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Abstract:
Evaluating training and tools used in research is a valuable approach to determine reliability, type-3 errors, and areas of improvement. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the ease of use and the effectiveness of the Healthy Campus Environmental Audits (HCEA) training, quizzes and tools utilized in the GetFRUVED social media intervention study.

Methods: Data collection was completed in spring 2018. The quiz attempts and results were tracked for data collectors who completed training certification. A 39-question web-based survey designed and pilot-tested for this study was administered online to 88 GetFRUVED participating schools. The survey questions assessed demographics, training materials, training platforms, quizzes, and each specific HCEA audit tool. The survey collected both Likert scale [1-low to 5-high] and qualitative data; analysis included non-parametric statistics.

Results: Participants included 163 individuals, with 51.3% being undergraduate research assistants. A sizeable number of participants (48.8%) spent 1-2 hours on audit training and a majority (66%) viewed the training while taking the quiz. Participants agreed/strongly agreed the audit training was easy to use (72%), interactive and engaging (60%) and effectively prepared them to take the quiz (65%). Participants agreed/strongly agreed the HCEA audit was easy to access (83%) and accurately reflected the audited environment (77%). Only 26.1% of participants used e-mobile software to collect the data in the field, but of that 77.8% stated it was easy/very easy to use. Of the 62 submitted strengths/benefits open-ended responses, 31% indicated HCEA audit tool was easy to use. Of the 58 improvement comments, 16% had technology issues while using the audits; 38% wouldn’t make any changes to the HCEA audit tool.

Conclusion: The HCEA training and audit tools can be useful and reliable in future projects, but some stopgaps between training and quizzes should be added to decrease potential type-3 errors. Improvements to the platform could reduce technology issues.
Executive Summary

The following research displays the process evaluation of the Healthy Campus Environmental Audits (HCEA). The HCEA occurred within the GetFRUVED project, a USDA research endeavor lead by the University of Tennessee. The HCE Audits were developed and lead by Dr. Tanya Horacek at Syracuse University and executed on college campuses across the country. The HCEA comprised of data collection for dining, stores, vending, walkability/bike-ability, recreation facilities/services, and policy environments.

After completing data collection for the HCEA for the GetFRUVED project, the Syracuse University research team chose to execute a process evaluation of the environmental audits in spring 2018. This included securing IRB approval, completing a literature review regarding survey best practices, constructing a process evaluation survey, deciding on methods of survey dissemination, participants’ survey reminders and completion incentives, collecting data from HCEA users, and evaluating the final data.

A process evaluation is a type of research that analyzes the method of data collection of a completed study in order to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses. It is a very helpful field of investigation because it provides insights as to what parts of the data collection process work well and what aspects need improvement. A weakness of this type of study is that it is typically done after initial data collection is completed, so it may help to explain results but might not affect future data collection. Regardless, providing process evaluations to the general body of research allows future researchers to build better studies.

IRB approval for this study was obtained with exempt status from Syracuse University. The process evaluation was built on Qualtrics. Questions were written based on prior research findings, including variables specific to the HCEA tools. An interesting aspect of this research...
was that it was conducted across the country. Students were trained to use HCEA tools, and then these tools were used in the field at universities and one high school to collect data. The process evaluation investigated the accessibility and effectiveness in the audit training and tools. The population surveyed in this study were primarily research assistants who completed HCEA training and collected data with any one of the tools.

The process evaluation survey was sent to research assistants via e-mail. Participants were asked for informed consent and were placed in a drawing for one of ten $25 gift certificates upon survey completion. A challenge of this study was reaching participants and reminding them to complete the survey. In spite of this, 163 individuals responded resulting in a 29% response rate. The data collected was reverse coded where necessary, institutions were classified by regions, and survey data was analyzed using non-parametric statistics via SPSS (a data analysis software).

This data was broken into three tables. Table 1 displays the time spent on training, practice and quiz. Table 2 displays the summary of training, audit and platform. And finally, Table 3 shows open ended responses to survey questions.

Key findings of this investigation include the strength of stopgaps in training tools, the preference and efficiency of sharing materials (such as the trainings, data collection tools, and process evaluation survey itself) over web-based platforms, and the difficulty of ensuring that all research participants are adequately trained.

Limitations of this study included the low response rate, largely due to the fact that the research using the HCEA tools occurred over four years at college institutions. It is very likely that some audit users had graduated at the time of process evaluation survey administration. A way to improve both the response rate and the usefulness of the feedback would be to have
HCEA users complete the process evaluation in tandem with audit data collection.

Additional research from this study could be identifying the way audit findings effect subsequent policy changes post publishing. The findings of this study could also be used to improve upon HCEA tools, utilizing an updated process evaluation in tandem with new training and tool usage.

