The Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research

Program Activities

Summary of Fiscal Year 2019-2020

Presented to the College

Final Version

August 2020

Matthew Archibald, Director Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research

Omar Nagi, Director, Undergraduate Research Program

Please do disseminate or cite without the authors' written consent

Table of Contents

The Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research:
Annual Report 2019-2020

Fishlinger Center: A Brief History

In February 2015, the College of Mount Saint Vincent announced the creation of the Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research. With funds generously contributed by William Fishlinger, a trustee of the College, the Center was designed to study public policy issues through independent and objective research conducted by students, faculty, and other members of the academic community. A distinctive feature of this Center was the Polling Center.

In its early years, under leadership of the advisory board chair, Provost Guy Lometti, and Director James Donius, the Center undertook a series of projects aimed at drawing attention to the College, by conducting ongoing nation-wide polling on topics such as human trafficking, health care, poverty, domestic violence, drug addiction, education and the environment. These studies were intended to provide faculty and students hands-on experience with survey design, data collection, and research analysis.

After experimentation with different approaches to polling and analysis, the Polling Center coalesced around a continuous/annual public opinion poll investigating Americans' sociopolitical and economic attitudes, expectations, beliefs and values. The Fishlinger Optimism Index was developed as a key component of these annual surveys. The Fishlinger Optimism is a measure of public opinion centered on Americans' attitudes about current and future sociopolitical and economic issues. It is derived from nationally representative data about trust in public officials, social/political issues, beliefs about the United States' place in the world, and a series of value statements dealing with individuals' feelings of success and security, among other issues.

Original Mission

The Fishlinger Center's mission is to illuminate public opinion on key public policy and social issues through independent empirical research that will serve as a vehicle for meaningful dialogue and constructive action. The Center's research is intended to elevate and extend the College's recognition, by positioning it as a reliable, if not, premier, source of current public opinion research and analysis. These core goals will enhance the reciprocal relationship between the College, its students, faculty, administration, alumni and the broader regional community. Alongside the Center's contribution to scholarship and public discourse, it is uniquely mandated to be a resource for undergraduate education.

Facilities

The Center, located in Founders' Hall, is equipped with twenty-six work stations for both internet and telephone data collection. Software packages for analysis and data collection include Decipher and IBM SPSS. In addition, the Center is a member of the IBM academic initiative. This provides the Center with access to IBM's advanced analytic packages for modeling and predictive analytics as well as Watson artificial analysis and machine learning. Facilities also include a conference room designed for qualitative interviewing and focus groups.

Board

The Center's Advisory Board boasts experts from academia, public service, and industry who have worked closely with survey research in its transition from banks of telephones to sophisticated Internet-based technology. Board member William Fishlinger and his wife Joan generously provided the Center's start-up funding.

Matthew Archibald, Ph.D. (Center Director) Assistant Professor of Sociology, College of Mount Saint Vincent

Karen Chaplin, M.Ed. Educator, Community Activist, and Nonprofit Board Member

William J. Fishlinger Founder, Chairman and CEO, Gramercy Risk Holdings LLC

Alexandra Fishlinger-Calame President and Founder, Rack-It-Up

Vincent Fitzgerald, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Communication, College of Mount Saint Vincent

Charles L. Flynn, Jr. President, College of Mount Saint Vincent

Anthony Foleno Senior Vice President for Strategy and Evaluation, Ad Council

Howard Gershowitz Senior Vice President, Mktg., Inc.

Guy Lometti, Ph.D. (Advisory Board Chair) (Retired) Provost and Dean of the Faculty, College of Mount Saint Vincent

Donna A. Lopiano, Ph.D. President, Sports Management Resources

Joseph Russo COO, Omnicom Public Relations

David Schliecker Vice President, Food Network/Cooking Channel Brand Research (Scripps Networks Interactive)

Leadership

Matthew E. Archibald, Ph.D., Director

The Director of the Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research at the College of Mount Saint Vincent, Matthew E. Archibald, Ph.D. holds a faculty appointment as Assistant Professor of Sociology. He brings broad experience to the Fishlinger Center that spans academic, private, and public sectors. Prior academic appointments include Emory University, Bates and Colby Colleges, and Michigan State University. Private and public sector positions include the Massachusetts' Department of Education and the Office of the Commissioner of Probation, as well as, Hornby Zeller Associates and the Public Consulting Group.

Professor Archibald has served in leadership roles on the Colby College Health Committee and as an advisor to the Science, Technology, Society, and Global Studies programs. At Emory University, he helped coordinate the Center for Health, Culture, and Society in the Rollins School of Public Health, as well as its Graduate Fellowship Program. In the sociology department, he served as the director of the undergraduate Certification Program in Social Research and Data Analysis, the co-director of Emory Study Abroad Program, Comparative Health Care Systems, and as the director of the department's graduate seminar.

Professor Archibald's teaching and scholarly work addresses public policy, medical sociology, health, illness and healthcare, and organizations. One strand of his current work focuses on disparities in healthcare. In this area, he and his colleagues and students examine local characteristics of behavioral healthcare networks. Another area of scholarship investigates minority participation in HIV/AIDS vaccine trials.

