectations. Finally, in responses to the **general section**, 100% or (N=10) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation and would recommend the session to others. The only general statement that did not receive a 100% or (N=10) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the presentation being a new concept 50% (N=5).

The Michigan Tobacco Quit line and Clinical Practice. Guidelines for treating Tobacco dependence

As indicated in Table 9 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session, only .6% (N=1) conference attendee completed and submitted their feedback and as a result, data was not analyzed.

The Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience

As indicated in Table 10 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N=11) attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the

survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=11) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** describe what lead up to issuing the public health emergency declaration on October 1, 2015, diagram the incident command structure of the GCHD used to respond to the emergency, describe roles, responsibilities, jurisdiction and authority of various units of government in the Flint water emergency) and the information presented was clearly understood. Likewise, 100% or (N=11) of evaluation respondents agreed/strongly agreed the **speaker** was well organized, the speaker was knowledgeable, answered questions in great detail and the speaker spoke clearly.

Regarding **program quality**, evaluation responses revealed that 100% or (N=11) agreed/strongly agreed visual aids enhanced the presentation and the information presented met participant's expectations. In contrast, 90.9% (N=10) of participants agreed/strongly agreed there was a sufficient amount of time for questions. Finally, evaluation responses to the **general section**, 100% or (N=11) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation and would recommend the session to others. The general section that did not receive a 100% or (N=11) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the presentation topic was a new concept 72.7% (N=8).

Pediatric Environmental Health- Children Are Not Just Small Adults

As indicated in Table 11 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N=14) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=14) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**objectives:** educate on the five key concepts in pediatric environmental health: Window of vulnerability, Breathing zones, Oxygen, Food and Water consumption, and Hand-Mouth behaviors, describe the elements of a pediatric environmental health history, and identify pediatric environmental health resources)

and the information presented was clearly understood. In regards to the **speaker**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=14) agreed/strongly agreed that the speaker was well organized, the speaker was knowledgeable and the speaker spoke clearly. The only statements regarding the speaker that did not receive a 100% or (N=14) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the speaker answering questions in great detail 92.9% (N=13). Regarding **program quality**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=14) agreed/strongly agreed that visual aids enhanced the presentation. In contrast, 92.9% (N=13) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed the information met their expectations and there was sufficient time allotted for individual presentation sessions. Finally, among responses to the **general section**, 100% or (N=14) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation and would recommend the session to others. The general section that did not receive a 100% or (N=14) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the presentation topic being a new concept 35.7% (N=5).

Food Access & Food Systems

As indicated in Table 12 of Appendix 4, for the breakout session (N= 22) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, the responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=22) agreed/strongly agreed the content met the stated objectives (**Objectives:** describe what lead up to issuing the public health emergency declaration on October 1, 2015, diagram the incident command structure of the GCHD used to respond to the emergency and describe roles, responsibilities, jurisdiction and authority of various units of government in the Flint water emergency) and the information presented was clearly understood. In regards to the **speaker**, responses revealed that 100% or (N=22) of those who completed the evaluation agreed/strongly agreed that the speaker was well organized, the speaker was knowledgeable, the speaker spoke clearly and the speaker answered questions in great detail. Regarding

program quality, responses revealed that 91% (N=20) agreed/strongly agreed that visual aids enhanced the presentation and there was sufficient amount of time for questions. In contrast, 95.4% (N=21) of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the presentation met their expectations. Finally, responses to the **general section** show that, 100% or (N=22) agreed/strongly agreed that participants enjoyed the presentation and would recommend the session to others. The general statement that did not receive a 100% or (N=22) agreed/strongly agreed was regarding the presentation topic being a new concept 63.6% (N=13).

Supplemental Online Conference Surveys

Since there was a lack of general conference surveys received, GHCD Community Health Analyst Brad Synder, M.P.H created and emailed a supplemental online survey to all conference attendees. The purpose of the supplemental online survey was to obtain additional feedback regarding the 2016 Public Health Conference. The supplemental online survey was composed of four different sections and included a total of twenty questions, with three of those questions being new questions that were not asked on the general conference survey i.e. "I was made aware that registration in advance was required to attend the conference", "How did you hear about this conference?" and "additional comments from their experience this year that may benefit next year's public health conference."