Process evaluation studies are particularly valuable as they reflect on areas of improvement for research projects. A criticism of research in general is that the evaluation portion, post research and publication, largely falls by the wayside. This research combats that by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the HCEA training and audit platforms.
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1. Introduction:

The Healthy Campus Environmental Audits (HCEA) are a comprehensive series of six audits evaluating dining, stores, vending, walkability/bike-ability, recreation facilities/services and policies to understand the full effect of the campus environment on health (1-6). The individual audits, supported by evidence-based research, focus on environmental factors that influence individual behavior relating to health promotion, food/dining decisions, physical activity education, and infrastructure. HCEA provides data to document, monitor, and advocate for changes to environmental and policy supports that facilitate health promotion.

Beyond colleges and universities, HCEA can be used for a variety of settings such as worksites, schools, hospitals, and communities. Each individual audit consists of approximately 15-25 items, each scored on a differential scale ranging from limited healthfulness environmental support evidence to extensive healthfulness environmental support evidence. Each audit was developed and reviewed by experts from 15 universities across the United States. All audits include online instructions and training via a password-protected website (CourseSites). An audit user completes training, a comprehension quiz, and audit practice prior to commencing official data collection. Audit data is collected using two programs. An online survey program (Qualtrics) and a web-based tool for the WALK/BIKE audit. These programs can be accessed using mobile devices as well as computers.

The specific audits include the following:

- The Full Restaurant Evaluation Supporting a Healthy (FRESH) Dining Environment Audit. This assesses dining halls and a variety of restaurant types regarding the healthfulness of the foods and the supports for choosing healthy options (1).
• Supportive Healthy Environment for Life-promoting Food (SHELF): A Simple Convenience Store Audit. This assesses the supports for individuals to choose healthy items and the healthfulness of foods at dollar stores, bodegas, drug stores and corner stores (2).

• Vending Evaluation for Nutrient-Density (VEND)ing Audit assesses vending machines accessibility; and vended product healthfulness, price, and promotion (3).

• Physical Activity Campus Environmental Supports (PACES) Audit evaluates recreational facilities, services and programs that support health and physical activity (4).

• WALK/BIKE audit assesses the walkability and bikeability of a campus and the surrounding area regarding path accessibility, safety, aesthetics, path size, etc (5).

• Policies, Opportunities, Initiatives and Notable Topics (POINTS) Audit assesses the health and wellness policies and initiatives for the full campus settings via a web-based search (6).

Beyond reliability and validity testing, there is limited research regarding the fidelity of environmental audit tools (7,8). It has been determined that checking feasibility and usability of a tool is important (9-11). Existing process evaluation environmental research focuses on the factors affecting the efficacy of an environment intervention (12-15) as opposed to an evaluation of environmental audit viability and audit training effectiveness (16-18). Some have assessed stakeholder perspective (19-21); however integrative validity using a bottom up approach to assess viable validity is necessary (22). Viable validity collects the view of the practitioner to assist in the external validation (21,22). The integrative validity then includes efficacy, effectiveness and viability (22). For complex investigations, process evaluations can be
especially helpful in identifying where uncontrolled and emergent factors can influence overall success (23,24).

A process evaluation study completed by Williams, et al. examined the effectiveness of environmental health risk audits to reduce alcohol-related violence. The study found that collaborative approaches, in addition to long implementation periods relate to more confidence among those being trained (13). Another study, completed by Helitzer, et al. observed that process evaluations in general should provide feedback via structured, highly quantitative tools rather than qualitative methods in order to produce the best feedback for the context in which tools are used (25).

Development and implementation processes are important in influencing reach, fidelity and receipt of participants (13). Methods used in previous process evaluation research includes phone interviews, in-person interviews, online surveys, open-ended questions, and multiple-choice questions. Online support was preferable for troubleshooting any issues or questions regarding evaluation tools compared to in-person support. However, a casual atmosphere for interviewing, using pictures as visual aids, and adapting opened-ended questions were also effective in evaluations (11,19).

In designing such a process evaluation, it is best to consider ease of administration for improved response rate. In a study of 362 participants, 249 completed surveys were returned (11). Of this, 209 chose to complete the online version of the study. Incentives offered for completing included candies and chocolate. Additionally, in-person participation reminders were communicated to ensure completion. Process evaluation questions were incorporated at the end of the survey to understand if marketing and promotion strategies helped encourage participant response rate. Furthermore, the process evaluation questions focused on the users’ experience
with the web-tool, including ease of use and length of time dedicated to the survey. This study found that web-based surveys can be a useful mode of administration (11). Collecting opinions from participants who have used the HCEA is essential to improving the audit tools and trainings because participants are able to provide a unique perspective separate from that of the research team (11). Previous research has shown that participants tend to appreciate open-ended questions as an opportunity to provide their opinions without the restriction of multiple choice options (19). In such cases, it is important when posing multiple choice and open-ended questions, to be clear so that the participant understands the question (15). When an evaluation tool is well designed, the efficiency and effectiveness of that tool will improve (13).