Professor Archibald received his Ph.D. and M.A. in sociology from the University of Washington, Seattle. He received his B.A. in philosophy from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Strategic Plan FYs 2021- 2024

In 2019-2020, the Center prepared for the next phase in its development. The aim of the next phase is to extend the Center's capacity from polling to conducting policy-relevant social, political and economic research, in the context of undergraduate learning. To facilitate that transition, a strategic plan was designed with the assistance of colleagues and Board. The plan is motivated by the Center's mission to provide a resource for scholarly activities leading to meaningful dialogue and constructive action on salient public policy issues of our times (see Table I below).[1]

Vision and Revised Mission

The Center serves as a vehicle for dialogue and constructive action on salient public policy issues. The Center realizes this aim by conducting policy-relevant research on social, political and economic problems confronting local, national and global communities. It is a resource for faculty, students and other institutions in the design, execution and translation of social science research devoted to public policy decision-making. As a core resource within a liberal arts institution, the Center aims to enhance the pedagogical relationship between the College, its students, faculty, administration, alumni, and the community, broadly construed, with regard to matters of ongoing public concern, such as disparities in health and healthcare, inequality, and the environment. The Center is uniquely tasked to serve as a resource for undergraduate education. The pedagogical function of the Center entails not only cultivating expertise in the rigors of the empirical sciences but a deeper understanding of our common humanity and moral commitments. The Center also provides a mechanism through which existing social science research capabilities of the College can be matched with external funding streams, combining expertise and capacities across disciplines and multiple institutions to address important social, political, and economic problems.

Priorities

The Fishlinger Center conducts research investigating policy-relevant social, political, and economic problems of our time. There are two overarching priority areas to sustain this purpose during the next five years. They are: 1) promote faculty/student/partner scholarship and 2) cultivate external funding streams. Faculty/student/partner relationships include not only faculty-student mentoring along the lines of traditional research teams, but faculty and student affiliation

---

[1] Until 2019 the Center lacked a disciplinary home. The Center is now housed in the sociology department. Having a departmental base will enhance faculty participation, and provide students dedicated resources to pursue a Public Policy major. During this transition year, 2019-2020, faculty and student involvement has increased markedly.

with nonprofits, such as the University Neighborhood Housing Project and Up to Us. [2] External funding streams may include small targeted sources such as the American Sociological Associations' Community Action Research Initiative, or as broad as the National Institutes of Health Research Training and Career Development. Center objectives and goals for the next five years will be to promote faculty/student/partner scholarship and develop external funding.

Objectives

Broad objectives and goals which will motivate faculty/student/partner scholarship and help develop external funding are outlined in Table I (below).

Additional Center Position- Director of Undergraduate Research

Given the importance of the pedagogical function of the Center, the director oversees faculty-student internships, work study, research projects and class-related Center resources. However, Professor Omar Nagi has been effectively directing the pedagogical components of the Center, which have been carried over from the Center for Undergraduate Research, begun 10 years ago under Professor Nagi's direction.

The Center would like to formalize this position by including under its purview the title of Director of Undergraduate Research. Because these responsibilities extend into the nonacademic months, the Center recommends that some responsibilities of the position receive funding in the coming years.

---

[2] See https://unhp.org/ and https://www.itsuptous.org/

Table I. 2019-2024 Priorities and Objectives

Year	Priority Area	Objective	Organizing tasks	Goal benchmarks
Yr1: 2019-2020	Scholarship/ Pedagogy	Generate faculty and student commitment. Develop research streams. Formalize processes for undergraduate research to contribute to Fishlinger Center Formalize processes for students to do professional data reports. Involve approximately 15% of CMSV students in Fishlinger related learning. Establish system for storing Fishlinger data at the Center, rather than relying on external partners for storage.	Interview faculty/ students. Set up Undergraduate Research Program. Consensus for three focal areas: health/healthcare, education, (e.g., undergraduate/ graduate education, research methodologies) and social/ economic inequality (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, labor, immigration)	Participation in Center and/or URP UG Center See example student climate survey report excerpt p. 24 60 students * 3 semesters (spring 2019, fall 2020, spring 2020) Center data storage on CMSV Cloud
	Funding	Identify funding sources	Interviews center directors	List of funders
Yr2: 2020-2021	Scholarship/ Pedagogy	Reinforce faculty and student commitment through project development. Increase to 25% CMSV students in Fishlinger related learning. Shift polling/survey focus to include three central research streams and related research objectives.	Coordinate faculty/ student research papers and pedagogy. Update and implement Undergraduate Research Program.	Accumulation of papers and talks thru Center and on URP website
	Funding	Identify/rank likeliest grant sources as well as long term funding grants and partners [3]	Begin application process	Submit application(s)
Yr3: 2021-2022	Scholarship/ Pedagogy	Identify faculty and student leadership, as well as collaborators at other institutions for funding development.	Work with faculty/ students on research papers and pedagogy aimed at higher profile dissemination. Integrate other data sources into Center.	Accumulation of papers and talks thru Center and on URP website

[3] See Appendix A

7

		Complete 3 year pipeline development of student training and participation for student roles in Center operations.	Begin long term application process	
	Funding	Collaborate on long term funding		Submit application(s)
Yr4: 2022-2023	Scholarship/ Pedagogy	Promote faculty-student-partner scholarship.	Work with faculty/ students on research papers and pedagogy aimed at higher profile dissemination. Integrate other data sources into Center.	Accumulation of papers and talks thru Center and on URP website
	Funding	Re-apply/new partners or begin tasks linked to funding	Initiate funding stream	Successful application or re-apply
Yr5: 2023-2024	Scholarship/ Pedagogy	Continue to promote faculty-student-partner scholarship. Develop next 5-year plan 2024-2029.	Organize 2025 conference. [4] Review grant and continued funding	Edited volume and conference papers.
	Funding	Begin tasks linked to funding	Initiate funding stream	Successful application

2019-2020 Program Activities: Overview

During the 2019-2020 fiscal year, the Center transitioned into its second phase with the retirement of its director, James Donius, and the recruitment of a new director (see *The Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research: The First Five Years; May 2019*).