The first section of the supplemental online conference survey included six statements assessing the **program content**, including whether: the conference program was well organized; speakers presented new information; the speaker did a good job in presenting the information; the content that was presented was helpful; and whether registering for the conference was an easy process. Response options for each of these five statements were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not

applicable). This section included a *new* statement: "I was made aware that registration in advance was required to attend the conference" and the response options were true or false.

The second section of the general conference survey included seven statements concerning the ***program quality***. Conference attendees were asked whether: the information presented met their expectations; time allotted for each session was sufficient; conference materials were useful; the information presented was clearly understood; the conference met my expectation; the speakers were well prepared and whether the participant would like to attend the conference next year. Response options for each of these seven statements were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not applicable).

The third section of the supplemental online conference survey assessed the conference ***facilities and accommodations*** and included five statements, including whether: the conference venue met their expectations; the room set up and accommodations were satisfactory; the venue was easily accessible; the lunch provided was satisfying; and whether the lunch provided enough options to meet everyone's needs. Response options for each of these five statements were based upon a Likert scale that ranged from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or N/A (not applicable).

In the final section of the supplemental online conference, Community Health Analyst, Brad Synder, M.P.H added *two new* questions at the end to obtain additional information on how to improve the conference for 2017. These two new questions included a multiple choice question: "How did you hear about this conference?" where response options included: email invitation, event flyer, GCHD website, friend/colleague, television, radio, newspaper, social media or other (please specify) and an open-ended question which asked participants to

provide additional comments from their experience this year that may benefit next year's public health conference.

Supplemental Online Conference Survey Results

As indicated in Table 13 of Appendix 4, for the supplemental online conference survey (N=35) conference attendees completed and submitted their feedback. Among conference attendees who completed the survey, responses related to **program content** revealed that 100% or (N=35) agreed/strongly agreed that the program was well organized, that speakers presented new information, the speakers did a great job presenting information, and the content presented was helpful. In addition, 94.3% (N=33) agreed/ strongly agreed that the speakers presented new information and 97.1% (N=34) agreed/ strongly agreed that registering for the conference was an easy process.

In regard to **program quality**, survey responses revealed that 100% or (N=35) of those who completed the survey agreed/strongly agreed that they were aware that registration in advance was required to attend the conference. Likewise, 100% or (N=35) of survey respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the conference met their expectations, the speakers were well prepared and they would like to attend the conference next year. Survey responses also revealed that 97.1% (N=34) agreed/ strongly agreed that the presentation met their expectation and the information presented was clearly understood. In addition, 94.3% (N=33) agreed/ strongly agreed that the conference material was useful and 91.4% (N=32) agreed/ strongly agreed that the time frame for each session was sufficient.

Finally, survey responses regarding conference **facilities and accommodations** revealed that 100% or (N=35) of those who completed the online survey agreed/strongly agreed that the speakers were well prepared, they would like to attend the conference next year, the venue met expectations, the venue was easily accessible, lunch was satisfying and the lunch provided

different options to meet everyone's needs. The only program quality item that did not receive a 100% or (N=35) agreed/strongly agreed was the room set up and accommodation 94.3% (N=33). Data regarding the two new statements created by Brad Synder, M.P.H (statements included: how did you hear about the conference and additional comments) were never received from GCHD.

VIII. Discussion

The purpose of this report is to provide an external process evaluation of the 2016 Public Health Conference. As previously discussed, the objectives for the 2016 Public Health Conference, as determined by Community Health Analyst, Brad Synder, M.P.H were to: (1) educate the community about the relationship between where one lives and their health status; (2) to explore the different avenues that affect community health and wellbeing; and (3) to learn how the different avenues i.e., chemicals, toxins, animal life, and social conditions that impact health since they have a complex relationship with environment".

Key Findings

In this evaluation report, findings suggest that the data collected from the presentations did not meet the objectives of the 2016 Public Health Conference. Even though some of the lectures and presentations were new concepts to the conference participants, there was not data to prove that this conference objective was successfully accomplished. In regards to the lecture on Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication, results showed that only 3.9% agreed/strongly agreed that the lecture was a new concept. Out of all the breakout sessions this lecture received the lowest score for being a new concept.