The effectiveness of an audit can also be measured in policy changes. In an English study documenting the effects of a health check program on cardiovascular disease (CVD) prevention, an audit was developed and implemented to measure the effect of the health checks on CVD diagnosis. Results from the audit displayed discrepancies in the way health checks diagnosed CVD compared to national diagnoses. From this data, the health check program is undergoing further development and refinement to better address health check training discrepancies before reimplementation (18).

The HCEA environmental audits have been used by hundreds of people across the United States. Investigating users’ experience and opinions regarding the quality of the training and audit tools is valuable as it leads to process enhancement; it can help identify what strategies were successful and should be repeated in future studies and which could be improved (24). The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the HCEA audit tools and student researcher training through the use of a process evaluation survey. The significance of this
evaluation is to determine the factors that will improve audit tools and training methods for future research.

2. Methods:

2.1 Study Design:

A process evaluation survey was designed to evaluate the opinions of researchers and student data collectors with regard to the HCEA tools and training materials. The purpose of the survey was to determine the effectiveness of the training curriculum in preparing individuals to complete the environmental audits, as well as the effectiveness of the audits on measuring the environmental variables. The evaluation survey questions were designed to address both parts.

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained with exempt status given this was a survey regarding environmental assessments. Data was collected spring 2018.

2.2 Participants:

The participants invited to complete the process evaluation survey were individuals who had previously utilized the HCEA training and tools. The participants all had enrolled in an HCEA Course Sites account and had previous experience in the GetFRUVED study. Participants included high school students, undergraduate and graduate students, PhD candidates, and both high school and collegiate faculty members from across the United States.

2.3 Survey Development Process:

A web-based survey was developed and pilot-tested. The literature was reviewed prior to question development. Questions were drafted to evaluate the effectiveness of the platform,
training curriculum, and the specific HCEA audits. Each of the survey questions were approved by group consensus. Questions were evaluated for relevance, clarity, and originality (to ensure there was not repetition among the questions). The survey was drafted three times, undergoing review and expert feedback between each draft.

2.4 Survey items:

Eighteen of the 39 questions developed were Likert Scale: strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Seventeen questions requested survey takers to check the most appropriate category and two were open-ended questions (A1). The demographic questions considered the survey completer’s: institution, institutional designation in FRUVED (control or experimental), role at the university (student, etc.), and audits performed. No identifiable information was collected. Participants also identified which specific audit they were evaluating.

Participants selected one audit (FRESH, SHELF, VENDING, PACES, WALK/BIKE, or POINTS) they used to continue the survey. At the end of the survey, participants could decide to complete another evaluation regarding a different HCEA tool they used.

For each audit: the first half of the evaluation survey assessed the audit training curriculum provided via Versal and PDF documents embedded within the Course Sites platform. Questions assessed the amount of time participants devoted to learning the material, and the ease of using the training website. Participants ranked the curriculum for ease of understanding; interactivity and engagement; and effectiveness for preparing them for the quiz and data collection.

Participants evaluated the training quiz, which assessed training comprehension prior to data collection. Participants indicated the time they devoted to taking the quiz, and the number
attempts required to pass the quiz with the minimum score of 80% (the minimum passing score) or higher [A1].

The second half of the evaluation survey for each audit addressed whether the audit tools facilitated accurate measurement of the environment. These questions also assessed the ease of understanding, ease of access to the audit and the environmental location being audited. The audit questions were assessed for clarity, logical order, and complexity. In general, the full audit was assessed for how accurately it reflected the environment being audited. Participants indicated if they used web-based access for data collection in the field and if so, ranked the ease of use. Participants also recorded questions for the Syracuse University team and rated the level of support they received [A1].

The two open-ended questions allowed participants the opportunity to provide comment on: 1) what they believed to be the strengths of the audit, and 2) what changes, if any, they would make to the audit.

2.5 Survey administration:

Emails were sent to all FRUVED study researchers enrolled on Course Sites who had accessed the audits of the FRUVED study. The e-mail requested that they complete the survey. It was made clear that participation was entirely voluntary. Upon consent, participants followed a link to complete the web-based survey via Qualtrics. Participants were informed of the purpose of the survey, what the survey would entail, risks and benefits of completion, assurance of confidentiality, and administrator contact information [A2].

After two-weeks, a second email was sent encouraging researchers to participate in the survey if they had not already done so. The survey link remained available for one month.
Researchers who chose to participate were entered in a drawing for one of ten $25 gift certificates as compensation.

2.6 Quiz Attempts:

The quiz attempt and pass rate data for HCEA Audit was tallied from Course Sites results.