As the outgoing director noted in an email to this *First Five Years* report, expectations for the next phase of the Center "should probably involve a return in focus to issues in line with the Center's mission of illumination, meaningful dialogue and constructive action," which had been largely overshadowed by unanticipated shifts in the national political agenda.

He continued: To meet those expectations, the Center will need to shift its reliance on polling as a data gathering mechanism, to more intensive survey research, through both original data collection practices, which the Center has already established, as well as through other primary and secondary sources of data underlying faculty and student scholarship. As the table, Priorities and Objectives (above) indicates, there are a number of ways to do so.

---

[4] See Appendix A

However, the primary focus for the five years beginning 2019, will be to establish the scholastic and pedagogical credentials of the Center, and to use those as leverage to apply for external funding from sources such as the National Institutes of Health, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, The (federal) Department of Education and others.

During the transition year, 2019-2020 a number of faculty- and student- led activities have moved the Center towards these overarching aims. Generally, activities involved: 1) Gathering and analyzing data from annual sample of U.S. sociopolitical and economic beliefs and attitudes to close-out the polling function of the Center (see below for excerpts from reports); 2) Securing commitment from faculty to work with Fishlinger (see e.g., screenshot of UG/URP advisory board); 3) Establishing website and funding for URP.

Table II. 2019-2020 Budget Allocations

Acct	Account Description	FY18 Actual Expense	FY19 Actual Expense	YTD 12/19/19 Invoices Posted	FY20 Approved Budget	FY21 vs FY20 Approved Budget		
						FY21 Proposed Budget	Inc (Dec) $	Inc (Dec) %
7021	Photocopying	330.25	114.2	1.5	-		-	
7201	Conference Expenses	1,252.95	2,419.81	-80	-		-	
7228	Prof Develop - Academic Admin/Staff	57.78	-	-	-		-	
7281	Memberships	198	-	-	-		-	
7309	Supplies	-	-	-	1,800.00		-1,800.00	-100.00%
7319	Miscellaneous Expense	73.23	-	-	-		-	
7329	Food Expenses	1,148.29	261.32	-	-		-	
7333	Business Travel	224.14	358.5	-23	-		-	
7373	Recruitment - Students	-	60.24	-	-		-	
7412	Fishlinger Center Advisory Board	-	-	-	1,000.00		-1,000.00	-100.00%
7413	Develop and Field Surveys	20,307.50	26,060.00	24,340.00	28,000.00		-28,000.00	-100.00%
7414	Training	2,500.00	-	-	2,000.00		-2,000.00	-100.00%
7415	Sample	-	-	14,060.00	11,000.00		-11,000.00	-100.00%
7492	Contracted Services	23,315.00	2,331.00	100	10,000.00		-10,000.00	-100.00%
7562	Telephone	960	200	-	1,000.00		-1,000.00	-100.00%
Total		50,367.14	31,805.07	38,398.50	54,800.00	-	-54,800.00	-100.00%

Fishlinger Center of Public Policy as a Center for Student Instruction

In relocating the Fishlinger Center and public policy major to sociology, the immediate aim was to involve students more heavily in Fishlinger operations and research, as well as securing a forum for utilizing Fishlinger data as a learning tool in classes.

Initiatives included;
- Use of Fishlinger Center data in classroom settings.
- Training students to assume professional support roles needed for Center operations, including organizing and analyzing data, preparing reports for online publication, etc.
- Inviting student researchers to affiliate with Fishlinger, and develop project work with the assistance of Fishlinger Center faculty advisors. This capitalizes on a current strength of the college, that had been largely disconnected from the Fishlinger Center.
- Utilizing the Fishlinger Center as an anchor for a more robust and focused Public Policy major.

Integration of Fishlinger Data into Coursework

Several courses were offered this past year that were explicitly built around utilization of Fishlinger data as a learning tool, as well as having the goal of training students to take larger professional roles in Fishlinger in subsequent semesters. These courses reached about fifteen percent of the UG student population, and began to raise the profile of the Center within the college community.

In the course of completing requirements for classes, students began to construct simple data reports from Fishlinger data, including qualitative coding reports, as well as write-ups of quantitative data. The culmination of these efforts came during the final week of the academic year, and we are finalizing edits and formatting for online posting of student reports.

These efforts provided students with both practical and conceptual training, as well as opportunities for credentialing (through internal publications for students who performed particularly well on these assignments). In this way, the Fishlinger Center and its association with the public policy major is in the beginning stages of realizing its purpose as a Signature Program of CMSV. The commitment made by the college to the Center will yield increasing returns in student learning. It also incentivizes learning by awarding scholarly distinction to top-performing students. Increasingly, Fishlinger Center will be a valuable recruiting tool for students interested in undergraduate achievements that go beyond class work.

Undergraduate Research Center (UG) and Undergraduate Research Program (URP)

Student Oriented Research Center Proposal

During 2019-2020, the Center began discussion across the campus with students, their faculty mentors and other interested individuals who might volunteer to build an effective student-oriented research center attached to the Fishlinger Center. Known among students as the Undergraduate Research Center (or UG) and in this document referred to as the Undergraduate Research Program (URP), the UG will mentor emerging student researchers by building a website published student/ faculty scholarship.