The 2016 Public Health Conference excelled in the following areas: (1) the location of the venue was easily accessible 100% or (N=39) this could have been contributed to the

conference being held at the Flint Institute of Arts located in downtown Flint. Having the Public Health Conference downtown was beneficial to the community. The conference was easily accessible and it accommodated the public needs (i.e. handicap, bus routes, located by colleges/universities) and (2) having a number of topics allowed individuals the opportunity to focus on their area of concern and/or interest. Responses for the general and online surveys showed that 100% or (N=35) of the participants agreed/strongly agreed that the conference met their expectation. Registering for the conference online did make registration an easy process 100% or (N=39), however it would have been beneficial to advertise the limited seating. This would encourage people to register in advance and attendees would have known registration was required. In the final section of the General Conference Survey, 89.7% of participants agreed/strongly agreed that the room setup and accommodation were satisfactory. This was the lowest percentage reported on the general conference survey and the information received would provide positive feedback to GCHD for future conferences set up and accommodations.

Limitations to Evaluation

There are three major limitations to this evaluation. First, the evaluation data collected is missing important demographic information about conference attendees. Inclusion of demographic questions such as ***Are you a resident of Genesee County? (yes/no)***, ***What is your occupation? (i.e., student, health professional, other)***, ***Please check your age range (<18, 19-30, 30-40, or 50+)***, and ***Please provide sex (male/female/other)*** would provide the Genesee County Health Department with information about whether the intended audiences were reached. In particular, information about the demographic composition of conference participants can be used to inform future conference marketing efforts. If, for example, certain audience segments showed low participation rates i.e., local health care providers, this

information can then be used to develop targeted marketing efforts to improve participation and engagement among this specific population.

Secondly, Genesee County Health Department objectives for the conference were not measured. For each session, the keynote presentations and individual breakout sessions the speaker's objectives was listed and measured by participant's responses (Strongly agreed/ strongly disagreed). Furthermore, the general conference survey and the online supplemental survey did not include measures to assess the conference objectives. In the future, the Student Evaluator would suggest that the objectives and evaluation measures are aligned. One way to develop measures is by using the SMART objectives guidelines which consist of five components (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Time scaled). SMART objectives would guarantee that attendees, employees, volunteers and the evaluator have the same objectives and the objectives are being measured.

Finally, in addition to the challenges posed by the data collection instruments used, another limitation to the current evaluation efforts concerns the low response rates to each evaluation effort employed. While over one hundred and sixty-seven individuals attended the conference, there was a lack of participation in the completed evaluations; i.e. 23% completed the General Conference Survey only 23% and only 20.9% completed the Supplemental Online Conference survey only 20.9% was completed. In addition, the three missing evaluation questions also affect the data received. With the lack of participation and the missing data the reliability of the results is affected. The reliability is affected if the sample size is too small, leading to biased results that may overestimate or underestimate the quality and impact of the conference. Given these limitation, the following recommendations are suggested for improving future evaluation efforts: (1) inclusion of demographic questions on the evaluation instruments to better assess conference attendees; and (2) allotting sufficient time within each session for

attendees to complete the evaluations, including designating staff or volunteers to facilitate and collect attendees feedback.

Appendix 1- General Conference Survey



2016 Public Health Conference
“Connecting Place, Environment, and Health”

Flint Institute of Arts

Tuesday, May 3, 2016



GENERAL CONFERENCE EVALUATION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Program Content	4	3	2	1
The program was well-organized.				
The speakers presented new information.				
The speakers did a good job presenting the information.				
The content that was presented was helpful.				
Registering for the conference was an easy process.				
Quality of Program				
The information presented met my expectations.				
The time frames for the sessions were sufficient.				
The conference material that was provided was useful.				
The information was clear to understand.				
Overall, the conference met my expectations.				
Overall, the speakers were well prepared.				
I would like to attend the conference next year.				
Facility				
The conference venue met my expectations.				

The room set-up and accommodations were satisfactory.				
The venue was easily accessible.				
The lunch was satisfying.				
The lunch provided different options to meet everyone needs.				