2.7 Analysis:

Data was reverse coded where necessary. Institutions were classified by regions. Survey data was analyzed using non-parametric statistics via SPSS.
3. Results

Participants included 163 individuals (29% response rate); 51.3% underclass research assistants, followed by 24.7% faculty/staff and 24% graduate students. Most participants represented the Southeast region 37.5%, followed by Northeast 25%, Midwest 21.5%, Northwest 13.2% and finally the Southwest 2.8%. Seventy-five percent (n=123) of the participants evaluated at least one audit. Most participants evaluated FRESH followed by PACES and VENDing (Table 1). There were no significant differences in results between audit type, so all results were combined. Most participants (48.8%) spent 1-2 hours on training for their audit. Fairly equal percentages (@ 33%) spent either 15-30 minutes or 30-60 minutes on their quiz. Majority (67%) viewed the training while taking the quiz. More than a third (36%) practiced data collection once, and almost 30% practiced twice, but 14% did not practice at all before collecting data. Less than a third passed their quiz in one attempt (29.6%), 31.3% passed on the second attempt. For the combined 1-2 times pass rate, FRESH (48%) and VENDing (39.5%) had the lowest overall pass rates compared to the remaining four audits: POINTS (78.8%), WALK/BIKE (78%), SHELF (69.8%), PACES (68%).
Table 1: Time spent on Training, Practice and Quiz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of training</th>
<th>Frequency % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESH</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELF</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENDing</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACES</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALK/BIKE POINTS</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POINTS</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on audit training</th>
<th>Frequency % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>7.2% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 hour</td>
<td>20% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>48.8% (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>19.2% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hours</td>
<td>1.6% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+ hours</td>
<td>3.2% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on quiz</th>
<th>Frequency % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 min</td>
<td>11.5% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 min</td>
<td>33.6% (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60 min</td>
<td>32.8% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60 min</td>
<td>9.0% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>13.1% (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referenced training during quiz</th>
<th>Frequency % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67% (75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice times before data collection</th>
<th>Frequency % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>14% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>36% (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>29.8% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>13.2% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>4.4% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 5 times</td>
<td>2.6% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiz attempts before passing (≥80%) – Course site results (N=776)</th>
<th>Frequency % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>29.6% (230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>31.3% (243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>17.3% (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>10.8% (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 5 times</td>
<td>11.0 % (85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 2: Participants agreed/strongly agreed the audit training was easy to use (72%), understandable (67%), interactive and engaging (60%) and effectively prepared them to take the quiz (65%) (Table 2). Participants agreed/strongly agreed the HCEA audit was easy to access (83%), understandable (75%) and accurately reflected the audited environment (77%). Participants rated the audit to have an average/appropriate level of complexity 2.52 ± 1.06.