As students envisioned it, the UG would help students gain much more than a knowledge about social and public policy; they would participate in the formulation of independent research and in data analysis, immersing themselves in some of the most complex and controversial problems facing the nation and the world today. By providing a forum for discourse that can stimulate intelligent dialogue about issues that deeply affect all Americans, the UG illustrates and enhances the relationship between students in the College and the common good.

The standards for UG research are defined by the Director of the Fishlinger Center in consultation with allied professors in each discipline of the student topic of research. From the early grassroot stage, the center will work to create an alliance with the graduating class to publish and modify their research thesis. Funding for the implementation of the project will be supported by the UP to Us student network. Five of CMSV students were awarded an honor by Up to Us in Spring 2020 (see below).

Table III. September 2019: Plan and Timeline.

No	Targeted Objective	Organizing	Date	Goal
1	Work with the IT Department to develop a Fishlinger Center Student Research Website.	Fishlinger Center, Class of 2022 and Sociology Department	October 1 to be completed before October 23	Met
2	Organize a Faculty Dialogue with Chairs and Professors at the college.	Sociology Department, Fishlinger Center, Class of 2022	October 16	Met
3	Speak to the Student Government meeting about the Launching ceremony and Center objectives	Fishlinger Center and Sociology Department, Class 2022	October 2, 2019	Met
4	Launch Ceremony.	Same	October 23	Completed
5	Sponsorship	UP to US		Awarded[5]

---

[5] The College of Mount Saint Vincent was awarded a Top 5 Campaign In recognition of outstanding achievement: Wantoe T. Wantoe Gesselle Sanchez Emily Perez-Garcia Brendjeen Pierre Chadwyck Watt. Presented by the Up to Us partner organizations: Clinton Global Initiative University, Net Impact, and Peter G. Peterson Foundation May 15, 2020.

Undergraduate Research Program Webpage

The following screenshot of the UG/URP website links undergraduate/ faculty research with the Fishlinger Center

Wave Hill Collaboration

The school at Wave Hill has been working with the sociology department for the past few years. This year, the Fishlinger Center and Wave Hill met to discuss resources the Center can provide. The points below summarize our conversation.

- Wave Hill would like to add new questions to the Center's poll about environmental, ecological, and public space issues.
- We will collaborate to provide robust internship and further research opportunities for CMSV students working with Wave Hill and other partners
- The Fishlinger team will teach Wave Hill interns sessions focused on statistics, data literacy and data visualization
- Wave Hill will have someone from the CMSV Sociology department mentor high school students on a research project focused on parks. Wave Hill pays $4100 for approx. 85 hours of time
- Longer term- collaborating to have local high school students take GIS courses at CMSV
- Looping in partnership person who works with education department.

Fishlinger Center Public Sentiment Brief Report: Optimism Index and Scales (excerpt)

Fishlinger Public Sentiment Brief Report

Optimism Index and Subscales:

January- April 2020

Introduction and Discussion

This is the second brief study examining Fishlinger Public Sentiment Data. In this study we analyze the Optimism Index and its subscales for the months January through April 2020. We compare these data to the years 2017-2019.

The data take two forms. First, we look at the percentage of survey respondents who were optimistic about: federal policy, national leadership, social progress, personal values and world views. Second, using an algorithm based on the Pilot project, 2016, we calculate subscale scores for each of these areas.

While the percentages over time remain relatively stable (e.g., optimism about federal policy hovers around 30% except in the inflated pilot year), the scores themselves vary greatly. The reason subscale scores vary greatly over time is that they are calculated relative to the Pilot data which tended to be slightly inflated.

Table 1 presents the Fishlinger Optimism Index and its component dimensions. The Index ranks respondents' optimism with respect to federal policy, national leadership, social progress, personal values and world view. Percentages of those responding favorably are presented in the initial column for each year, followed by respondent Index scores. The numbers reported for each subscale are based on a possible score of 60, while the overall Index itself is arrayed between 1 and 75.

Table 1. Fishlinger Optimism Index

	Pilot 2016		2017		2018		2019	
Subscale	Percent	Score	Percent	Score	Percent	Score	Percent	Score
Federal policy	34.0%	NA*	27.1%	44	26.7%	53	28.4%	36
National Leadership	32.3		25.8	69	24.2	63	26.0	61
Social progress	41.8		33.6	19	32.6	20	33.1	20
Personal values	45.1		42.7	47	41.1	39	40.9	68
Worldview	53.3		33.2	61	34.5	41	35.5	39
Index score				59		57		53
N=	490		2528		2401		1800	

*Index scores based on 2016 percentages

Table 2 presents the Fishlinger Optimism Index and its component dimensions for the months January through April 2020. Compared with the earlier years, the percentages are stable. The scores themselves vary, given that they are derived from weights relative to the Pilot data.

Table 2. Fishlinger Optimism Index 2020

Subscale	January Percent	Score	February Percent	Score	March Percent	Score	April Percent	Score
Federal policy	30.9%	44	32.7%	54	30.4%	47	29.5%	64
National Leadership	28.8	90	26.4	52	28.7	92	28.0	52
Social progress	34.1	36	34.3	65	33.6	5	32.0	5
Personal values	42.3	37	41.0	46	41.6	81	40.4	52
Worldview	37.3	84	36.1	21	35.4	60	36.3	51
Index score		69		62		68		60
N=	199		194		202		202	

Fishlinger Public Sentiment Brief Report US Sociopolitical Attitudes, Expectations, Beliefs and Values: 2017, 2018, 2019 (excerpt)

Fishlinger Public Sentiment Brief Report

US Sociopolitical Attitudes, Expectations, Beliefs and Values:

2017, 2018, 2019

Introduction

This brief study reframes previous analyses conducted by the Fishlinger Center investigating Americans' sociopolitical attitudes, expectations, beliefs and values. The following tables provide descriptive data ranking Americans' sociopolitical priorities (i.e., attitudes), their expectancies with regard to those priorities (i.e., optimism), as well as an examination of their shared beliefs and values.