Appendix 2- Supplemental Online Conference Survey

Supplemental Online Conference Survey

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The program was well-organized				
The speakers presented new information				
The content that was presented was helpful				
Registering for the for conference was an easy process				
I was made aware that registration in advance was required to attend the conference				
Quality of the Program				
The information presented met my expectations				
The time frames for the sessions were sufficient				
The conference material that was provided was useful.				
The information was clear to understand				
Overall, the conference met my expectations				
Overall, the speaker were well prepared				
I would like to attend the conference next year				
Facility and Accommodations				
The conference venue met my expectations				
The room set u and accommodation were satisfactory				
The venue was easily accessible.				
The lunch was easily accessible.				
The lunch provided different options to meet everyone's needs.				

How did you hear about this conference?

- Email invitation
- Event Flyer
- GCHD website
- Friend/Colleague
- Television/Radio
- Newspaper
- Social Media
- Other (please specify)

Please provide additional comments from your experience this year that may benefit next year's conference.

Appendix 3-Individual Breakout Sessions Evaluation Form



Public Health Conference
“Connecting Place, Environment and Health”

Flint Institute of Arts
 Tuesday, May 3, 2016



Opening Speaker:
One Health: *Speaker's Name*

Program Objectives:

At the end of the educational activity, the participant will be able to:

1.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Program Content				
The content met the stated objectives.				
The information presented was clear to understand.				
Speaker: Kim Signs				
The speaker spoke clear to understand.				
The speaker was knowledgeable.				
The speaker was well-organized.				
The speaker answered questions in great detail.				
The speaker did a great job projecting their voice				
Quality of Program				
There was a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.				
Visual aids enhanced the presentation.				
The information presented met my expectations.				
General				
I enjoyed this presentation.				
This lecture was a new concept to me.				
I would recommend this session to others.				

Appendix 4- Evaluation/Survey Results

General Conference Survey
Table 1

Topics	Total Sample N=39
The program was well organized.	
<i>Agree/ Strongly Agree</i>	38(97.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The speakers presented new information.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	38(97.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.6%)
The speakers did a great job presenting the information.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	38(97.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The content that was presented was helpful.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
Registering for the conference was an easy process.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The information presented met me expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The time frames for the sessions were sufficient.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	38(97.5%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.6%)
The conference material that was provided was useful	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The information was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
Overall, the conference met my expectation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
I would like to attend the conference next year.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The conference venue met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	38(97.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.6%)
The room set-up and accommodations were satisfactory.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(89.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	3(7.7%)
The venue was easily accessible.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The lunch was satisfying.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	38(97.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	--
The lunch provided different options to meet everyone needs.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	37(94.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.6%)

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
“The Practice of One Health”**

Table 2

Topics	Total Sample N=47
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	47(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	45(95.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.1%)
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	47(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	47(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	46(97.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.1%)
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(91.5%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.1%)
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(83%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	7(14.9%)
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	47(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	47(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	40(85.2%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.1%)
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	42(89.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	3(6.4%)
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(74.5%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	9(19.1%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(91.5%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(4.2%)

Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
“Health and Equity in All Policies: The Crossroads of Policy and Public Health”
Table 3

Topics	Total Sample N=43
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(92.8%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(4.8%)
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	41(95.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.3%)
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	42(97.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.3%)
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	41(95.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(4.7%)
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	40(93.1%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(4.7%)
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	43(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	30(69.8%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	12(27.9%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	39(90.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.3%)

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
"Public Health and Climate Change"**

Table 4

Topics	Total Sample N=31
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	31(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	21(67.8)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	9(67.8%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	30(96.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(3.2%)

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
 “Green and Healthy Homes in Detroit”
 Table 5**

Topics	Total Sample N=6
If the content met the stated objectives.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	6(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
“Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication”**

Table 6

Topics	Total Sample N=12
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(91.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(8.3%)
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(91.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(8.3%)
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(91.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(8.3%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
 “Methods and Approaches for Assessing Water Quality and Health”**

Table 7

Topics	Total Sample N=13
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(92.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(7.7%)
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	12(92.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(7.7%)
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(84.6%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(15.4%)
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
 “Environmental Justice in Detroit and Michigan”
 Table 8**

Topics	Total Sample N=10
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	8(80%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(20%)
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	9(90%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(10%)
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	7(70%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(20%)
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	5(5.0%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	5(5.0%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
“The 5A’s of Tobacco Intervention and the Michigan Tobacco Quit Line”
Table 9