Over 75% of participants agreed/strongly agreed the questions asked on the audits were ordered logically. Additionally, 38.9% agreed/strongly agreed that the audit was confusing at times. Finally, 26.1% of respondents used e-mobile to collect the data in the field, and 77.8% of those who used e-mobile rated it easy/very easy to use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCEA Training</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.76 ± 0.96</td>
<td>2.4 (3)</td>
<td>8.9 (11)</td>
<td>17.1 (21)</td>
<td>52.0 (64)</td>
<td>19.5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.58 ± 1.06</td>
<td>2.4 (3)</td>
<td>15.4 (19)</td>
<td>14.6 (18)</td>
<td>50.4 (62)</td>
<td>17.1 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive and engaging</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.53 ± 0.97</td>
<td>1.6 (2)</td>
<td>12.2 (15)</td>
<td>26.0 (32)</td>
<td>45.5 (56)</td>
<td>14.6 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lot of questions</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.03 ± 1.02</td>
<td>6.5 (8)</td>
<td>24.4 (30)</td>
<td>28.5 (35)</td>
<td>35.8 (44)</td>
<td>4.9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively prepared for the quiz</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.52 ± 1.12</td>
<td>5.7 (7)</td>
<td>10.7 (13)</td>
<td>18.9 (23)</td>
<td>49.2 (60)</td>
<td>15.6 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately reflected the audit</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.70 ± 0.99</td>
<td>2.4 (3)</td>
<td>8.9 (11)</td>
<td>20.3 (25)</td>
<td>50.4 (62)</td>
<td>17.9 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs represented environment</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.62 ± 0.94</td>
<td>2.4 (3)</td>
<td>10.6 (13)</td>
<td>26.0 (33)</td>
<td>46.3 (57)</td>
<td>13.8 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared for interactions during audit</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.31 ± 1.04</td>
<td>5.0 (6)</td>
<td>15.8 (19)</td>
<td>35.8 (43)</td>
<td>34.2 (41)</td>
<td>9.2 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples like those encountered</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.62 ± 0.87</td>
<td>0.8 (1)</td>
<td>10.0 (12)</td>
<td>27.5 (33)</td>
<td>48.3 (58)</td>
<td>13.3 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCEA Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily accessible</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.08 ± 0.81</td>
<td>0.8 (1)</td>
<td>5.0 (6)</td>
<td>11.6 (14)</td>
<td>54.5 (66)</td>
<td>28.1 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.86 ± 0.86</td>
<td>0.8 (1)</td>
<td>6.6 (8)</td>
<td>18.2 (22)</td>
<td>53.7 (65)</td>
<td>20.7 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logically ordered</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.94 ± 0.82</td>
<td>0.9 (1)</td>
<td>5.1 (6)</td>
<td>16.2 (19)</td>
<td>54.7 (64)</td>
<td>23.1 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing at times</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.11 ± 0.96</td>
<td>3.4 (4)</td>
<td>25.0 (29)</td>
<td>32.8 (38)</td>
<td>34.5 (40)</td>
<td>4.3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective of the environment</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.91 ± 0.79</td>
<td>0.9 (1)</td>
<td>4.3 (5)</td>
<td>17.9 (21)</td>
<td>57.3 (67)</td>
<td>19.7 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of audit questions</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.91 ± 0.79</td>
<td>0.9 (1)</td>
<td>4.3 (5)</td>
<td>17.9 (21)</td>
<td>57.3 (67)</td>
<td>19.7 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of audit questions</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.52 ± 1.06</td>
<td>15.4 (14)</td>
<td>26.5 (31)</td>
<td>46.2 (54)</td>
<td>9.4 (11)</td>
<td>2.6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used e-mobile for data entry a</td>
<td>26. 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>Somewhat difficult</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Very Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of mobile entry b</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.17 ± 1.08</td>
<td>5.6 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7 (6)</td>
<td>27.8 (10)</td>
<td>50.0 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent a question to HCEA Team -Yes</td>
<td>35. 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit team able to answer my questions</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.83 ± 0.93</td>
<td>1.7 (2)</td>
<td>7.8 (9)</td>
<td>18.3 (21)</td>
<td>49.6 (57)</td>
<td>22.6 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit team provided timely answer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.89 ± 0.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7 (3)</td>
<td>26.7 (12)</td>
<td>37.8 (17)</td>
<td>28.9 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible facilities for data collection</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.18 ± 0.90</td>
<td>0.9 (1)</td>
<td>6.2 (7)</td>
<td>8.8 (10)</td>
<td>42.5 (48)</td>
<td>41.6 (47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a scale of 1 (not complex enough) to 5 (too complex)

b scale of 1 (very difficult) to 5 (very easy)
Table 3 summarizes the open-ended responses. Of the participants who commented, 38% indicated they found the audit tools practical and easy to use and 20.6% wrote tools were thorough, detailed and varied. Seventeen percent of comments referenced audit and results relatability and applicability. Some participant comments related to the individual audits. While 39.6% of the participant comments indicated no changes were necessary to the audit tool, some 18.9% had issues with the audit technology and a few found the audits were too subjective, affecting representativeness (10.3%). A few participants 8.6% expressed the audit questions or the quiz questions were unclear. A few participants expressed specific concerns regarding how reflective the FRESH and WALK/BIKE audits were in comparison to the environment being audited.

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS (n=63)</th>
<th>Practical, easy to use (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is a practical assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Written instructions with examples/consistent (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simple (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very organized, easy to navigate, and short/streamlined (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ease of use/understandable (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good/nicely prepared/layout (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The verbal training prepared me for the quiz and the audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety / Thorough / Detailed</td>
<td>• It covers all the concerns extensively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 13)</td>
<td>• Thorough (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variety of questions/information/broad (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions covered the environment, even details that I would have not thought important/detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• They examine important components of health on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adds comprehensive assessment of the campus environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable / Relatable (N = 11)</td>
<td>• Opens up your mind to your surroundings and food availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It makes you dig deep into the happenings of the campus and examine more closely how things are run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• You learn a lot of facts you did not know about or pay attention to before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helpful to see issues or good portions on campus regarding healthy vending, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- You learn more about your school strengths and weaknesses through the audits
- Matched the parts of my school well
- I like the idea of assessing the campus health environment. This allows us to better support students in making healthier lifestyle choices
- Evaluating campus safety and accessibility is extremely important
- I thought that it was a collaborative effort in both learning about our campus and learning research skills
- I loved the information we received back. The students enjoyed the process
- Able to make a difference on the campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of Technology</th>
<th>Ease of remote access. Able to write in comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N = 5)</td>
<td>Easy to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to input data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to use online (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N = 3)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESH Audit (N = 6)</th>
<th>Good tool to use and had options for all combinations of offerings at the dining locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples and pictures were a great reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think there was a good variety of questions, which is good to get an overall view of each dining establishment and really show strengths and weaknesses of that establishment in terms of promoting or demoting healthy food options (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It collected an accurate collection of data for the majority of food available on and around campus at restaurants affordable by the majority of students (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vending Audit (N = 2)</th>
<th>It had most of the vending machine items (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WALK/BIKE Audit (N=1)</th>
<th>Using the mapping tool is simple and straightforward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTIONS (n=58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (N = 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None /None that I can think of (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have any suggestions/ OK (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Issues (N =11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would definitely do it on an I pad next time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish the HCEA audit tool could be completed by 2 people, we had to use a google doc and then have 1 person enter all the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needing to have internet access particularly for bike/walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It could be easier for students to access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially all in one platform would be helpful. When we did them, they were on so many different ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students found it difficult to enter data in and the website kept freezing and we kept having to start over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questions on the PDF version did not always line up with the Qualtrics questions asked when we were entering the data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. A summary or a way to review info prior to final submission would be useful. 2. I would have liked the option to print a summary of the final data submitted.