A subset of survey results summarizes the extent to which Americans are optimistic about the future, given their sociopolitical priorities and personal values. These future expectations form the Fishlinger Optimism Index. The Fishlinger Optimism is a measure of public opinion centered on Americans' optimism about the future. It is derived from opinion data about public officials, social/political issues, beliefs about the United States' place in the world, and a series of value statements dealing with individuals' feelings of success and security.

The final table in this report displays the Index and its major components during the three-year span.

Table 1 depicts survey respondents' ranking of social, political and economic issues. Percentages represent those who felt the indicated sociopolitical issue was very or extremely important. Confidence intervals in the table are set at the 95% range.

Table 1. Sociopolitical Priorities 2017-2019

	2017			2018			2019		
Domain	Percent	CI	Domain	Percent	CI	Domain	Percent	CI
Economy	83.8	82.3, 85.3	Economy	76.5	74.8, 78.2	Health Care I	74.9	72.9, 76.9
Health Care I	80.9	79.4, 82.5	Health Care I	75.6	73.9, 77.4	Health Care II	74.1	72.0, 76.1
Health Care II	78.6	77.0, 80.2	Health Care II	74.7	72.9, 76.5	Economy	74.0	72.0,
Social Security	75.1	73.4, 76.8	Social Security	70.1	68.3, 72.0	Social Security	68.5	66.4,
Terrorism	73.0	71.3, 74.8	Medicare	69.0	67.1, 70.9	Medicare	66.4	64.2, 68.6
Medicare	72.2	70.4, 74.0	Terrorism	65.2	63.3, 67.1	Terrorism	61.3	59.1, 63.6
Domestic Violence	71.3	69.5, 73.1	Domestic Violence	63.8	61.9, 65.7	Domestic Violence	61.3	59.1, 63.6
Fiscal Policy	68.9	67.1, 70.7	Fiscal Policy	63.3	61.4, 65.3	Environment	60.8	58.5, 63.1
Education Reform	68.4	66.6, 70.2	Environment	62.7	60.8, 64.7	Human Trafficking	59.9	57.7, 62.2
Poverty	67.0	65.1, 68.8	Education Reform	62.2	60.2, 64.1	Immigration	59.4	57.1, 61.7
Environment	66.8	64.9, 68.6	Immigration	61.8	59.9, 63.8	Fiscal Policy	59.3	57.1, 61.6
Human Trafficking	66.1	64.3, 68.0	Human Trafficking	61.7	59.7, 63.6	Gun Control	58.2	55.9, 60.5
Unemployment	65.3	63.4, 67.1	Poverty	60.9	58.9, 62.9	Education Reform	57.7	55.4, 60.0
Immigration	64.9	63.1, 66.8	Gun Control	60.8	58.8, 62.7	Poverty	56.7	54.4, 59.0
Foreign Relations	62.8	60.9, 64.7	Foreign Relations	57.7	55.7, 59.7	Foreign Relations	54.1	51.8, 56.4
Race Relations	61.8	59.9, 63.7	Unemployment	56.2	54.2, 58.2	Animal Rights	53.4	51.1, 55.8
Higher Education Attainment	61.0	59.1, 62.9	Higher Education Attainment	55.5	53.5, 57.5	Unemployment	52.7	50.4, 55.0

Age Discrimination	58.9	57.0, 60.8	Race Relations	55.5	53.5, 57.5	Trade Relations	51.8	49.5, 54.1
Gun Control	58.5	56.6, 60.4	Animal Rights	54.4	52.4, 56.4	Higher Educated Attainment	51.2	48.9, 53.5
Monetary Policy (Interest Rates)	58.5	56.5, 60.4	Age Discrimination	54.1	52.1, 56.1	Age Discrimination	51.2	48.9, 53.5
Animal Rights	57.7	55.8, 59.6	Trade relations	53.9	51.9, 55.9	Monetary Policy (Interest Rates)	50.2	47.9, 52.5
Trade Relations	57.7	55.7, 59.6	Monetary Policy (Interest Rates)	53.8	51.8, 55.8	Welfare Reform	50.0	47.7, 52.3
Welfare Reform	57.0	55.1, 59.0	Welfare Reform	51.4	49.4, 53.4	Race Relations	49.9	47.6, 52.2
Gender Equality	54.4	52.4, 56.3	Gender Equality	49.1	47.1, 51.1	Abortion Rights	46.2	43.9, 48.5
Religious Fanaticism	50.4	48.4, 52.3	Abortion Rights	46.0	44.0, 48.0	Gender Equality	46.1	43.8, 48.4
Abortion Rights	49.8	47.9, 51.8	Religious Fanaticism	45.4	43.4, 47.3	Religious Fanaticism	45.0	42.7, 47.3
AIDS/HIV	42.6	40.6, 44.5	Teen Pregnancy	37.8	35.8, 39.7	AIDS/ HIV	36.2	34.0, 38.4
Teen Pregnancy	39.9	38.0, 41.8	AIDS/ HIV	37.7	35.8, 39.7	Teen Pregnancy	35.9	33.7, 38.1
LGBT	38.1	36.2, 39.9	LGBT	34.7	32.7, 36.5	LGBT	33.6	31.4, 35.7

Table 2 depicts survey respondents' ranked expectations of desired future outcomes with respect to social, political and economic priorities. Specifically, respondents were asked if they felt optimistic about the following sociopolitical priorities. Percentages show those who were very or extremely optimistic. As in Table 1, the confidence intervals were set at the 95% level.

