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Executive
Summary

This project is inspired by living on a college campus that loses the functionality of much of its public space during the winter months. As snow covers campus, students stay indoors, retreating towards white interiors, screens, and private spaces. But what if there existed sustainable public spaces that offered the same opportunities for diverse interaction during the winter that parks offer during warmer months? This project—a temporary “Winter Park”—was a first look at the form that four-season green space on campus might take.

In ENVS 4100, students are encouraged to pursue projects that are “low hanging fruit,” defined as opportunities to benefit sustainable well-being at Western Michigan University that are low-cost, high impact, and realistic. In this case, the fruit is the opportunity for encouraging dialogue surrounding our culture of sustainability. This is done by creating spaces—not unlike the student cafés and performance spaces that have been discussed in previous ENVS 4100 projects—that connect students to the natural and built environments and foster critical thinking about these connections. For despite the large amount of work and activities coming from the Office for Sustainability at Western Michigan University, an awareness of these activities (or even the office at all) is not widespread among the student body. I propose that one way to build awareness is to winterize the first-order connection between students and sustainable campus culture, tying together “greening” and the literal green of parks while responding to the issue of the loss of seasonal public space.

The first iteration of this kind of space was installed for a pilot in early March in the lobby of the Richmond Center for Visual Arts. The lobby, chosen according to several criteria—it was underutilized, highly visible, and feasible for installation this semester—provided a great deal of foot-traffic and plenty of open space. The park itself was constructed using a combination of recovered materials. The main structural elements were modules made of old pallets from WMU’s Waste Facility; indoor green came from reusable rolls of green turf carpet (the grass needed to last and be fit for use in second and third installations) and a variety of indoor plants. Short lawn chairs were placed around the space on top of stacks of pallets and a hammock was hung between two groupings. See Appendix 1 for images of the park.
During the park’s pilot, it became clear that students are hungry for a public connection between the built and natural environments in addition to the seasonal romance with traditional greenspace. The first park was seen by hundreds of students on the way to class, positioned strategically in the view of those passing onto campus from the Miller Auditorium parking garage through the second floor of the RCVA. Dozens of the students that saw the park engaged with the space: activities included relaxing on the grass between classes, doing homework, eating lunch, simply hanging out, holding meetings, power-napping, reading, and even practicing tuba. Following the installation an online survey was distributed, sent via email to students in the Gwen Frostic School of Art (to which the Richmond Center is home), shared on social networking sites, emailed to classmates, and posted on social forums for Lee Honors College students and general WMU students. Data from this survey confirmed the observed response—students want this kind of space to be a part of their campus. Specific analysis of these surveys will be covered in the following pages.

From the analysis and discussion of this pilot project I hope to leverage a proposal for further installations of this type at indoor and outdoor locations across campus. The goal is to build on this base model and explore potential partnerships with other project groups, ENVS 4100 initiatives, and members of the campus community, looking at further integration of sustainable design into the materiality of the park while refining the process overall. Further exploration of this kind will serve to grow the integration of sustainable culture and the public space of Western Michigan University through active spaces for diverse interaction that are available to students year-round.

---

**Introduction**

This project aims to address two issues on campus. The first is the lack of student awareness of the immense amount of effort coming from the Office for Sustainability towards building a campus culture of sustainability. The second is the loss of green public space—a seasonal reduction of opportunities for students to connect with the natural environment—during Kalamazoo’s harsh winters. In order to stress the importance of this project’s attempts to address these issues, each will now be discussed at length in the contexts of site-specific observations, past research, and potential effects.
A major concern with the seasonal availability of green space is the loss of the connection between students and the natural environment. Students move indoors towards screens, white walls, and private spaces as harsh conditions and low temperatures lower the allure of the exterior. Some indoor public spaces on Western Michigan’s campus attempt to remedy this—discussed in more detail in Best Practices: Our Campus—but most do not, meaning students are alone together in the loss of their overall available green space. The introduction of pop-up parks as temporary interventions across campus is an ideal way to combat this loss. In doing so, the university will build a unique and engaging campus environment that stands to reverse the draining effects of a long winter.