Topics	Total Sample N=1
If the content met the stated objectives.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	1(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

Individual Breakout Session Evaluation

“The Flint Water Emergency: The Genesee County Health Department Experience”

Table 10

Topics	Total Sample N=11
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(90.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(9.1%)
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	11(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	8(72.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	3(27.3%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	10(90.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(9.1%)

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
 “Pediatric Environmental Health- Children Are not Just Small Adults”**

Table 11

Topics	Total Sample N=14
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(92.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(92.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(7.1%)
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(92.9%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(7.1%)
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	5(35.7%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	8(57.1%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	14(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

**Individual Breakout Session Evaluation
 "Food Access & Food System"
 Table 12**

Topics	Total Sample N=22
If the content met the stated objectives	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
If the information presented was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker spoke clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was knowledgeable to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speaker answered questions in great detail.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	----
The speaker did a great job in projecting their voice.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Was there a sufficient amount of time at the end for questions.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	20(91%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(9.1%)
Visual aids enhanced the presentation	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	20(91%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(9.1%)
The information presented met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	21(95.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(4.5%)
I enjoyed this presentation.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
This lecture was a new concept to me	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	13(63.6%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	8(36.4%)
I would recommend this session to others.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	22(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	-

**Supplemental Online Conference Survey
Table 13**

Topic	Total Sample N=35
The Program was well organized.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The speakers presented new information.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	33(94.3%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(5.7%)
The speakers did a good job presenting the information.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The content that was presented was helpful.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Registering for the conference was an easy process.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	34(97.1%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.9%)
I was made aware that registration in advance was required to attend the conference.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The information presented met me expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	34(97.1%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.9%)
The time frames for the sessions were sufficient.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	32(91.4%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	3(8.6%)
The conference material that was provided was useful.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	33(94.3%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(5.7%)
The information was clear to understand.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	34(97.1%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	1(2.9%)
Overall, the conference met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
Overall, the speakers were well prepared.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
I would like to attend the conference next year.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The conference venue met my expectations.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The room set-up and accommodations were satisfactory.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	33(94.3%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	2(5.7%)
The venue was easily accessible.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The lunch was satisfying.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---
The lunch provided different options to meet everyone's needs.	
<i>Agree/Strongly Agree</i>	35(100%)
<i>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</i>	---

References

- Detroiters Workers Environmental Justice. Fostering Clean, health and Safe Community. (2016). Retrieved June 15, 2016, from <https://dwej.org/>
- Green and Healthy Homes Initiative. (2016). Retrieved May 3, 2016, from: <http://www.greenandhealthyhomes.org/>
- Live Science. (2016) Global Warming: News, Facts, Causes & Effects. Retrieved June 26, 2016, from: <http://www.livescience.com/topics/global-warming>
- My-Peer Toolkit. (n.d.). Retrieved June 29, 2017, from <http://mypeer.org.au/monitoring-evaluation/types-of-evaluation/>**
- Newman, N. Pediatric Environmental Health: Children are not just small adults. (2016). Retrieved from June 16, 2016, <http://www.gchd.us/docs/Dr.%20Nicholas%20Newman.pdf>.
- One Health Initiative will unite human and veterinary medicine. (2008, Oct. 1) Retrieved June 27, 2016, from: <http://onehealthinitiative.com/>
- Rudolph, L., MD, MPH American Public Health Association (2016). Retrieved June 5, 2016, from: <http://www.apha.org/hiap>
- Golden, A. B.A.A. Speak To Your Health! Community Survey Working Towards a Smoke-Free Genesee County. (2009, Feb). Retrieved August 4, 2016, from: <http://prc.sph.umich.edu/wp-content/health-briefs/9-smoking.pdf>.
- Synder, B. GCHD Public Health Conference Evaluation. (2016, May) Retrieved May 4, 2016, from: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Preview/?sm=FDi2RyfVoJJQRRfkqnJ4PIQFJ82WKhQCOYhoZd3l6RHyX9uCjrVM71oreOgNWPq142ek94HsQgLbjpZ2Cqk6oPktPtOhWZaimmAe9otRFPA_3D
- Valack, M. M.P.H. Genesee County Health Department. (2016) Retrieved May 4, 2016, from <http://www.gchd.us/>