Table 2. Optimism about Sociopolitical Priorities 2017-2019

	2017			2018			2019	
Domain	Percent	CI	Domain	Percent	CI	Domain	Percent	CI
Economy	43.9	42.0, 45.8	Economy	41.3	39.3, 43.3	Economy	41.4	39.2, 43.7
Terrorism	39.2	37.3, 41.1	Unemployment	37.3	35.4, 39.2	Medicare	37.9	35.6, 40.1
Health Care	39.1	37.2, 41.0	Health Care	36.4	34.4, 38.3	Unemployment	37.6	35.3, 39.8
Medicare	38.2	36.3, 40.0	Terrorism	36.2	34.3, 38.1	Animal Rights	37.0	34.8, 39.2
Social Security	38.1	36.2, 40.0	Medicare	36.0	34.1, 37.9	Affordable Health Care	36.6	34.4, 38.8
Immigration	37.6	35.7, 39.5	Domestic Violence	35.6	33.7, 37.5	Health Care	36.4	34.2, 38.6
Affordable Health Care	37.5	35.6, 39.4	Social Security	35.0	33.1, 36.9	Social Security	36.4	34.2, 38.6
Unemployment	37.1	35.2, 39.0	Affordable Health Care	34.9	33.0, 36.7	Terrorism	36.3	34.1, 38.5
Domestic Violence	37.1	35.2, 38.9	Immigration	34.6	32.7, 36.5	Domestic Violence	35.0	32.8, 37.2
Education Reform	35.6	33.8, 37.5	Animal Rights	34.3	32.4, 36.2	Immigration	34.5	32.3, 36.7
Animal Rights	35.5	33.6, 37.3	Education Reform	33.6	31.7, 35.5	Age Discrimination	34.4	32.2, 36.5
Gun Control	34.0	32.2, 35.8	Environment	32.9	31.0, 34.8	Education Reform	33.2	31.0, 35.3
Environment	34.0	32.1, 35.8	Higher Education Attainment	32.8	30.9, 34.6	Human Trafficking	33.1	30.9, 35.2
Age Discrimination	33.8	32.0, 35.6	Human Trafficking	32.5	30.6, 34.3	Higher Education Attainment	32.5	30.3, 34.6
Trade Relations	33.1	31.2, 34.9	Foreign Relations	32.3	30.4, 34.2	Environment	32.5	30.3, 34.6
Fiscal Policy	32.9	31.1, 34.7	Gun Control	31.8	30.0, 33.7	Trade Relations	32.3	30.2, 34.5
Human Trafficking	32.9	31.1, 34.7	Trade Relations	31.7	29.8, 33.5	President Trump	32.3	30.1, 34.4

Welfare Reform	32.5	30.7, 34.3	Age Discrimination	31.6	29.8, 33.4	Poverty	31.7	29.5, 33.8
Foreign Relations	32.3	30.5, 34.1	President Trump	30.8	28.9, 32.6	Gender Equality	31.4	29.3, 33.5
Higher Education Attainment	32.2	30.4, 34.0	Poverty	30.3	28.5, 32.1	AIDS/ HIV	31.3	29.2, 33.4
President Trump	31.9	30.1, 33.7	Gender Equality	30.3	28.5, 32.1	Gun Control	31.2	29.0, 33.3
Poverty	31.8	30.0, 33.6	Fiscal Policy	30.2	28.3, 32.0	Foreign Relations	30.9	28.8, 33.0
Monetary Policy (Interest Rates)	31.6	29.8, 33.4	Race Relations	29.9	28.1, 31.7	Monetary Policy (Interest Rates)	30.8	28.6, 32.9
Race Relations	30.8	29.0, 32.6	Abortion Rights	29.7	27.9, 31.5	Welfare Reform	30.5	28.4, 32.6
AIDS/HIV	30.4	28.6, 32.1	Monetary Policy (Interest Rates)	29.1	27.3, 30.9	Abortion Rights	29.9	27.8, 32.0
Gender Equality	29.5	27.8, 31.3	AIDS/HIV	29.0	27.2, 30.8	Fiscal Policy	29.7	27.6, 31.7
Affordable Health Care	28.5	26.7, 30.2	Welfare Reform	28.8	27.0, 30.6	Race Relations	29.6	27.5, 31.7
Domestic Policy	27.9	26.1, 29.6	Domestic Policy	27.9	26.1, 29.6	Domestic Policy	28.8	26.7, 30.8
Religious Fanaticism	27.5	25.8, 29.2	Supreme Court	26.6	24.8, 28.3	Supreme Court	27.7	25.6, 29.7
Supreme Court	27.3	25.6, 29.0	Religious Fanaticism	26.1	24.3, 27.8	Teen Pregnancy	27.3	25.2, 29.3
Teen Pregnancy	25.2	23.5, 26.8	Teen Pregnancy	25.7	23.9, 27.4	LGBT	26.0	24.0, 28.0
LGBT	24.5	22.8, 26.1	LGBT	25.4	23.7, 27.1	Religious Fanaticism	25.7	23.7, 27.7
Senate	21.9	20.3, 23.4	House of Representatives	20.3	18.7, 21.8	House of Representatives	22.7	20.7, 24.5
House of Representatives	21.9	20.3, 23.4	Senate	19.4	17.8, 20.9	Senate	21.6	19.7, 23.4

Fishlinger Public Sentiment on Climate Change 2018: A Brief Student Report (excerpt)

Introduction

This brief report serves as a template for analyses of Fishlinger Public Sentiment Data. It was generated by students at the College of Mount Saint Vincent, Sociology 307.

American Attitudes Toward Climate Change

The Fishlinger Center for Public Policy conducted a national representative survey in stages over the calendar year of 2018. In that survey, respondents were asked 24 questions about the environment, 3 of which gathered qualitative responses.

The survey consisted of 2401 respondents overall. However, some of the questions on the environment were only asked during certain stages of the sampling, and have a lower number of respondents. The data from these questions is presented below.

q5r9: Environment - How important is the issue of Environment to you personally?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	104	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Hardly at all	177	7.4	7.4	11.7
	Somewhat	614	25.6	25.6	37.3
	Very	728	30.3	30.3	67.6
	Extremely	778	32.4	32.4	100.0
	Total	2401	100.0	100.0	

In Q5R9, 62.7% of respondents consider the environment to be either very or extremely important, while only 11.7% report it to be hardly, or not at all important.

q7r9: Environment - How optimistic are you about the issue of
Environment in the future?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Val id	Not at all	269	11.2	11.2	11.2
	Hardly at all	435	18.1	18.1	29.3
	Somewh at	907	37.8	37.8	67.1
	Very	436	18.2	18.2	85.3
	Extremel y	354	14.7	14.7	100.0
	Total	2401	100.0	100.0	

While 62.7% of respondents consider the environment to be very or extremely important, only 32.9% are very or extremely optimistic about how we will address this issue in the future (Q7R9).

Respondents were then asked whether they are confident of resolving our challenges with the environment in two different ways.

q10r5: Global warming will be resolved in coming years

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Val id	Disagree Completely	650	27.1	27.1	27.1
	Disagree Somewhat	866	36.1	36.1	63.1
	Agree Somewhat	625	26.0	26.0	89.2
	Agree Completely	260	10.8	10.8	100.0
	Total	2401	100.0	100.0	

In responding to question Q10R5, 36% were agreeable to the idea that we will solve the problems faced by global warming, while the table below shows that 77.3% are in agreement that environmental issues will continue to haunt us in the future. It should be noted that agreeing that problems will be solved in the future is not mutually exclusive with believing they will also continue to haunt us in the future (Q10R13).

q10r13: Environmental issues will continue to haunt us in the future

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Val id	Disagree Completely	136	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Disagree Somewhat	409	17.0	17.0	22.7
	Agree Somewhat	1027	42.8	42.8	65.5
	Agree Completely	829	34.5	34.5	100.0
	Total	2401	100.0	100.0	

While 63.8% of respondents reported that the consider climate change to be a very or extremely serious problem (Q59), they report in Q60 that only 19.3% are very or extremely satisfied with U.S. efforts in that area.

Q59: How serious a problem do you feel "Climate Change" is...?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Serious	15	.6	5.0	5.0
	Hardly Serious at all	32	1.3	10.6	15.6
	Somewhat Serious	62	2.6	20.6	36.2
	Very Serious	78	3.2	25.9	62.1
	Extremely Serious	114	4.7	37.9	100.0
	Total	301	12.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2100	87.5		
Total		2401	100.0		

Q60: How satisfied are you with current US efforts in this area?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Satisfied	63	2.6	20.9	20.9
	Hardly Satisfied at all	70	2.9	23.3	44.2
	Somewhat Satisfied	110	4.6	36.5	80.7
	Very Satisfied	31	1.3	10.3	91.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Extremely Satisfied	27	1.1	9.0	100.0
	Total	301	12.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2100	87.5		
Total		2401	100.0		

However Q61 shows that Americans are more optimistic about future U.S. efforts than they are with current efforts, with 30.9% saying very or extremely optimistic.

Q61: How optimistic are you about US efforts in this area in the future?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Satisfied	34	1.4	11.3	11.3
	Hardly Optimistic at all	59	2.5	19.6	30.9
	Somewhat Optimistic	115	4.8	38.2	69.1
	Very Optimistic	57	2.4	18.9	88.0
	Extremely Optimistic	36	1.5	12.0	100.0
	Total	301	12.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2100	87.5		
Total		2401	100.0		

Respondents were then re-asked the questions, with "global warming" substituted instead of "climate change." The results were broadly similar, with only subtle differences. Asked how serious is global warming (Q63), 64.9% of respondents said extremely or very serious. This is only 1.1% greater than those who reported similar feelings for "global warming", and difficult to attribute to any systematic difference.

Q63: How serious a problem do you feel "Global Warming" is...?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Serious	28	1.2	9.3	9.3
	Hardly Serious at all	23	1.0	7.6	16.9
	Somewhat Serious	56	2.3	18.6	35.5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Very Serious	92	3.8	30.6	66.1
	Extremely Serious	102	4.2	33.9	100.0
	Total	301	12.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2100	87.5		
Total		2401	100.0		

However, when asked about whether they are satisfied with U.S. efforts in the area of climate change (Q64), 25.6% reported being very or extremely satisfied. This is a considerably higher than the 19.3% who reported the same sentiment about U.S. efforts for global warming.