The lack of public green space during the winter carries a second burden. The effective loss of the usability of campus’ lawns, gardens, and parks is a loss of multiple-use space, space that encourages diverse interactions and fosters meaningful social exchange between students, professors, and members of the community. Alumni or community members are hardly likely to walk with their children around the halls of academic buildings or cafeterias, after all—these spaces are single use. Losing this space is losing the ability to foster meaningful public life—defined by urbanist and architect Jan Gehl as “everything that takes place between buildings, to and from school, on balconies, seated standing, walking, biking, etc.”


Acknowledging and responding to the loss of parks and ensuring that multiple-use spaces exist during the winter is a quick way to build a place for public life to prosper, strengthening connections between students, community members, and faculty looking to engage in meaningful ways with the public space of Western Michigan University.

Answering the problems related to seasonal loss of public space presents an opportunity to address the second issue: the lack of student awareness of the campus culture of sustainability. The list of achievements concerning sustainability at Western Michigan University—coming from the Office for Sustainability and various academic departments—is growing every year. Students pay $8 each semester for a sustainability fee. President Dunn has signed and is a steering member of the President’s Climate Commitment. Yet many students are completely disengaged with this part of WMU’s culture. Efforts to spread awareness of sustainability at WMU currently exist: posters around campus advertise the OFS and the Gibbs House, freshman receive Eco Mugs, and general
education classes in ENVS allow non-major students to fill degree requirements while learning about sustainability. The Office for Sustainability’s also offers an internship program, provides “Green Jobs” student employment, distributes a Student Sustainability Survey, offers funding each semester for student sustainability projects through the Student Sustainability Grant and programs lectures and other events at the Gibbs House and OFS. It is a vibrant but small part of the campus culture.

In addition to these numerous practices, however, non-traditional efforts to connect students to this culture of sustainability hold a great amount of potential. This project aims to serve as that kind of connection, existing as a highly-visible reminder of sustainable practices. Though the first iteration of the park did not incorporate any innovations in sustainable design, future installations of these indoor parks could serve as a test-site for sustainable materials and new design practices. Also, ensuring that campus literally remains green during the winter provides an inescapable head-nod to the university’s stated desire to build a culture of sustainability.

This project was designed as an urban intervention. The pilot installation of the first park employed what San Francisco design collective Rebar calls “tactical urbanism,”2 a term developed when they pioneered the now-global event Park(ing) Day in 2005.3 Like the temporary parking-space parks developed by Rebar and other urbanites, the Winter Park in the Richmond Center used low-cost materials to create something with a potentially high impact with a low ease of implementation. The goal: to make “use of modest or temporary revisions to urban space to seed structural environmental change.”4 Note: funding for this project was provided by the Gwen Frostic School of Art’s Student Enrichment Grant, which I applied for in the Fall 2015 semester.

**Methodology and Data**

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid

**Building Winter Park 1.0**

The first step was the identification of an ideal location for the intervention to be placed. Several locations were considered based on their status as space that was underutilized, highly visible, and feasible for installation this semester. These locales included the second floor Sangren Hall adjacent to Flossie’s Café, the first floor of the Bernhard Center near the televisions, the lobby of the Richmond Center for Visual Arts, and the second floor atrium
of the Gilmore Theatre Complex. Of these locations, the RCVA Lobby was chosen; it was most accessible and provided the greatest foot-traffic (highest project visibility) because of its location next to Miller Auditorium’s Parking Garage.

To secure this location I contacted Mindi Bagnall and Don Desmett, Coordinator and Director of the Richmond Center for Visual Arts. After discussing the goals of the project we decided on installation during the second week of March (the first week of school following the university’s spring break). Because of the abnormal installation space—typically the RCVA does not allow student use of the lobby—I was given two days for the initial installation: March 14 and 15.

After determining a location and window for this exhibition I began to concentrate on the materiality of the park. This selection was made considering the cost, sustainability, and re-usability of the materials. The materials purchased needed to be able to be installed and uninstalled quickly and stored for re-use at new locations. Focusing on these requirements and using Rebar’s suggestion of using modest materials I first collected some 45 pallets that were going to be destroyed at Western Michigan University’s waste site on East Campus, re-using them as my main building material for seating. Using money from the Enrichment Grant I purchased two sections of green carpet to be used as the lawn and to top the pallets. Indoor plants were purchased to be placed in the space. A hammock and several chairs were procured to provide alternative seating.