- It would have been nice if there was a way to save items. I had to constantly enter a ton of items not listed. (2)
- Make it easier to ask questions

### Representative (N = 6)

- Content
- Availability
- The settings did not capture all of our good settings. It was very irrelevant
- The biggest thing I took away from this audit was that the questions were too subjective. For example, we mapped a nature trail therefore things like sidewalks, lighting, etc would not be expected to be there. But I felt that some areas like that graded lower because the questions were subjective.
- Could be more realistic to actual auditing environments
- Some questions were redundant

### Confusing / Unclear (N = 5)

- Clarify the one confusing question
- Rationale to questions
- Clarify how to answer if none of the possible answers apply to the situation.
- have way more detail about what it is asking specifically. Some questions are very subjective.
- I can’t remember much. But in know I had some difficulties getting started in the beginning- in trying to navigate the different sections

### Quiz Concerns (N = 5)

- The quiz was too difficult and at times confusing.
- reasoning for why a question is wrong (2)
- Requiring a quiz prior to audit collection was a good idea but make the content and quiz clearer as to what you are asking. It wasn't until I took the quiz that I started to understand what was needed.
- More direct examples of the quiz questions and how to answer them

### Too simple (N = 3)

- Make it more complex
- Some descriptions could be explained in a bigger depth
- More flexibility in your answers

### Too detailed / difficult (N = 3)

- It was pretty in depth
- Easier and simpler
- Too much information at once. We needed more practice

### FRESH Audit (N = 5)

- The audit tool could be more objective. The "overall healthfulness of a menu" is different to each person. Some foods/cooking methods may be considered healthy by one person, and unhealthy by another.
- I don't really think I would change much because there was a good variety of questions. However, it was a little hard to use when I completed an audit at a local coffee shop just because not all the information on the audit really applied to that particular establishment. But as a whole, I thought the audit did a nice job of assessing the restaurants.
- More education and definitions when auditing pizza and "healthy" sandwich shops. (2)
- Some of the terminology seemed counterintuitive to how foodservice is set up at our university. For example, at our student center we have what most
would probably call a food court, but since each has its own register the audit didn't consider it a food court.

| Walkability/Bike-ability Audit (N = 2) | • need to change the map tool to see the roads that need to be evaluated (2) |
4. Discussion

Research examining the effectiveness of audit and training methods is important to finding efficient ways to improve such processes. It helps determine reliability, type-3 errors, and areas of improvement. This research evaluated the effectiveness of the HCEA audit tools specifically through the administration of a process evaluation survey. It identified that online training and audit tools are effective and user-friendly in spite of small drawbacks.

As consistent with other studies, completing the process evaluation via web survey allowed participants to share their thoughts (11). Overall user satisfaction was high in terms of training and audit ease of use, preparedness, and accurate reflection of audit environments. However, some technology issues were established from responses, such as users having connectivity issues with the audit tool. This result is consistent with other process evaluation research (11). Many of the technology issues listed indicated that the problem was not entirely with Course Sites and Versal, the platforms training was completed on. Instead, comments suggested that making training/audit tools more accessible while in the field was most needed. This aligns with previously completed research stating that online data collection is efficient and in many cases preferred by individuals (7-9).