Q64: How satisfied are you with current US efforts in this area?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Satisfied	60	2.5	19.9	19.9
	Hardly Satisfied at all	57	2.4	18.9	38.9
	Somewhat Satisfied	107	4.5	35.5	74.4
	Very Satisfied	41	1.7	13.6	88.0
	Extremely Satisfied	36	1.5	12.0	100.0
	Total	301	12.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2100	87.5		
Total		2401	100.0		

Several noteworthy numbers appear in the above set of questions
- Respondents generally have a more favorable opinion of environmental policies of the OECD nations, than developing nations.
- For the United States, 39% of respondents consider our efforts are somewhat or far too lax, which is a more negative assessment by respondents than any other OECD nation listed above.
- There seems to be a contradiction in respondents, between their stated levels of concern in different portions of the survey.
  - In the case of all selected nations, the answer that the nations policies were *just about right*, garnered a plurality of respondents in all nations, and an outright majority in 5 nations.

- o In none of the nations listed, did respondents say that the nation's policies were too lax, in proportions that match their general concern about environmental problems.
- o For example, while about 65% of respondents reported that climate change and global warming are very or extremely serious, there was no case where 65% of respondents felt that the efforts of any given nation were too lax.

Additionally, respondents were asked (Q49) if American environmental policies should look more like the Germany. While 69% felt German policies were *just about right*, only 41.5% felt that the U.S. should do more to conform to those policies.

Q49: Should the United States adopt environmental policies more like those in Germany?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	83	3.5	41.5	41.5
	No	117	4.9	58.5	100.0
	Total	200	8.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2201	91.7		
Total		2401	100.0		

Finally, there were 3 sets of qualitative responses;
- When I say Climate Change, what words immediately come to mind
- When I say Global Warming, what words immediately come to mind
- When asked whether the U.S. should follow German environmental policies (yes or no), respondents were asked a follow up, open-ended question, *why did you say that*?

1) Analysis of the qualitative responses on the way
2) Can also mix in some cross-tabs with demographics, including political leanings.

Appendix A – Example of NSF Funding Streams

NSF provides support for a variety of individual Centers and Centers programs that contribute to the Foundation's vision as outlined in the NSF Strategic Plan. Centers exploit opportunities in science, engineering and technology in which the complexity of the research problem(s) or the resources needed to solve the(se) problem(s) require the advantages of scope, scale, change, duration, equipment, facilities, and students that can only be provided by an academic research center

The National Science Foundation's (NSF) Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBE) supports research in many areas associated with our rapidly changing world, including fundamental research on human development, learning, and social behavior, and the surrounding social, economic, and natural environments. Research supported in SBE advances our understanding of people, social organizations and society in a changing world where there are new opportunities for human interconnectedness as well as challenges that affect our ability to live healthy and productive lives. With this Dear Colleague Letter (DCL), SBE wishes to notify the research community of a new opportunity called Build & Broaden (B2) and invites the submission of conference proposals in FY 2020. Proposals should be designed to foster partnerships and build research collaborations among institutions that include at least one Minority-Serving Institution (MSI). MSIs include Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), Tribal Colleges or Universities (TCUs), and other institutions that enroll a substantial fraction of underrepresented minority students, as described below1. The response to this DCL will inform future steps for B2 in FYs 2021- 2024.

Appendix B – URP Newsletter Write Up

Mount undergrads find new research space on campus

Posted November 25, 2019

.

By CHRISTINA RASMUSSEN

They wanted a space to call their own. A space dedicated to undergraduate research — run by students — that fosters academic excellence and success while simultaneously gaining real life skills.

And that's exactly what the students at the College of Mount Saint Vincent got.

Members of The Mount's sophomore class collaborated with the school's Fishlinger Center for Public Policy Research to open the Riverdale Avenue college's first student-oriented research center. Officially, it's known as the Fishlinger Center for Undergraduate Research, but students already are shortening that to a more familiar "UG Center."

The Mount established Fishlinger Center in 2015 to broaden public policy research and analysis. The UG Center is independent of the main Fishlinger department, but is inheriting the space to become the first student-run research platform at the college.

The center makes room for 25 computer workstations as well as a virtual component that includes a website designed by Mount junior Syeda Anjum. It includes past research projects conducted by Mount students and faculty in the new facility, as well as resources for someone to start their own research.

Sophomore class president Wantoe Teah Wantoe spearheaded the movement, bringing some of his classmates on board. Wantoe worked closely with school administrators, as well as Fishlinger Center director Matthew Archibald.

"I'm very excited for this project," Wantoe said. "I've seen a lot of research first-hand as an international student, so this project means a lot to me."

Research at the center is wide-ranging and multidisciplinary, Wantoe said, with an aim to publish original content while reflecting new and innovative discoveries and contemporary issues in public policy, natural science, environmental issues and international development, among others.

Mount sociology professor Omar Nagi was one of the educators who spoke at the research center's Oct. 30 launch, talking about how it would benefit generations of Mount students to come.

"A lot of people say your career begins after you graduate college," Nagi said. "But your career begins now, in college."

The Mount's center is unique because at most other colleges, research centers are dedicated solely to graduate research, Nagi said. Opening the doors to undergrads provides those same resources, but just much earlier in academic pursuits.

The UG Center received support from the non-profit organization Net Impact, which pushes to educate undergrads about the fiscal and economic challenges facing the United States. Grant money from Net Impact paid for the building and the center's website.

"We've done something amazing here at The Mount," Wantoe said. "All we need now are students who are eager to research and enhance their knowledge."

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Intern Christina Rasmussen is a student at the College of Mount Saint Vincent.*