Though the arrangement of these materials was modeled prior to installation, I found that the space needed to be rearranged on-site to respond to the needs of the users moving through the space. Pallets were arranged in modules of three units—each pallet measures around six inches high; eighteen inches is accepted as an optimal seating height. Stacks of 1, 2, and 3 modules—3, 6, and 9 pallets—were arranged to create a variety of seating heights with a rhythm that encouraged movement throughout the space. Opposing modules of pallets were placed to encourage dialogue. See photos of the fully installed Winter Park in the Richmond Center Lobby in Appendix 1.
Data Collection — Photos
A large part of intervening in public space is tracking the effects of this intervention. I knew I needed to collect some sort of observational data to fully understand the ripples caused by implementing this project in the RCVA. Using Jan Gehl’s How to Study Public Life as a resource, I decided to set up a camera on an interval timer. This camera took a photo of the space every ten seconds for the duration of the installation, serving as a visual record of the usage of the space and the relative numbers of people interacting with the various elements. These photos showed visitors relaxing on the grass between classes, doing homework, eating lunch, simply hanging out, holding meetings, power-napping, reading, and even practicing tuba—please see them in Appendix 3.

Data Collection — Survey
Following the installation an online survey was distributed, sent via email to students in the Department of Art (to which the Richmond Center of Home), shared on social networking sites, emailed to classmates, and posted on social forums for Lee Honors College students and general WMU students. Additional participants came from snowball sampling by participants contacted using any of the methods listed above.

Accompanying the survey was an animated GIF constructed of images from the time-lapse, provided to give students that may not have seen the space some insight. The survey consisted of 15 questions:

Three (3) multiple choice questions providing information on the park’s visibility, approachability, and stickiness (how long people tended to use the space)
Eight (8) Likert scale questions addressing opinions on repeating the project, the pilot’s success, and student connection to the built and natural environment
Four (4) open demographic questions used to gather information about the participants

The full survey can be seen in the Appendix 4 while analysis of responses can be found in the Discussion section of this paper.
Though this project is unique on Western Michigan University’s campus, some spaces already exist that attempt to maintain some flora during the winter, bringing in potted plants (real and fake) in different ways. These spaces include the Office for Sustainability, the Bernhard Center’s Campus Trends area, the WMU Theatre Department, and more. The plants range from large palms in the Gilmore Theatre Complex to small hanging plants in the Bernhard Center. Because this project is more extreme than the introduction of more potted plants, methods of Best Practice will now be looked at from outside sources.

Research into other kinds of indoor green space indicates that this kind of project has no known predecessors at other universities. Various components of this project have been done before — urban interventions, temporary parks, sustainability-focused public spaces, and more have been done many different times—but no projects have been found that share all of the same goals and factors as this. Because of this, several projects that either provided inspiration for or share some components with the Winter Park will be discussed below.

**Park(ing) Day, Rebar Group**

Park(ing) Day is an annual worldwide event that encourages people to temporarily take back their public space by legally (feeding the meter) turning a parking spot into public park for a day. It was created by San Francisco-based cross-disciplinary design collective Rebar Studio in 2005 and continues today as a global movement. It eventually grew into the Parklet program. This project is relevant for its references to tactical urbanism, urban interventions, and the potential of spatial change in seeding a shifts in perspective. The thinking and writing of Rebar, particularly their Park(ing) Day Manifesto, was a great inspiration for this project.

**San Francisco Parklets**

San Francisco has leveraged efforts to provide more urban green space through their multifaceted Pavement to Parks Program, intended to “provide opportunities for communities to create small but important public spaces.” These spaces, divided into Temporary Street Plazas and Parklets, which “repurpose part of the street next to the sidewalk into a public space for people,” and act as micro-parks across the city, have been extremely successful.
The main goal of San Francisco’s Pavement to Parks Program is the creation of mixed use space, with the plazas described as intended to create “a pedestrian-only space for community-sponsored events, gatherings, and greenspace.” This program exemplifies the power of a governmental push for spatial diversity and green space.