A way to increase data collectors’ preparedness could be to improve engagement in training. The multimodal resources used created a barrier for users to get to their intended resource. A more accessible e-mobile site, with fewer barriers to entry, may be easier to use and lead to more accurate data collected (11). Ultimately, the development of an app may be preferential to the use of e-mobile sites such as Versal or Course Sites (11). Offering a variety of access options is most ideal as it allows users to select their preferences given their technology tool availability and would increase participation (11,19).
Regardless of the training medium, including stopgaps could ensure that participants must cover each benchmark before moving on to the next portion of training. Such stopgaps could take the form of releasing the next part of the HCEA process on the website once a quiz has been completed and passed; or making trainings inaccessible while a participant is taking a quiz. It may be beneficial to have those completing audit trainings self-record their completion and then compare this to the time actually spent via administrator view on Course Sites. Tracking how many participants completed the training and how long they spent on training would allow researchers to compare data collector’s preparedness against actual time spent completing trainings. In the work by Reynolds, et al., this method was used to complete the process evaluation (15). In general, better oversight of student research assistants by a more senior member of the research team at each institution might also be an effective way to ensure students are completing each step. Many studies have displayed the importance of sufficient dedication of time to training in order for the training to be effective (16, 17).

To improve how well the audit reflects the environment, questions could be changed to diminish subjectivity, making them more reflective of different campus environments. As HCEA researchers were across the country, this led to a diversity of areas in which data was collected, meaning the questions were possibly not accounting for all environments. These discrepancies were particularly true for the FRESH and WALK/BIKE audits. Valuable feedback was provided via this process evaluation to direct revisions of the HCEAs. Future data collection and processing could focus on environment specifics such as if schools were in a city or suburb and if the university is private or public. Allowing for additional open-ended comments within each HCEA during data collection will also give audit users an avenue to document the differences on their campus.
Audit effectiveness can also be tracked via policy changes (18). An interesting way to expand this work would be to track campus policy changes implemented as a result of HCEA administration and feedback. This could help to further validate the effectiveness of the audit tools and allow for the investigation of health environment policy changes on actual environment users’ health.

A limitation of this study included difficulty in recruiting participants. Some past studies reported high response rates as high as 69% after utilizing multiple modes of survey completion including paper, online, and in-person interaction (11). Other multi-institution studies have recorded response rates below 20%, indicating that getting users to complete surveys can be difficult and that survey response rates are highly variable (26,27). Given the HCEA tools were accessed by over 500 researchers over a four-year time frame, indicates high use, but the low-response rate provided only a snapshot of the potential feedback. In this time, some research assistants might have graduated, and some responders indicated they could not remember specifics. A set of email reminders were utilized but were insufficient (11). To improve response rate, another option for continued research is the implementation of process evaluation survey simultaneously and immediately following training and audit completion. This would allow users to provide more relevant and applied suggestions to the training and audits in real time. Those results could be compared to the results collected in this study and would display the differences in user perspective of the tools after different time frames of disuse.

5. Conclusion

The HCEA training and data collection tools were ultimately successful. The trainings effectively taught data collectors how to utilize the audits while the audits themselves allowed
researchers to easily collect valuable data on campus environments. A majority of users found the tools easy to use and intuitive. The conducted process evaluation, covering six separate trainings and audit tools was effective in identifying both areas for improvement and strengths of the HCEA studies.
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## Appendix
### [A1] Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>Agree to participate/Do not agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is the name of your college/university or high school?</td>
<td>Choose from selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Was your campus an intervention or control site?</td>
<td>Intervention/Control/Do not know/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What is your role on campus?</td>
<td>High school student/Undergraduate student/Graduate student/PhD candidate/Faculty or staff/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What year are you in school</td>
<td>Freshman/Sophomore/Junior/Senior/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I completed the following audit training(s) on the Versal website. (select all that apply)</td>
<td>FRESH/SHELF/VENDING/PACES/POINTS/WALK/BIKE/I did not complete Versal training audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>For the rest of the survey, pick one audit that you completed and answer the remaining survey questions based on your experience in that one audit. Select from the list below which audit you have picked:</td>
<td>FRESH/SHELF/VENDING/PACES/POINTS/WALK/BIKE/I did not complete Versal training audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How long did you spend on the Versal audit training?</td>
<td>&lt;1hr/102hr/3-4hr/5-6hr/7+hr/ I did not complete Versal training audits/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Versal audit training was easy to use.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Versal audit training content was easy to understand.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Versal audit training material was interactive and engaging.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I had a lot of questions after I completed the Versal audit training.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Versal audit training accurately reflected the audit.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The photographs used in the Versal audit training accurately represented the environments I audited.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Versal audit training prepared me for social interactions with employees at the facilities I audited.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Versal training was effective in preparing me for taking the HCEA quiz.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>What are the strengths of the Versal audit training?</td>
<td>Open response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>What improvements, if any, could be made to this Versal audit training?</td>
<td>Open response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The sample situations provided in the HCEA quiz on CourseSites were similar to those that I encountered while collecting data.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>How long did you spend on the HCEA quiz for this audit?</td>
<td>&lt;15 minutes/15-30 min/30-60 min/&gt;60 min/I don’t remember/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Did you reference the Versal audit training while completing the HCEA quiz?</td>
<td>Yes/No/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>How many times did you take the HCEA quiz before passing (80% or higher)?</td>
<td>1 time/2 times/3 times/4 times/5+ times/I don’t remember/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Why do you think you had to take the survey more than four times? (select all that apply)</td>
<td>I did not complete the training/The trainings did not adequately prepare me for the quiz/The quiz was too difficult/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>How many times did you practice using the HCEA audit before data collection?</td>
<td>1 time/2 times/3 times/4 times/5+ times/I didn’t practice/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I was able to easily access the Qualtrics survey for this HCEA audit.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The HCEA audit was easy to understand.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Did you use a smartphone or i-pad/tablet to enter data into the Qualtrics survey while at a site collecting data?</td>
<td>Yes/No/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>How would you rate the ease of mobile entry?</td>
<td>Very easy/Somewhat easy/Neutral/Somewhat difficult/Very difficult/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The HCEA audit questions were ordered logically.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The questions in the HCEA audit were confusing at times.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Using the slider scale, rank the complexity of the HCEA audit questions (0 being not complex enough and 5 being too complex).</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I could gain access to all the facilities assigned to me for data collection.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The HCEA audit questions were reflective of the environment that I evaluated.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The audit team at my school could answer most, if not all, of the questions I had about data collection and this HCEA audit tool.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Did you send questions to the HCEA Team at Syracuse University?</td>
<td>Yes/No/Choose not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The HCEA Team was able to answer my questions in a timely manner</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>What are the strengths of the HCEA audit?</td>
<td>Open response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>What changes, if any, could be made to this HCEA audit tool?</td>
<td>Open response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Did you use another HCEA audit and are willing to evaluate it?</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Thank you for completing this survey! Enter your name and school email address for a chance to win one of ten $25.00 gift cards.</td>
<td>Open response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[A2] Consent Form

**Healthy Campus Environmental Audit Evaluation Study**

**Informed Consent:** You are invited to take part in a research project described below. You are invited because you have used the Healthy Campus Environmental Audits (HCEA) through FRUVED or another avenue this past year. The purpose of the research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the HCEA system, training and tools. Tanya Horacek, PhD, RD the lead conducting this study will be glad to answer any questions you may have. You can call her at 315-443-9323 or email her at the study email hcea@syr.edu. **You must be at least 18 years old to be in this research project.**

**Description of the project:** This study consists of taking a survey that is about 15 minutes long.

**What will be done:** If you decide to participate, you will complete this online survey. Your name will be entered into a drawing for one of ten $25.00 gift cards for completing the survey. You must indicate your agreement to participate and that you are at least 18 years of age to access the survey.

**Risks or discomfort:** The survey should take about 15 minutes to complete and the questions being asked should not pose any discomfort. If any question poses discomfort, simply select the "Choose not to answer" response to that question.

**Benefits of this study:** Although you will not receive any benefits, the results of this study will help us assess the usefulness and effectiveness of the HCEA training and tools and will help us to make the necessary changes.

**Confidentiality:** Although you will provide your email as part of the survey to be entered into the drawing, that information will be removed from your survey responses before data are analyzed. Your participation is recorded for purposes of picking 10 winners in the drawing.
part in this study is confidential; however, you should understand that any form of communication over the internet does carry a minimal loss of confidentiality. *Whenever one works with the internet there is always the risk of compromising privacy, confidentiality and/or anonymity. Your confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology being used. It is important for you to understand that no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the internet by third parties.* None of the information that will be analyzed will identify you by name. The unidentifiable data will be stored on password-protected computers in the Department of Public Health, Food Studies and Nutrition at Syracuse University for at least 3 years.

**Decision to quit at any time:** The decision to take part in this study is up to you. You do not have to participate; your participation is voluntary. If you decide to take part in the study, you may quit at any time. You have the right to stop participating at any time, but once data have been entered and verified and the link between participant and code has been destroyed, we will not be able to remove your data. If you wish to quit, simply inform Tanya M. Horacek at 315-443-9323 or hcea@syr.edu of your decision.

**Ongoing Research:** This is part of ongoing research being conducted by the HCEA team at Syracuse University.

**Rights and Complaints:** If you are not satisfied with the way this study is performed or have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may discuss your complaints. Feel free to contact Dr. Tanya Horacek, the person in charge of the study, (315)443-9323 or you may contact the Office of Research Integrity and Protections 214 Lyman Hall 315-443-2013 or orip@syr.edu

**You have read this Consent Form. Your questions have been answered.**

Checking “I agree to participate” on this form means that you understand the information in this explanation of the study, and you agree to complete the survey and allow your data to be used for research. Please note that you must be at least 18 years of age in order to participate.