**Gehl Architects**

Gehl Architects is an international design group with offices in Copenhagen, New York, and San Francisco that focuses on urban intervention and design. Gehl’s projects are numerous and thus will not be discussed individually, but their approach is admirable, focusing on designing for the human scale in order to better the relationship between people’s quality of life and the built environment. Gehl Studio San Francisco is led by the founders of Rebar Studio and helped partner with San Francisco to build the Parklet program.

**Giseppi Licari’s Public Room**

Similar intent can be observed in the work of Rotterdam-based artist Giuseppe Licari, who describes his work as “heterotopic landscapes” that exist on the “cross-border of the natural world and the built environment, exploring the territories emerging from their encounters.” Licari’s 2013 installation Public Room is particularly relevant to this project—the artist turned an entire gallery into an indoor park in an attempt to invert “the common understanding of indoors as private and outdoors as public.” Though Licari’s focus is on this inversion rather than re-establishing a lost connection to the natural elements of parks, working with the intention of shifting the attitudes of individuals engaging with the space is a powerful goal present in the Winter Park project as well. See photos of Licari’s work in Appendix 3.

**Park Here “Pop Up Park”**

A similar installation was created in New York City in OpenHouse’s Galleries. Called “Park Here,” the pop-up park has been repeated several times to provide New Yorkers with a “tranquil oasis away from the busy, cold, New York City winter.” This project focused less on sustainability and more on the presence of green space itself as an opportunity for relaxation. See photos in Appendix 3.
AFJD  *They Grow Without Us*  
(a partnership with the University of British Columbia)

Commissioned by the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, architecture firm AFJD designed and installed temporary seating arrangements grown from mushrooms. The research behind this installation “suggests a future in which biodegradable architectural components are grown rather than manufactured, adding valuable material to local ecosystems at the end of their life.”[12] The project was funded by UBC’s Campus and Community Planning to align with sustainability goals of the UBC Centennial Initiative. This is an ideal case—a university commissioning designed interventions in public space that align with the campus culture of sustainability. This is another avenue that this kind of project could take at Western Michigan University, eventually focusing less on responding to seasonal public space and focusing more on sustainable design. See photos of *They Grow Without Us* in Appendix 3.

**Discussion**

This section focuses on the data collected from the time-lapse photography and survey distributed to students.

**A—Photos**

Analysis of the photos show that the Winter Park saw a variety of use by 50–100 students during its two day run. The photos show higher usage on the second day of the installation, potentially indicating that usage would increase as students grew used to the space or became aware of its intent. The following observations can be made about the use of the space:

Most users gravitated towards the lowest modules of pallets, but a consistent hotspot was the furthest module (9 pallets high) with a chair on top.

Single users tended to stay for shorter periods of time and chose seating closest to the entrance of the park. Groups were more likely to “explore” the space.

Mornings saw higher use of the park (most likely because of the incredible lighting in the space) than evenings, but evenings saw longer sustained use (homework or relaxation)

See photos of the space in Appendix 3.
B—Survey Responses

Survey responses have been divided into four categories for improved analysis.

Overview

73 students responded to the survey. Of the collected survey respondents, 65.8% saw the park while it was installed. Gender was left as an optional response for participants and thus data is incomplete for this consideration. Academic status for respondents is shown in the following chart.

![Academic Status Chart](image)

Usage and Engagement

Survey respondents were each asked three questions about the space’s engagement and visibility. Recall that 65.8% of respondents indicated that they saw the space. The rest answered based on images included with the survey.

1) For how much time did you engage with & explore the space?

![Time Spent Chart](image)

These responses indicate that of those respondents using the space, most engaged for 5 or more minutes. The difference between the upper time intervals is minimal—not more than one or two respondents—and suggests the importance of this kind of space’s approachability. It is essential that future investigations create spaces that feel even more available for students to use.
2) Which factor of the installation do you feel was the most compelling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The greenery (plants, grass)</th>
<th>The play (moving through the space)</th>
<th>The interactions (socializing)</th>
<th>The novelty (something new in a familiar place)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to this question affirm the importance of the greenery and novelty. As an urban intervention, providing a break in normalcy was one goal of this project—these responses show that students respond well to these changes and would likely use them repeatedly.

Perspectives & Repetition

Three questions were asked to attempt to gauge student’s connection with the public space on campus and both their built and natural environments.

4. The built environment influences me daily.
5. The natural environment influences me daily.
6. “We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us.”
   —Winston Churchill. Can the same be said of campus?

Respondents were next asked four questions pertaining to the repetition of this kind of project, looking at both indoor and outdoor options and to the space’s impact.

7. The addition of more vibrant, sustainable outdoor green spaces on campus would improve my quality of life.
8. The Winter Park installation could work if attempted outdoors.
9. The addition of more vibrant, sustainable indoor green spaces on WMU’s campus would improve my quality of life.
10. This installation should be repeated in the Richmond Center.
11. This installation should be repeated at other indoor locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Neutral</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Disagree</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of respondents strongly agreed with each proposal except the consideration of an outdoor installation of this type, which saw more students simply agreeing. This enthusiasm indicates a student population with a strong desire for this kind of public space, a clear indicator that further investigation into interventions across campus is a step in the right direction. Western Michigan University would benefit from more new public spaces providing year round connections with the natural environment. Temporary interventions into the public space at strategic locations across campus could work similarly to the pilot Winter Park, providing students with a multiple-use space for diverse interactions and offering first-order connections to the campus culture of sustainability. These future iterations would focus less on laying groundwork and more on incorporating sustainable design.

Because of the nature of this data, the analysis has certain limitations. The most notable hole in data came from the time-lapse observation, as there were several small windows during the 48-hour period that the park was up in which the camera was full—the memory card had to be emptied—or the lighting had changed sufficiently that photos were impossible to make out. Though these errors were corrected as quickly as possible, it would be ideal for future observational sessions to collect complete photographic records rather than nearly-complete ones. The overwhelmingly positive response from the survey makes analysis of student reactions relatively straightforward, but improvements to question wording, survey length, and distribution method could all be made if the survey were to be sent out again.

Further limitations came from the time allotted for the design of the park itself. Because the first park was a pilot, simple materials were selected—easily procurable and stackable pallets for seating and green carpet—but I would like future work to be more thoughtful in its design. Investigation into the creation of park furniture from more sustainable materials is a high priority for future work. Perhaps the most difficult piece of this project was the need for me to wear many hats throughout. Setting meetings, collecting data, handling installation, and writing this report have together been an enormous workload. Any kind of collaboration with other project groups—particularly the pop-up Farmer’s Market group—would have been ideal. Working on a project team for future investigations is essential if progress is to be made beyond this point.
This project has been an excellent experience and a great exercise in connecting my interest in urban interventions with the public space and culture of sustainability at Western Michigan University. The response to the pilot Winter Park are extremely encouraging and there are a number of future follow-up projects I hope to engage with following this semester. Recommendations for these projects are divided into ST (short-term) and LT (long-term) as follows:

**ST 1 — Install a second Winter Park in late Fall 2016**

Because of the success of the first Winter Park, I propose a second space be created in a different area of campus. I am currently in the process of meeting with contacts in Sangren Hall about setting up a time for a park to be installed next semester on the second floor near Flossie’s Café. This kind of intervention is quick, cheap, and serves to expose lots of students to the goals described in this report. I have had many students express interest in helping with future work after seeing the first park in the Richmond Center and believe that a second round would go much more smoothly. Proper timing would allow for more serious investigation into sustainable materials.

**ST 2 — Participate in Park(ing) Day at WMU and Downtown in front of PEDAL Bikes**

A quick way to investigate urban interventions outdoors in Kalamazoo is through participation Park(ing) Day. Converting a parking space or two at WMU — perhaps in front of the Bernhard Center or by Miller Auditorium—and one in front of PEDAL into temporary parks could create interest in this work that would funnel back into Winter Parks. PEDAL is a suggested community location for its connection to the sustainability-focused biking community.

**ST 3 — Create Sustainability Space near OFS for mixed-use**

The parking lot beside the Office for Sustainability provides ample room for an urban intervention intended for mixed use programming by the Office and student groups. Creating a space somewhere between a Farmer’s Market and the Winter Park would allow for seating, entertainment, and other varying events while furthering the notion of bettering public space on campus through thoughtful interventions. Additionally, an installation next to the Office would create a spatial stickiness that might introduce students walking past to the campus culture of sustainability.
L2 1 — Sustainable design classes in the College of Fine Art

The School of Art is supposed to be implementing a new degree program in packaging design in the next few years. I suggest that there be a sustainable focus in this program. Though this suggestion is vague, the implementation of sustainable coursework into this new degree’s curriculum would be an excellent step towards university-wide sustainability research.
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Appendix 1—
Current Contact Information

Ed Ryan
(269) 830-8675
edward.ryan@wmich.edu
621 Locust Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Appendix 2—
Contact Log

The following is a log of important points of contact with various faculty and university staff involved in the planning process and includes contact information for those listed.

01/06/2016 email Mindi Bagnall
Sent initial email to Mindi about the usage of the RCVA Lobby

01/08/2016 meeting Mindi Bagnall, Don Desmett
Sat down with Mindi and Don to discuss my proposal and the use of the lobby; they agreed and we looked at dates

01/11/2016 meeting Leon Sun
Met with Leon to discuss the project; Leon agreed to sign the non-degree exhibition form given to me by Mindi and Don

02/05/2016 email Mindi Bagnall
Discussed possibility of installing the park for an entire week; after checking with Don it was confirmed that I would have only two days to execute installation

03/16/2016 email Lou Ann Morgan
Lou sent an email responding to the park installation with suggestions for contacts in Landscaping and other areas.

04/12/2016 meeting Amy L. Burns
Met with Amy to discuss the possibility of an installation of this kind at Sangren, particularly looking at the second floor near Flossie’s. She encouraged me to send over materials to pass along to contacts in Dining Services, who control the space near Flossie’s.
Amy Burns, Sangren Hall Building Coordinator
amy.burns@wmich.edu

Don Desmett, Director of Exhibitions, Richmond Center for Visual Arts
Richmond Center Building Coordinator
donald.desmett@wmich.edu

Lou Ann Morgan, Marketing Specialist Senior Administration, University Libraries
lou.morgan@wmich.edu

Mindi K. Bagnall, Coordinator of Exhibitions, Richmond Center for Visual Arts
Curator, University Art Collection
mindi.bagnall@wmich.edu

Appendix 3—Photos

Winter Park installation in the Richmond Center for Visual Arts
2. Did you see the Winter Park installation while it was up?
   1. Yes
   2. No

3. If yes, for how much time did you engage with and explore the space?
   1. I saw the space and I did not use the space at all
   2. I did not see the space and thus did not use it at all
   3. 1–5 minutes
   4. 11–15 minutes
   5. More than 15 minutes

4. Which factor of the installation do you feel was the most compelling?
   1. The greenery (plants, grass, etc.)
   2. The playfulness (moving through the space)
   3. The interactions (socializing)
   4. The novelty (something new in a familiar place)
   5. Other (do tell!) __________

5. The built environment influences me on a daily basis.
   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neutral
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly Disagree

6. The natural environment influences me on a daily basis.
   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neutral
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly Disagree

7. “We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us.”
   —Winston Churchill. Do you think the same can be said of our campus?
   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neutral
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly Disagree

8. The addition of more vibrant, sustainable outdoor green spaces on WMU’s campus would improve my quality of life.
   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neutral
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly Disagree
9. The Winter Park installation could work if attempted outdoors.
   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neutral
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly Disagree

10. The addition of more vibrant, sustainable indoor green spaces on WMU’s campus would improve my quality of life.
    1. Strongly Agree
    2. Agree
    3. Neutral
    4. Disagree
    5. Strongly Disagree

11. This installation should be repeated at the Richmond Center.
    1. Strongly Agree
    2. Agree
    3. Neutral
    4. Disagree
    5. Strongly Disagree

12. This installation should be repeated at other indoor locations across campus.
    1. Strongly Agree
    2. Agree
    3. Neutral
    4. Disagree
    5. Strongly Disagree

13. If a student, please indicate your academic status
    1. Freshman
    2. Sophomore
    3. Junior
    4. Senior
    5. NA

14. Major / Occupation: ________________

15. What is your gender? ________________

16. Please provide an email address if you wish to hear about further extensions and installations: