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Welcome to the Green League Guide

The Higher Education sector has made huge, green strides since the publication of the first People & Planet Green League in 2007 and the vast majority of institutions are to be applauded. However, whilst some Green League indicators highlight great progress – over 96% of institutions now have publicly-available environmental policies – others reveal frustratingly slow progress. For example, an increase in carbon emissions since 2005 shows a disconnect between scientific necessity, policy commitments and actual performance at a sectoral level.

The forthcoming People & Planet Green League, which will be published by The Guardian in May 2012, clearly still has an important role to play in measuring, highlighting and driving forward progress. Each of the 13 criteria set out in this guide represents a crucial building block in the sector’s transition away from business as usual towards a fair, sustainable and low-carbon education sector. From carbon reduction to whether institutions are equipping their graduates with the skills to enter a global, low-carbon economy, the methodology behind this 6th Green League is designed to test institutions’ commitment to and actual performance in creating a fair and sustainable future.

People & Planet has consulted widely to ensure this year’s Green League criteria represent the most comprehensive and independent assessment yet of the sector’s sustainability commitments and performance. Over half of all HE institutions fed into a thorough review of the criteria in 2011 either online or through stakeholder events and we have continued to work with experts in specific fields of sustainability research (curriculum, carbon, sustainable food etc) to refine these.

In 2011, People & Planet also re-established the popular Green League Oversight Group (GLOG) which is made up of environmental managers, academics and sustainability professionals representing the huge diversity of our HE sector. Find out more about the GLOG 2012 members and contact them.

“The People & Planet Green League is, I think, rapidly moving from being something that is ‘done’ to the HE sector, to something that is ‘owned’ by the sector. This is in no small measure due to the increasingly inclusive approach taken by People & Planet”

Clive Russell, Director of Strategic Projects, Guildhall School of Music and Drama

This guide is designed to provide all the information that key stakeholders, particularly those submitting on behalf of their institutions, should require. As ever, please continue to challenge People & Planet and feedback on things we could be doing better, and good luck for 2012!

Louise Hazan
Green League Manager, People & Planet
greenleague@peopleandplanet.org
The above timeline explains the key dates and phases for the People & Planet Green League 2012. At time of going to print, not all dates were confirmed. Please check the Green League website’s Stakeholder Area for the latest available information. [http://peopleandplanet.org/greenleague/stakeholder-area](http://peopleandplanet.org/greenleague/stakeholder-area)

If you have any questions or concerns about the above timeline please contact us: greenleague@peopleandplanet.org
Overview
People & Planet is committed to developing the Green League by drawing on the expertise and feedback of the sector alongside key sustainability considerations. As a result of this approach we introduced several significant changes to our processes in 2011, including a new appeals procedure. Consultation with stakeholders and a thorough internal review revealed that these were generally well received and our focus this year is on embedding these changes rather than introducing new ones.

The key changes to the People & Planet Green League 2012 are focused on refining the methodology and clarifying how points are awarded rather than introducing new criteria or significantly changing our processes or point allocation. Consultation with the sector and Green League Oversight Group has highlighted several key areas for further consideration in the longer term and we are committed to exploring these together with stakeholders.

Throughout this guide any changes to criteria have been highlighted in red. Please take extra care reading anything highlighted in red to ensure you are aware of these.

We remain 100% committed to the following principles in producing the People & Planet Green League in 2012 and beyond:
• full transparency & accountability
• independence
• recognising diversity
• celebrating best practice
• uniform metrics and data
• the right to appeal

Key Methodology changes
• 2. Environmental staff FTE: People & Planet has reviewed and clarified the types of staff role that qualify for points based on stakeholder feedback.
• 7. Sustainable Food: This criteria now includes 2 new potential ‘actions’ eligible for points: ‘100% organic milk’ and the use of ‘Less and better meat and dairy’.
• 9. Curriculum: The types of evidence accepted have become more flexible and the range of actions that qualify for points have been broadened.
• 11. Waste: Points for ‘Percentage of waste an institution recycles’ and ‘Waste mass per head’ are now calculated for waste mass excluding construction waste due to widespread concerns over the uniformity and accuracy of this data in the EMS returns.
The People & Planet Green League takes a dual approach to environmental management - looking both at universities’ commitment to systemic improvement and at their actual performance. Both are essential indicators of universities’ commitment to and actual transition towards a low-carbon, post-oil future which will require resilience and innovation from all sectors of society. The first nine Management and Policy criteria demonstrate whether an institution has a systematic means of improving its performance. The following four indicators in the performance section reveal how well an institution is actually performing on the ground in comparison to other institutions.

**Management and Policy Criteria**

1. **Publicly Available Environmental Policy**

   **Why measure this?**
   An environmental policy provides a formal, public and permanent demonstration of intent regarding performance. It is crucial in ensuring there is sustained, strategic improvement in environmental performance, backed up by senior management and with adequate resources. Last year’s People & Planet Green League revealed that 96% of institution now have some form of environmental policy but these varied widely in strength and the breadth of environmental impacts they covered.

   Policies, targets and reporting are key drivers of performance improvement across the sector and the People & Planet Green League awards points for those with strong environmental policies and associated actions plans. Universities should have policies and action plans which set specific and time-bound targets or performance indicators covering all major aspects of environmental management. Simply complying with environmental legislation is deemed insufficient. Universities are only awarded maximum points in this section if their policy or related action plans set targets for improvements in all eight key areas of environmental management.

   **How are points allocated?**
   **Total: 5 points**

   The institution has a publicly available environmental policy published in the last five years

   **1 Point**
The institution reports on the environmental policy annually at a senior level of university administration **2 Points**

The institution sets targets to reduce environmental impact in ALL of the following areas **2 Points**

- Waste management
- Construction & Refurbishment
- Transport
- Emissions & Discharges
- Sustainable Procurement
- Community involvement
- Water
- Biodiversity

**How is this criteria assessed?**

1a) Does your institution have a publicly available environmental policy? **1 Point**

**Clarifications:**
- Complying with environmental legislation is insufficient.
- No points awarded if policy is draft version.
- No points if policy is not publicly available – ie. weblink provided.
- No points if not signed off at senior level.

**Evidence required:**
- Provide a weblink to the policy.

1b) Has the environmental policy been reported on since 1 April 2011? **2 Points**

**Clarifications:**
- Points can be awarded even if a university has a draft policy as long as they have a clearly laid out future reporting structure.
- Points only awarded if policy is reviewed annually.
- No points if evidence not provided
- No points if the policy was not directly reported on or was not directly referred to in the attached evidence. Where minutes were provided only detailing discussion of general sustainability matters points were not awarded.

**Evidence required:**
- Statement from responsible party about the reporting structure in place, including the staff member (job title) or committee to which the report was made or will be made if policy less than a year old.
- Attach evidence of reporting (eg. a published report, committee meeting minutes.)
1 c) Does the policy and / or accompanying action plans or separate policies cover the following areas, setting specific, time bound targets for reducing environmental impact? (Waste management, Transport, Sustainable Procurement, Water, Construction & Refurbishment, Emissions & Discharges, Community Involvement, Biodiversity) **2 Points**

Clarifications:

- No points if specific and timebound targets not set in ALL 8 impact areas.
- No points for draft environmental policies or action plans
- No points are awarded if policy or action plans don’t currently exist. We do not count creation of a policy as a timebound target
- No points if policy or action plans do not include time bound targets or actions/activities (eg. reduce x impact by x% by specific date). Targets/action plans must be current.

**Further detail on point allocation for each key impact area:**

- **Water, waste, transport:** must include specific, quantifiable, time-bound targets to reduce impacts (eg. reduce impacts from x form of transport by x% by 20xx, and/or increase no. of passengers using y form of transport by z by 20xx). Carbon reduction targets which relate specifically to waste, water or transport are acceptable if clearly highlighted in evidence.
- **Biodiversity:** must identify specific time-bound actions to improve biodiversity or reduce negative environmental impacts (eg. increase x species by xx/build green roof by 20xx).
- **Sustainable Procurement:** must cover general purchasing and not a single entity (eg. paper). It must show clear evidence that there are action plans to reduce environmental impacts of procurement – although we are more lenient on these being time-bound or not. We are also looking for specific evidence of a whole-life costing approach to procurement. Points can be awarded for working towards a specific level of the Sustainable Procurement Assessment Framework (Wales) or Flexible Framework by a specified date.
- **Construction and refurbishment:** setting numerical targets is not essential –eg. a target for ALL new buildings to reach a certain BREEAM standard is acceptable. However, we still require time-bound targets to be in evidence. Must apply to the wider institution rather than one specific building or project.
- **Community Involvement:** setting numerical targets is not essential in this area but we do expect to see evidence of specific, time-bound action points or targets for engagement of local community and/or students and staff. These must refer specifically to involvement in environmental issues or the management of sustainability impacts.
- **Emissions & Discharges:** Refers to toxic, chemical or hazardous emissions to air and water, not simply carbon emissions. We can accept evidence showing that an audit concluded that this area is not appropriate for setting targets. Points will not be awarded if you simply state that emissions and discharges targets are not applicable without further explanation.

**Evidence required:**

- Environmental policy and/or accompanying action plans/policies for each impact area
- You MUST SPECIFY the relevant section, page or tab of the environmental policy and of any additional policy or action plan documents linked to or uploaded.
2. Environmental Management

Staff FTE

Why measure this?
Without the expertise and championing of professional staff dedicated to environmental management, it has been repeatedly demonstrated that green initiatives in universities are unlikely to be systematic, well-coordinated and resourced, or have significant, sustainable success. Environmental Managers develop objectives and set priorities with significant, time-bound targets and can co-ordinate the work to fulfill them.

To help ensure this category is fair to all institutions - large & small - points are awarded to institutions based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) posts per 5,000 FTE students. While larger institutions require more staff, research and consultation has demonstrated that economies of scale enable universities to manage their environmental impacts effectively with less staff per 5,000 students. To recognise this we have an upper limit of 15,000 when counting the number of students an institution has.

Full points are only awarded where an institution can show that there are at least two FTE members of staff per 5000 with overall responsibility for strategy and implementation of environmental management policy (where these responsibilities form at least 50% of their role).

In this section only staff that have responsibility for developing, implementing and monitoring environmental management plans are counted. This distinction is made to recognise the importance of having professional environmental staff with the expertise and responsibility for developing a strategic approach to environmental management. After consultation with the Green League Oversight Group, People & Planet has provided clearer definitions of the type of staff roles that will qualify for points and these are listed in the clarifications section below.

How are points allocated?
Total: 8 points
The institution can qualify for points for either i), ii) OR iii).

i) Less than one full time equivalent dedicated staff member  4 Points
Institution has at least 0.5 FTE member of staff per 5000 students, up to a maximum of 15,000 students, with full responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans.

Note: A staff member has part-responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans if they are working on only one aspect of environmental management (e.g. waste), or have other non-environmental management responsibilities.
ii) At least one full time equivalent dedicated staff member   **6 Points**
Institution has at least one full time equivalent member of staff with full responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans per 5,000 students, up to a maximum of 15,000 students. For example, one full time member of staff with at least 50% responsibility for environmental management plus at least 0.5 FTE members of staff working on only one aspect of environmental management (eg. waste manager).

iii) At least two full time equivalent dedicated staff members   **8 Points**
Institution has 2 or more FTE members of staff per 5,000 students, up to a maximum of 15,000 students. At least 1FTE has full responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans plus additional part or full time staff with responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans.

**How is this criteria assessed?**

2 a) Does the university have any part time staff whose sole job purpose is developing and implementing environmental management plans (eg. Sustainability Manager)? Please state the total FTE for these part-time staff members and upload job descriptions.

2 b) Does the university have any full time staff who have responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans in one specific area of sustainability (e.g. Waste Manager, Carbon Manager, Travel Plan Co-ordinator, Energy Manager etc.)? Please state the total FTE for these full-time staff members and upload job descriptions.

2 c) Does the university have any full time staff who have responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management plans alongside other responsibilities (e.g. Health, Safety and Environment Manager)? Please state the total FTE for these staff, taking into account the percentage of time dedicated to environmental management and upload job descriptions. Do not include staff where this forms less than 50% of their role.

2 d) Does the university have any full time staff whose sole job purpose is developing and implementing environmental management plans? Please state the total FTE for these full-time staff members and upload job descriptions.

**Example**

1 FTE Environment and Energy Manager (50% on Environmental Management) = 0.5 FTE
0.6 FTE Waste Manager (50% environmental management) = 0.3FTE
1 FTE Carbon Manager (100% environmental management)
1 FTE Director of Estates (10% on environmental management) = 0 FTE as below the 50% threshold

**Total: 1.8 FTE = 6 points**
Clarifications:
• No points for failure to attach relevant job description or related link.
• No points for job descriptions which do not clearly show responsibility for developing, implementing and monitoring environmental management plans. For example, a waste manager with responsibility for developing a waste reduction strategy/targets and coordinating its implementation will be counted, whereas the estates personnel responsible for the day-to-day collection and recycling of the waste would not. Lab technicians responsible for the safe disposal of chemicals and other discharges are not eligible for points.
• No points awarded for environmental champions, these are counted in section 8.
• No points for roles like janitors, Course Leaders or Vice-Chancellors unless job descriptions clearly show over 50% of time spent on developing and implementing environment management plans or systems.

Staff roles that DO NOT qualify for points
• Administrative roles
• Day to day running of facilities e.g. technician roles
• Janitorial roles
• External communications roles
• Roles promoting sustainability in the curriculum
• Roles researching general environmental management issues
• Unpaid internships
• Full-time students carrying out environmental management duties.
• Staff members employed by the Student Union

Staff Roles that DO qualify for points
• Roles with responsibility for developing and implementing environmental management duties
• Data analyst roles e.g. energy/carbon data.
• Roles primarily dedicated to implementing environmental management plans developed by others
• Communication roles where primary responsibility is encouraging sustainable behaviour change or communicating environmental management plans within the university.
• Where a post is newly created and has not yet been recruited at the time of submission, we do not count this. However, in cases where a staff member leaves an existing post and the university is in the process of actively recruiting a replacement we will consider this.
• 2a is the only question where less than 0.5FTE could be awarded. For 2b, 2c & 2d we expect all roles submitted to consist of at least 50% responsibility for developing environmental management plans and awarded either 0.5 or 1 FTE based on whether the responsibility for this was shared with other duties (eg. Health & Safety and Environmental manager).
• Points are only awarded where the job description clearly shows that environmental management responsibilities makes up at least 50% of the role. When judging the proportion of staff members time that is spent on environmental management duties People & Planet judges the balance of duties contained in the “Role Description” or “Responsibilities” section of the job description.
Evidence required:
- Job description or weblink to job description
- If no job description is available, please download and sign the accompanying statement form to confirm the described responsibilities form at least 50% of their role. This statement acts as an affirmation from the responsible party that the submitted information is accurate and must include the responsible party’s contact details.

Download the form here.

3. Environmental Auditing & Management Systems

Why measure this?
Only by analysing and regularly auditing the variety of different environmental impacts - from energy to procurement and biodiversity - can an institution set targets, assess priorities and monitor performance improvements. The People & Planet Green League awards points for institutions that have audited a variety of different environmental impacts. This is a key element of any externally-accredited Environmental Management System, such as ISO14001, EMAS, Green Dragon and EcoCampus.

In recognition of the rigour and accuracy of external environmental management systems, the People & Planet Green League also awards points to those universities that have opened themselves up to the external scrutiny of such schemes. In recognition of the incremental nature of accreditation for these schemes, we award points according to progress towards the highest achievable standard in each scheme, as well as taking into account whether or not the standard has been achieved across the majority of the estate and not simply on one campus.

How are points allocated?
Total: 8 points

Institution has audited environmental impacts in the following areas in the last five years
- Waste management (½ point)
- Transport (½ point)
- Sustainable Procurement (½ point)
- Energy (½ point)
- Water (½ point)
- Construction & Refurbishment (½ point)
- Emissions & Discharges (½ point)
- Biodiversity (½ point)

4 Points

Institution operates an externally audited environmental management system (e.g. ISO14001, EMAS, Ecocampus, Green Dragon, IEMA Acorn Scheme [BS8885]) up to 4 Points
Environmental Management Systems scoring grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited inspection to BS 8555 (IEMA Acorn Scheme)</th>
<th>Green Dragon Award (Wales)</th>
<th>EcoCampus</th>
<th>EMAS</th>
<th>ISO14001</th>
<th>EMS covers 50% or more of universities gross internal area</th>
<th>EMS covers less than 50% of universities gross internal area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>0.5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Points</td>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Points</td>
<td>1.5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Points</td>
<td>1.5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 and Phase 6</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
<td>EMAS Registered</td>
<td>ISO 14001 certification</td>
<td>4 Points</td>
<td>2 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How is this criteria assessed?**

3. a) For which of the following areas has the institution carried out a comprehensive audit of environmental impacts in the last five years? (Waste management, Transport, Sustainable Procurement, Energy, Water, Construction & Refurbishment, Emissions & Discharges, Biodiversity) **0.5 points for each area audited**

Clarifications:
- No points were awarded for failure to provide evidence of a comprehensive audit of each impact area. We are looking for evidence which clearly highlights the baseline figures established by the audit in each area.
- Audit doesn’t have to cover every square inch of campus but if it is not of whole campus then it must clearly demonstrate that the impacts in that area are being effectively monitored and managed.
- No points are awarded for evidence of systems audits carried out as part of an external EMS scheme (eg. EcoCampus audit transcript) as these do not contain actual evidence of the baseline audit, and are also subject to points in 3b so cannot be double counted.

Evidence Required:
- Reports of the audit for each impact area and/or minutes of any meeting in which the audit was reported on clearly highlighting the baseline figures established by the audit and the date when each audit was carried out.

3. b) Is your institution part of an external environmental management system (e.g. ISO14001, EMAS, Ecocampus, Green Dragon, BS8885 etc.)? **4 points**
If Yes, what stage/phase/level have you achieved in the scheme?
If Yes, what campuses and other parts of the estate does this cover?
In total does the physical area that is covered by the EMS amount to 50% or more of the university estate?
Clarifications:
- Universities cannot score points for having more than 1 EMS in place. Please only submit evidence for your highest scoring EMS (see scoring grid above).
- No full points unless the Environmental Management System covers 50% or more of the institutions’ estate which is judged by the gross internal area covered rather than the activities e.g. teaching
- Only those schemes explicitly in the scoring grid above are eligible to receive points.
- For EMAS and ISO14001 no points awarded unless full certification achieved.

Evidence Required:
- Certification documents or weblink to external EMS certifiers website clearly setting out the stage/level/award the institution has achieved.
- Documents that demonstrate which parts of the university estate are included in the external environmental management system e.g. audit documents
- Statement from the responsible party confirming that the physical area covered by the external environmental management system amounts to 50% or more of the university campus

4. Ethical Investment Policy

Why measure this?
A strong ethical investment policy ensures an institution’s investments and banking practices are conducted transparently and in an economically-viable, socially-responsible manner, not blind to wider social, environmental and humanitarian concerns. Ethical investment policies are not only necessary to direct decision-making around the investment of ‘extraneous funds’. They inform decisions about all areas of investment conducted by an institution, including but not limited to pension fund investments, equities investment and choice of banking providers.

If an ethical investment policy isn’t put into practice then it is not worth the paper it’s printed on. The People & Planet Green League only awards full points if there is a clear process for regular review, with ongoing opportunities for staff, students and other stakeholders to engage with the policy and evidence that the policy is being acted upon.

How are points allocated?

Total: 3 points

Institution has a publicly-available ethical investment policy 1 Point

Institution has a publicly available ethical investment policy which is reported on annually and/or there are ongoing opportunities for staff, students and other stakeholders to engage with the policy 1 Point

Institution has, on ethical grounds: a) divested, b) invested, c) engaged with companies as a shareholder, or d) changed banking provider 1 Point
How is this criteria assessed?

4a) Does the institution have a publicly available ethical investment policy? **1 Point**

Clarifications:
- An ethical investment policy should be comprehensive, so simply stating that no investments will be made in one particular industry (e.g. tobacco industry) does not qualify.
- No points awarded for institutions that include only limited statements within an existing investment Policy.
- No points for simply stating that the university has no funds to invest therefore doesn’t require an ethical investment policy. Such policies are necessary in considering the environmental and ethical implications of a range of financial decisions, for example, selection of banking providers.
- We do not agree with ALL definitions of ethical investment – sustainable procurement (e.g buying products and services) does not count.
- No points awarded for policies that do not commit an institution to going beyond financial incentives (i.e. only investing ethically if there is no price difference).
- Providing the ethical policy of an investment firm is not sufficient. We require evidence of the institution’s own policy and commitment to ethical investment.

Evidence required:
- Ethical Investment policy document
- Weblink to publicly-available policy or (if not on the web) signed statement from responsible party confirming that the policy is publicly-available and contact details of the responsible party.

4. b) Is the ethical investment policy reported on annually? **See 4c**

Clarifications:
- No points for failure to include minutes of reports or other proof describing how the policy is reported on.

Evidence required:
- Web link to evidence of the reporting or uploaded documents eg. minutes from a finance committee in which the policy was reported on since 1 April 2011
- If the policy is new, provide a short, signed statement from responsible party confirming the intended reporting structure and contact details of the responsible party

4 c) Are there ongoing opportunities for staff, students and other stakeholders to engage with the ethical investment policy? **1 Point for 4b and/or 4c**

Clarifications:
- No points for failure to include minutes of reports or other proof describing how stakeholders engage with the policy.
- Points are not awarded for simply making the ethical investment policy publicly-available, we also require evidence that an institution provided ongoing opportunities for staff, students and other stakeholders to engage with it.
Evidence required:
• Signed statement from staff AND student representatives that such opportunities exist (eg. student union executive)

4d) Has your university taken investment, divestment action, engaged with companies as a shareholder or switched banking providers on ethical grounds? 1 Point
Clarifications:
• No points for failure to include minutes of meetings highlighting the action taken or other relevant proof of action.
• No points for general statements from investment managers committing to screen investments for ethical considerations. We also require actual evidence of the screening procedure and any outcomes in terms of determining investment, divestment or a change in banking or investment provision.
• Investing in spin off companies alone is not accepted as evidence of ethical investment action.
• ‘Shareholder engagement’ is a specific approach to ethical investment. Points will not be awarded unless evidence shows engagement goes beyond simply raising ethical concerns without sustained or subsequent engagement or shareholder action.
• People & Planet commits to keep all evidence submitted confidential. Irrelevant or sensitive areas of the evidence submitted may be blanked out.
Evidence required:
• Upload evidence that such action has been taken e.g. minutes from University Council in which the investment, divestment or change of banking provider was discussed.

5. Carbon Management
Why measure this?
A steep and annual reduction in global carbon emissions is required to avert catastrophic global climate destabilisation and keep global warming increases to below 2 degrees. This requires that countries like the UK, which have historical responsibility for creating the majority of emissions, reduce our carbon emissions by at least 40% by 2020 and 90% by 2050.

The UK Government expects all sectors of society to contribute to the 80% reductions by 2050 enshrined within the Climate Change Act (2008) and Climate Change (Scotland) Act (2009). Carbon management is therefore central to the future of environmental management in universities, as recognised by the joint publication by Hefce, Universities UK and GuildHE’s of a Carbon Reduction Strategy (2010) which set a sector-wide carbon reduction target. Although this strategy applies only to English institutions, similar requirements are in place for institutions in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, for example through the Universities and Colleges Climate Change Commitment for Scotland (UCCfS) and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (Hefcw).

The People & Planet Green League awards points to those institutions which have created
strong carbon management plans with targets broadly in line with the sector-wide reduction targets set by the Hefce/UniversitiesUK 2010 strategy. It rewards those universities with ambitious short-term targets as these are crucial to reducing the impact of cumulative emissions and getting an institution on track for a longer-term transition to low-carbon operations.

The People & Planet Green League also awards points for institutions taking a holistic approach to carbon management by including the full scope of their emissions in the reduction targets they set themselves. Transport, waste and procurement activities are said to account for up to 50% of an institution’s carbon footprint so it is vital that all institutions start including these in their carbon management plan baselines and targets as soon as possible. Guidance for institutions on how to do this was published in January 2012 and all institutions will be required to calculate and reduce these so-called Scope 3 emissions by the end of 2012.

**How are points allocated?**

**Total: 7 points**

Institution has a publicly-available carbon management plan which meets the Carbon Trust and Capital Investment Framework requirements **2 Points**

Yearly average % carbon reduction target (taken from an institution’s short-term targets from a 2005 baseline) are equal to: **2 Points**

- 0 points: less than 2.4%
- 1 point: between 2.4% and 2.85%
- 2 points: 2.85% or higher

The carbon management plan includes a baseline and reduction targets for emissions from the following areas:

- Procurement **1 Point**
- Staff and student business trips e.g. flights to conferences and field trips **1 Point**
- Staff and students commuting to university on a daily basis **0.5 Points**
- Carbon emissions associated with the travel between students’ homes and the university at the start and end of term (including international students’ travel to and from their home country) **0.5 Point**

**Example 1:**

An institution that has a short term target to reduce carbon emissions by 20% by 2015, compared to a 2005 baseline, would be awarded 0 points as this is equivalent to a 2% yearly average reduction over 10 years.

**Example 2:**

An institution that has a short term target to reduce carbon emissions by 30% by 2015, compared to a 2005 baseline, would be awarded 2 points as this is equivalent to a 3% yearly average reduction over 10 years.
How is this criteria assessed?

5 a) Does the institution have a publicly available carbon management plan which meets the Carbon Trust and Capital Investment Framework requirements? **2 Points**

Clarifications:
Criteria (5a) has been developed in consultation with and approved by The Carbon Trust.

“The Carbon Trust and Hefce’s Capital Investment Framework 2 set out a series of requirements for effective HE carbon management plans. People & Planet uses the same requirements to assess whether an institution’s CMP meet this criteria and receives the full two points available.”

*Tim Pryce, Public Sector Manager, Carbon Trust*

No points are awarded if the CMP is not/does not:
- publicly-available.
- include a carbon baseline for 2005 which covers all scope 1 and 2 emissions, and set an aspirational carbon reduction target for 2020 against this baseline*
- set a SMART carbon reduction target that is a realistic milestone towards the 2020 target, covering scope 1 & 2 as minimum
- include an implementation plan to achieve the SMART carbon emission reduction target including estimated carbon savings, time scales and resources. These should cover capital projects and actions to embed carbon management within the institution, for example, through corporate strategy, communication and training. There should also be consideration of how to measure and reduce scope 3 emissions.
- State the estimated investment needed to achieve the SMART target, and the energy and maintenance cost savings that result
- Clear responsibilities for carbon management.
- A commitment to monitor progress towards targets regularly and to report publicly annually.
- be signed off by the institution’s governing body.
* Non English institutions are not covered by CIF2 and can therefore set a baseline and a target for dates other than 2005 and 2020 if they wish

Evidence required:
- Link to publicly-available Carbon Management Plan or equivalent document
- For questions 5b, c, d, e, f, g please specify the relevant page number on the documents uploaded/linked to confirming you meet the criteria (eg. “See page 26 for Scope 3 baseline figures and related targets”)

5. b) What are your institutions short term carbon reduction targets? **2 Points**

Please include baseline year.
- 0 points: less than 2.4%
- 1 point: between 2.4% and 2.85%
- 2 points: 2.85% or higher
Clarifications:
• 0 - 2 points awarded based on the average annual short-term carbon reduction targets set out in carbon management plans. Short-term targets are calculated from the target closest to a 10-year period as possible.
• Points can be awarded if no CMP exists. However, targets need to be referenced in a previous environmental policy or similar document signed off at senior level and publicly-available.

5 c) Does the carbon management plan include a baseline and reduction targets for emissions from procurement? **1 Point**

Clarifications:
• Procurement emissions need to be included in CMP baseline against which total reduction targets are set or include specific targets for reducing these emissions.
• A baseline review of procurement emissions alone is not adequate - we are looking for evidence that carbon reduction targets include emissions created by the institution’s procurement activities.
• 0 points if targets/baseline appear in draft documents not signed off at senior level.

5 d) Does the carbon management plan include a baseline and reduction targets for emissions from staff and student business trips? **1 Point**

Clarifications:
• A baseline and targets for reducing staff and student travel emissions needs to be included in CMP and not just referenced in an independent travel plan.
• 0 points if targets/baseline appear in draft documents not signed off at senior level.

5 e) Does the carbon management plan include a baseline and reduction targets for emissions from staff and student commuting to university on a daily basis? **0.5 Points**

Clarifications:
• A baseline and targets for reducing staff and student travel emissions needs to be included in CMP and not just referenced in an independent travel plan.
• 0 points if targets/baseline appear in draft documents not signed off at senior level.

5 f) Does the carbon management plan include a baseline and reduction targets for emissions associated with the travel between students’ homes and the university at the start and end of term (including international students travel to and from their home country)? **0.5 Points**

Clarifications:
• A baseline and targets for reducing staff and student travel emissions needs to be included in CMP and not just referenced in an independent travel plan.
• 0 points if targets/baseline appear in draft documents not signed off at senior level.
6. Ethical Procurement & Fairtrade

Why measure this?
Whilst other criteria (1 & 3) assess an institution’s commitment to sustainable procurement in terms of environmental impacts, the People & Planet Green League also looks at the social and ethical impacts of sustainable procurement, in keeping with Defra’s definition of sustainable procurement in ‘Procuring the Future’

A sustainable university will consider its impacts in the UK and beyond, particularly through its purchasing policies. Buying and promoting Fairtrade goods is a recognised way of raising living standards for farmers and primary producers in developing countries. Fairtrade University certification is an objective standard, accredited by the Fairtrade Foundation, which demonstrates that an institution is, at least in part, considering its wider social and economic impacts.

People & Planet believes it is important for institutions to demonstrate commitment to the social and ethical impacts of their whole supply chains (across the broad range of products and services they procure) by taking concrete and credible steps beyond Fairtrade’s focus on helping primary producers. Therefore points are awarded to universities that have steering groups which address these impacts across product areas not covered by Fairtrade.

The garment industry is widely recognised as one in which serious human, gender and labour rights abuses are commonplace. Whilst garments are not the largest area of spend for universities it is an area in which the university sector can drive significant positive change and reduce the sustainability risk in its purchasing decisions. For this reason, the People & Planet Green League measures whether or not a university (or their purchasing consortium) is affiliated to the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) which requires all garment suppliers to disclose the location of factories and permit inspections. The WRC works with institutions to develop a Code of Conduct for their garment suppliers and helps institutions or purchasing consortia to work collectively to impact on human, gender and labour rights abuses. For further details contact us.

People & Planet is also committed to researching and including other areas (such as ICT & construction) in which procurement can reduce adverse ethical and social impacts. We will consult with stakeholders to find appropriate indicators that can be introduced to the Green League and add more weighting to this criteria from 2013 onwards, giving the sector plenty of notice.

How are points allocated?

Total: 2 points

Institution is an accredited Fairtrade University with the Fairtrade Foundation **1 Point**

Institution has a joint staff/student steering group with the remit of increasing the sustainability - including environmental, social and economic standards - of all procurement categories **0.5 Points**
Institution is affiliated to the Worker Rights Consortium, in order to monitor the suppliers and parts of its garment supply chains that are not covered by Fairtrade certification **0.5 Points**

### How is this criteria assessed?

**6a) Fairtrade University status** **1 Point**  
Information for this criteria is provided directly by the Fairtrade Foundation and points will be awarded to all institutions awarded Fairtrade University status by 1 April 2012.

6b) Does your institution have a joint staff/student steering group with the remit of increasing the sustainability, including environmental, social and economic standards, of all procurement categories? **0.5 Points**  
**Clarifications:**
- No points unless separate steering group exists (or working groups within an existing Fairtrade steering group) with specific remit which includes one or more of the following
  - Expanding procurement of Fairtrade products beyond existing categories
  - Reducing violations of labour rights in international supply chains
  - Introducing recommendations of EAUC Promoting Poverty Aware Procurement on campus, See the [EAUC project Promoting Poverty Aware Procurement on Campus](#) information sheets for procurement categories steering group should cover.
- No points unless the steering group includes at least one senior procurement manager and student representative

**Evidence required:**
- Upload terms of reference of steering group or minutes from relevant steering group clearly highlighting its remit.
- Statement from responsible party confirming remit and make-up of joint student and staff steering group/working group including contact details for responsible party.

6c) Is your university affiliated to the Worker Rights Consortium, in order to monitor the suppliers and parts of its supply chains that are not covered by Fairtrade certification? **0.5 Points**

**Clarifications:**
- No points if evidence not provided
- Points can be awarded if the university is part of a purchasing consortium which is affiliated to the [Worker Rights Consortium](#)
- No points awarded if the institution is still only discussing or working towards affiliation.

**Evidence required:**
- Certificate of affiliation or minutes of the meeting at which affiliation was approved at senior level.
- Statement from responsible party confirming affiliation to the Worker Rights Consortium, including date of affiliation and contact details for the responsible party.
7. Sustainable Food

Why measure this?

The food we consume accounts for around 30% of the UK’s carbon footprint according to Sustain, WWF and the Food Climate Research Network. Universities have a significant role to play in the food chain both as procurers and providers of food to over 2 million students each year. People & Planet believes education institutions have a responsibility to address the sustainability and carbon intensity of their food supply chains, whether it is provided internally or through contractors.

The People & Planet Green League awards points specifically for institutions that have made a high-level policy commitment to improving performance around sustainable food, setting a good example for students and staff. Whilst contract caterers may operate sustainably and have sustainability policies in place People & Planet (and the leading sector body - Sustain) believe it is vital that universities adopt their own clear policy to demonstrate they recognise the importance of food and take seriously the wellbeing of their staff and students and the sustainability impacts of food. A template sustainable food policy can be downloaded from the Sustain website.

The People & Planet Green League also awards points to institutions that can show they are already taking simple, concrete steps to improve the sustainability of the food they offer staff and students. These include easy actions such as only purchasing/serving 100% free-range eggs or organic milk, sourcing sustainable fish, serving seasonal fruit & vegetables, reducing meat & dairy consumption and not offering bottled water. The Green League rewards universities taking a range of the above actions (whether or not they are providing catering themselves or requiring their contract caterers to fulfill them) or alternatively, for achieving an equivalent standard in the Soil Association’s Food for Life accreditation scheme. Introduced in 2009, this criteria is being gradually strengthened to include a wider range of sustainable food ‘actions’ and increasing the number of actions necessary in order to gain full points.

The Food for Life Catering Mark is a unique award scheme from the Soil Association. It provides an independent guarantee that what’s on the menu is freshly prepared, seasonal and free from controversial e-numbers, trans fats, MSG and GM ingredients. It is open to all food providers and offers bronze, silver and gold awards. Institutions can apply for the Catering Mark for one or all of their food outlets. Find out more on the Soil Association website.

How are points allocated?

Total: 2 points

Institution has a publicly-available sustainable food policy which sets specific timebound targets for improvements **0.5 Points**

Institutional sustainable food policy is reported on annually at a senior level **0.5 Points**
Institution is implementing some or all of the following sustainable food practices:

• increasing purchase/sale of free-range eggs
• increasing purchase/sale of sustainable fish
• increasing seasonal variation
• reducing sale of bottled water
• reducing consumption of meat & dairy products
• increasing purchase of organic milk

How is this criteria assessed?

7a) Does your institution have a publicly-available sustainable food policy (or a Sustainable Procurement Policy which integrates sustainability criteria for food) which sets specific timebound targets for improvements? **0.5 Points**

Clarifications:

0.5 points will only be awarded if Policy meets the following criteria:

- Publicly-available – ie. Provide a link to where this policy can be viewed by staff/students or explain how it can be accessed publicly
- signed off at senior management level
- states explicitly that it covers all food outlets and food served by the university (it may exclude vending machines, and student union, for which university does not have responsibility)
- If the institution has outsources its catering, policies provided by contract caterers reflecting their principles are not acceptable here. The policy must be authored by the university itself and reflect the institution’s aims, objectives and principles with regards to healthy, sustainable food.
- includes time-bound, measurable or specific targets for improvements in at least 4 of the following areas:
  - increasing seasonal fruit & vegetables
  - increasing higher welfare meat & dairy
  - reducing meat & dairy consumption
  - increasing purchase/sales of sustainable fish (as defined by MCS)
  - purchasing 100% organic milk
  - increasing purchase/sales of free-range eggs
  - sustainable, local sourcing
  - increasing purchase/sales of fairtrade goods
  - reducing use of artificial additives
  - removing bottled water for sale
  - reducing food waste
  - reducing water & energy usage

Evidence required:

- Please provide a web link to the policy or upload questionnaire as an attachment.
- If no weblink provided, please provide written statement and contact details for person responsible confirming that the policy is available publicly and explaining why it is not available online.
7. Sustainable Food (continued)

7.b) Is the sustainable food policy been reported on annually at a senior level?  

**0.5 Points**

Clarifications:
- No points unless evidence provided that policy has been reported on since 1 April 2011.
- No points unless evidence provided that policy was reported on at a senior level.

Evidence required:
- A copy of the annual report, relevant committee meeting minutes or evidence of reporting structure if policy is less than a year old.
- Specify the staff member (job title)/ committee to which the report was made.

7.c) Which of the following sustainable food practices are being implemented at your institution?  

**1 Point**

Clarifications:
- 0 points if doing less than 3 of the below, or if adequate evidence not provided.
- 0.5 points if doing 3 or 4 or confirmation from Soil Association that working towards Food for Life Bronze accreditation*
- 1 point if doing 5 or 6 or accredited to Food for Life bronze standard or higher.
- NB: points are available regardless of whether you receive points for 7a or 7b.

*’Working towards’ refers to institutions officially in contact with the Soil Association’s Catering Mark Officer, Jenny Collins, and confirmed by the Soil Association as actively working towards Food for Life accreditation.
- The following actions can apply to catering outlets (eg. cafeterias) or retail outlets selling food.

i) Free-range Eggs

Does the university ensure that on an ongoing basis all whole/liquid/dried eggs are purchased from a free-range production system and any products purchased containing egg state that the eggs are from a free-range production system?

Evidence required:
- 3 random invoices clearly highlighted to show the purchase of 100% free-range eggs and egg products (or highlighted extract from catering contract confirming the same)
- written confirmation from responsible staff member that this is the case, including staff member’s contact details.

Clarifications:
- A Good Egg Award is not sufficient evidence of using free range eggs, as it is awarded for the use of cage-free eggs which is a lower welfare standard than free range.
ii) Sustainable Fish
Has the university eliminated any fish from the menu which appear on the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) “red list” or IUCN red list or avoid tuna which has been caught using purse seine nets with Fish Aggregation Devices (FADS) and does the university seek to serve MSC certified fish and maximise use of fish on the MCS fish to eat list)?

Evidence required:
• 3 random invoices clearly highlighted to show the purchase of fish and fish products with MSC certification or appearing on the MCS fish to eat list (or highlighted extract from catering contract confirming the same) NB: no point awarded if fish appear on either red list
• written confirmation from responsible staff member that this is the case, including staff member’s contact details.

iii) Seasonal variation.
Do all food offers/menus change with the availability of seasonal produce with at least 2 (major) items per main dish served in the season it is naturally abundant?

Evidence required:
• At least 3 dated menus from across the academic year which make use of and highlight a number of seasonal fruit and vegetables
• Menus can use a broad specification like ‘seasonal vegetables’ or state clearly that fruit and vegetables are subject to seasonal variation.
• Written confirmation from responsible staff member that this is the case, including staff member’s contact details.

iv) Bottled Water
Has the university has stopped offering purchased bottled water in its hospitality service (NB: this does not apply to water bottled on site from the mains)?

Evidence required:
• Written confirmation from responsible staff member that this is the case, including staff member’s contact details.

v) Purchasing 100% organic milk
Does the institution ensure that on an ongoing basis all milk purchased is certified as organic?

Evidence required:
• 3 random invoices clearly highlighted to show the purchase of 100% organic milk
• written confirmation from responsible staff member that this is the case, including staff member’s contact details.

vi) Less and better meat & dairy
Does the institution use 100% Red Tractor Assured meat & dairy products and/or follow Feel Good Food Days guidance on meat/dairy portions and/or hold at least one meat-free day each week.
Evidence required:
• Written confirmation from responsible staff member of how institution meets this criteria, including that staff member’s contact details.
• Plus one or more of the following:
  • 3 random invoices showing that 100% of the livestock produce (meat and dairy) used meets the Red Tractor Assured standards as a minimum.
  • 2 recipes showing use of recommended smaller meat or dairy portions
  • at least 3 dated menus from across the academic year highlighting meat-free days.

vii) Food for life certification
Is the institution working towards Food for Life accreditation with the Soil Association?

Clarifications:
• 'Working towards' refers to institutions officially in contact with the Catering Mark Officer, Jenny Collins, and registered by the Soil Association as working towards Food for Life accreditation by 1 April 2012.
• Confirmation will be sought directly from the Soil Association that the institution is actively working towards Food for Life certification.

Evidence required:
• Copy of Food for Life certification covering more than one outlet confirmation from Soil Association and/or evidence of certification of more than one outlet) (0.5 or 1 point equivalent)

8. Staff and Student Engagement

Why measure this?
An institution’s transition towards environmental sustainability cannot be achieved without the engagement and support of the entire university community including students and staff at all levels. Whilst universities are directly responsible for many environmental impacts through their operations, the university community also contributes significantly to its overall footprint through its behaviour - for example, consumption of electricity or travel/recycling habits.

Universities that play an active role in encouraging and engaging students and staff in sustainable behaviour change will be able to make their transition to a low-carbon, lower-energy future much more smoothly, cheaply and quickly. Furthermore, behaviour and values learnt whilst at university have long-lasting impacts on graduates throughout their lives.

From the example they set to students to the large volumes of waste glass they generate, Students’ Unions and Students’ Associations also have a big environmental responsibility. In addition to some universities owning and managing Students’ Union properties, all universities can share expertise on environmental management with their student unions or associations, as well as providing resources (such as time or grants) for environmental initiatives by their staff and students.
**How are points allocated?**

**Total: 3 points**

0 points if doing none or less than 3 of the below
1 point if doing 3-4 of the below
2 points if doing 5-7 the below
3 points if doing 8 or more of the below:

a. Students’ Union or Students’ Association associated to the institution has achieved a Bronze, Silver or Gold Award in this year’s [Green Impact Union Awards](#) (or similar)
b. University actively supports an annual [Go Green Week](#) or Environment Week
c. Staff engagement scheme to involve staff in improving the environmental performance of the university- for eg. [Green Impact Universities](#) or departmental eco-champions
d. Initiatives to increase energy saving behaviour of all students in halls of residence (eg. [Student Switch Off](#))
e. Initiatives to increase recycling behaviour of all students in halls of residence
f. Student representation on all university committees concerned with estates, planning, finance and resource allocation.
g. Environmental awareness-raising campaigns that reach all students and staff
h. Coursework linked to sustainability projects within the university/estates department.
i. Availability of university funds for student or staff-led practical sustainability projects (eg. campus allotments, recycling schemes etc)
j. Oversight and involvement of students and staff in the development and ongoing monitoring of Carbon Management Plan.
k. Provision of space for student / staff food-growing projects
l. All staff inductions cover sustainability policy and issues
m. Trade Union climate action groups (eg. GreenReps) or time off to participate in Union-linked sustainability initiatives.

**How is this criteria assessed?**

8. Do any of the following activities take place at your university? **0-3 Points**

Clarifications:
- The same activity/evidence cannot be submitted under more than one category. If evidence is submitted twice points will only be awarded under the most relevant category.

a) Students’ Union or Students’ Association associated to the institution has achieved a Bronze, Silver or Gold Award in this year’s Green Impact Union Awards (or similar)

**Evidence required:**
- If Students’ Union or Students’ Association is part of the Green Impact scheme then no evidence is required as evidence of Green Impact Union Award will be provided directly by NUS who coordinate the Green Impact Unions scheme.
- If not affiliated to NUS, please ask student union/association to provide evidence of comparable level of activity to the Green Impact Unions Bronze Award or higher.
8. Staff and Student Engagement (continued)

Clarifications:
• Points not awarded if the institution has not yet achieved an award or is still classed by NUS Services Ltd as “working towards” the award on 1 April 2012.

b) University actively supports an annual **Go Green Week** or Environment Week

Clarifications:
• University must provide resources and/or help organise the week to qualify for points
• The initiatives must go beyond awareness raising (eg. Poster campaigns)
• No points were awarded for one-off or one-day events.
• No points awarded for a week which only covers one environmental area e.g. cycling week unless several events are held throughout the year on a range of topics.
• No points awarded for Health/Wellbeing/Fairtrade weeks unless there was a significant environmental element included.

**Evidence required:**
• Evidence of these activities is needed in the form of minutes from meetings where projects are formally agreed to or programme of activities or weblink to relevant media coverage.

c) Staff engagement scheme to involve staff in improving the environmental performance of the university eg. **Green Impact Universities** or departmental eco-champions

Clarifications:
• If run by external organisation (eg. EAUC’s Green Impact Universities scheme) evidence will be requested directly from them.
• No points for only including individual members of staff sitting on committees or steering groups, we’re looking for evidence of engagement schemes open to all staff.

**Evidence required:**
• Evidence of these activities is needed in the form of minutes from meetings where projects are formally agreed to and/or link to information on website.

d) Initiatives to increase energy saving behaviour of all students in halls of residence eg. Student Switch Off

Clarifications:
• The initiatives must go beyond awareness raising (eg. Poster campaigns)
• If the university has no halls of residence, we will consider evidence of energy-saving initiatives across a significant proportion of the wider student body.
• No points awarded unless a brief outline of the reach and results of activities carried out to increase energy-saving behaviour is provided.
• If initiative is run by Student Switch Off evidence of involvement will be provided directly by them. An institution must be signed up by 1 April 2012.

**Evidence required:**
• Brief outline of the reach and results of activities carried out to increase energy-saving behaviour
• Minutes from meetings where projects are formally agreed to and/or relevant weblinks to details of the initiative.

e) Initiatives to increase recycling behaviour of all students in halls of residence
Clarifications:
• The initiatives must go beyond awareness raising (e.g. Poster campaigns)
• Where the university has no halls of residence, we will consider evidence of initiatives to increase recycling by a significant proportion of the wider student body.
• No points awarded simply for installing or providing recycling facilities, we’re looking for evidence of a comprehensive, ongoing engagement scheme
• No points awarded unless a brief outline of the reach and results of activities carried out to increase recycling behaviour was provided.

Evidence required:
• Minutes from meetings where projects are formally agreed to and/or links to websites relating to the initiatives.
• Brief outline of the reach and results of activities carried out to increase recycling behaviour.

f) Student representation on all university committees concerned with estates, planning, finance and resource allocation
Clarifications:
• No points unless evidence from student representative confirms this is the case.
• Points only awarded if evidence from student representatives confirms participation in ALL relevant committees.

Evidence required:
• Statement from a responsible party in the students union executive confirming that students have representation on all university committees concerned with estates, planning, finance and resource allocation, including contact details of relevant party.

g) Environmental awareness-raising campaigns that reach all students and staff
Clarifications:
• No points unless the campaigns cover all campuses or departments.

Evidence required:
• Minutes from meetings where projects are formally agreed to and/or signed off communications plans clearly highlighting environmental awareness-raising initiatives.
• Please attach evidence and provide a brief statement from a responsible party confirming how the campaign was designed and resourced to reach all staff and students (e.g. photos, university newsletter, screenshots of intranet pages etc)

h) Coursework linked to sustainability projects within the university/estates department.
Clarifications:
• The coursework must be part of an academic course within the university.
8. Staff and Student Engagement (continued)

- The coursework could be from any department or discipline, as long as it related directly to the sustainability operations of the institution.
- No points awarded for internships or volunteering schemes.

**Evidence required:**
- Evidence of these activities is needed in the form of the course outline documents or similar.

i) Availability of university funds for student or staff-led practical sustainability projects (eg. campus allotments, recycling schemes etc)

**Clarifications:**
- This criteria refers to grassroots, practical projects developed and implemented by staff and students.
- The funds must be from the university directly and not from student union funds or external grant-making bodies.
- This criteria does not refer to capital funding for large-scale sustainability projects carried out by university staff.

**Evidence required:**
- Evidence of the above in the form of minutes from meetings where projects or funding are formally agreed to.
- Upload or links to evidence of the projects started with funding is required.

j) Oversight and involvement of students and staff in the development and ongoing monitoring of Carbon Management Plan.

**Clarifications:**
- The involvement must be in developing and monitoring of the Carbon Management Plan and not simply a smaller part of the plan (e.g. monitoring energy use in a department).
- No points for involving staff/students in development phase of CMP but not in the ongoing oversight and monitoring of its implementation.
- Points can be awarded where the carbon management clearly states a process or structure for ongoing engagement of staff and students in the implementation and oversight of the plan.

**Evidence required:**
- Please provide evidence in the form of minutes from meetings or terms of reference for a carbon management committees, or steering group clearly highlighting student and staff representatives.

k) Provision of space for student / staff-led sustainable food projects

**Clarifications:**
- This question has been updated since the publication of the People & Planet Green
League 2012 guide on 18 January. In addition to food growing projects, we now also accept evidence of the provision of space for student/staff run sustainable food distribution projects such as veg-box scheme or food co-ops

- Roof gardens and raised beds are acceptable

**Evidence required:**

- Please provide evidence in the form of minutes from meetings where projects are agreed or official agreement documents between university and staff/students for use of space for food growing.
- Either map or photo evidence of the food growing site and brief description of how students and staff can get involved/access the space.

**l) All staff inductions cover sustainability policy and issues**

**Clarifications:**

- No points if sustainability is simply mentioned briefly in a presentation or induction document, we required evidence of a comprehensive induction.
- No points for simply holding a stall at an induction fair, we require evidence of an induction process which would reach and engage all staff in the sustainability agenda.

**Evidence required:**

- Relevant parts of staff training handbook, induction course outline or similar.

**m) Trade Union climate action groups (eg. GreenReps) or time off to participate in Union-linked sustainability initiatives.**

**Clarifications:**

- It is not sufficient to provide a letter from HR saying that staff members are entitled to have time off for union activities if requested. We require evidence that staff have actually taken time off/participated in trade-union linked sustainability activities.
- Points only awarded if union members confirm that they have received time off for sustainability-related training or events.

**Evidence required:**

- Statement from responsible party from the staff union (eg. GreenRep) confirming that this is the case, including contact details of the responsible party.
- Minutes from meetings where the above is formally agreed to and/or links to websites relating to the initiatives.
9. Curriculum

Why measure this?

Education for Sustainable Development will be crucial to ensuring our society has graduates that are able to understand and tackle the interlinked social and environmental problems that we face over the next century. The university sector could and should be a major contributor to society’s efforts to make the transition to a low-carbon economy - through the skills and knowledge that its graduates learn and put into practice.

A number of universities have been pioneering ways to promote Education for Sustainable Development throughout the curriculum, in subjects as diverse as engineering, history, art and music. Useful guidance for those just starting out can be found online. The People & Planet Green League rewards universities taking key steps to integrate sustainability into their core activities of teaching and research.

In recognition that there are a number of different but equally valid ways to promote Education for Sustainable Development, universities can score points from using a wide range of approaches.

How are points allocated?

Total: 2 points

0 points if doing none or only one of the below
1 point if doing 2-3 of the below
2 points if doing 4 or more of the below

a) Strategic or Corporate Plan commits to promoting Education for Sustainable Development through the curriculum
b) Teaching and Learning strategy explicitly mentions Education for Sustainable Development in the curriculum
c) Environmental policy explicitly mentions promoting Education for Sustainable Development through the curriculum
d) Institution makes available support or training to help all academic staff integrate education for sustainable development into the curriculum
e) Institution has a mechanism for reviewing and reporting on progress on the integration of education for sustainable development into the curriculum

How is this criteria assessed?

General Clarifications:
• Points are awarded even if the exact phrase “Education for Sustainable Development” was not used, we simply required reference to an Education for Sustainable Development approach to curriculum.
• The documents in this section must explicitly mention sustainability in the context of the curriculum. A general commitment to promoting sustainability across the...
The institution does not provide evidence that the university is taking action on Education for Sustainable Development approach rather than focusing on sustainability in the university estate.

- The Education for Sustainable Development approach is characterised by being proactive in integrating sustainability across the curriculum rather than simply promoting a sustainability department or stand-alone sustainability course. Therefore only committing to supporting a sustainability department or course does not count.
- In the Green League 2011 no points were awarded for documents which only committed to include sustainability into the “relevant curriculum” or “where appropriate”. In response to feedback from the sector points will now be awarded in these cases.
- Points may be awarded for commitment to promoting related approaches and subjects, such as Global Citizenship, through the curriculum.
- The documents in this section must explicitly mention sustainability in the context of the curriculum. A general commitment to promoting sustainability across the institution does not provide evidence that the university is taking action on Education for Sustainable Development rather than focusing on sustainability in the university estate.

9 a) University Strategic Plan commits to promoting Education for Sustainable Development within the curriculum.

Clarifications:
- Education for Sustainable Development involves sustainability being integrated across the curriculum and therefore only committing to supporting a sustainability department or course was not sufficient.

Evidence required:
- Copy of Strategic Plan, corporate plan, mission statement or equivalent document.
- The document provided in evidence doesn’t have to use the specific phrase “education for sustainable development” but the description must be of an education for sustainable development approach.

9 b) University Teaching and Learning Strategy explicitly mentions Education for Sustainable Development in the curriculum.

Clarifications:
- Points were awarded even if the exact phrase “Education for Sustainable Development” was not used, we simply required reference to an Education for Sustainable Development approach to curriculum.

Evidence required:
- Please attach and specific relevant page of the Teaching and Learning Strategy covering the whole institution.

9 c) University environmental/sustainability policy explicitly mentions promoting Education for Sustainable Development through the curriculum.
Evidence required:
• Copy of appropriate policy document highlighting relevant section

9 d) University makes available support or training to help all academic staff integrate Education for Sustainable Development into the curriculum.

Clarifications:
• The support or training must be made available to ALL academic staff.
• By academic staff we do not include staff members who have a purely administrative role.
• Providing training or support on general environmental issues or environmental management does not count as this training is not focused on integrating sustainability into the curriculum.
• A training event focused on supporting staff to integrate sustainability into the curriculum is sufficient as long as the event is open to ALL staff.

Evidence required:
A copy of one of the following:
• Evidence of offer of support.
• Training programme or mentoring plan.
• Evidence of training or mentoring outcomes.
• Job description of person whose role is to provide support/training in Education for Sustainable Development.
• Evidence of an Education for Sustainable Development training event open to all staff.

In addition we will require a statement from the responsible party confirming that training or support is available to ALL staff along with their contact details of responsible party.

9 e) University has a mechanism for reviewing and reporting on progress on the integration of Education for Sustainable Development into the curriculum.

Clarifications:
• Evidence of a single reference to sustainability from the minutes of a general curriculum review board does not count. This is because it does not demonstrate that the university is committed to reviewing progress in a strategic way.

Evidence required:
A copy of one of the following:
• Brief description and evidence of reporting structure.
• Terms of reference for the committee or steering group which has responsibility for reporting on progress.
• Copy of job description of the individual responsible for reporting, including explanation of duties and contact details for the individual.
• Minutes of meetings that demonstrate that progress is reported in a strategic and long term way (eg. minutes that show Education for Sustainable Development is a permanent agenda item on a curriculum review board).
Performance Criteria

The People & Planet Green League 2012 awards a total of 30 points based on institutions’ performance in a number of key environmental impact areas. All points in this section (with the exception of criteria 10a) are based on Estates Management Statistics data provided to People & Planet by the Higher Education Statistics Agency which took over responsibility for data collection from Hefce in 2010.

10. Energy sources

Why measure this?

Universities have a clear responsibility to rapidly reduce their emissions of greenhouse gases in order to help prevent further climatic destabilisation. Whilst improving energy efficiency is absolutely crucial, carbon reductions will not be achieved by energy conservation measures alone and it is therefore vital for universities to invest in renewable and decentralised energy technologies.

Peak oil and energy security are also important considerations for any institution to integrate into their planning, policies and management. As finite resources dwindle on a planet with ever-growing global demand for energy, the domestic production of clean, renewable energy will be key factors in the HE sector’s sustainability and transition to a low-carbon future.

The People & Planet Green League recognises universities contributing to the creation of additional renewable energy generation in the UK through the purchase of renewable electricity subject to Levy Exemption Certificates (LECs). In recognition of the importance of onsite power generation it also awards points for the percentage of energy being produced on site by universities and to those universities with onsite Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plants.

How is this criteria assessed?

Total: 6 points

10 a) Percentage total electricity from renewable sources subject to LECs 0-3 Points

Clarifications:

• Point allocation is calculated by comparing percentage with other institutions
• No points unless relevant evidence provided
• No points if evidence provided does not clearly state that electricity is from sources subject to LECs.
• Points are awarded in this category for the % of electricity purchased from renewable electricity sources subject to LECs that an institution provides evidence for. If the % stated differs to that in the evidence provided, points will be awarded based on the % evidenced.
• Where an institution simply refers to the energy-mix of their electricity supplier without providing evidence of the % of LEC electricity they are purchasing, a figure of 0% is awarded as we require evidence in the form of electricity contracts.
• Electricity from CHP plants that burn fossil fuels (e.g. gas) is NOT considered renewable, regardless of whether it is covered by LECs.

Evidence required:
• Please provide a copy of your energy contract highlighting the proportion from renewables and confirming that the energy comes from renewables as defined above.

10 b) Institution has an onsite Combined Heat and Power Plant (CHP) 1 Point

Clarifications:
• Data taken directly from “D72c Energy generated on site by CHP” of Estate Management Statistics (EMS 2010-11)

10 c) Percentage of total energy generated on-site from Low and Zero-Carbon (LZC) technologies 0-2 Points

Clarifications:
• Point allocation is calculated by comparing percentage with other institutions
• Total percentage calculated from EMS criteria “D72d Renewable energy generated on or off site, either by the HEI independently or in partnership with others” divided by “D38a Energy consumption”

11. Waste & Recycling

Why measure this?
By not recycling, institutions are burying and burning resources unnecessarily, wasting money on landfill taxes as well as contributing to pollution and climate change. There is currently no firm recycling target for the higher education sector, but evidence from previous league tables shows that many institutions can achieve at least 70% recycling rates. The People & Planet Green League ranks institutions according to the proportion of total waste mass they recycle, as compared to the rest of the sector, although no institution recycling less than 25% of their waste will receive points in this category.

Recognising that reducing waste is environmentally superior to recycling waste, the People & Planet Green League awards up to four points for the waste mass per head produced by institutions, as compared to other institutions.

In previous years People & Planet have calculated figures for this criteria using the EMS data for total waste mass including construction waste, however, as construction waste varies greatly year to year it does not always reflect the quality of waste management practices that a university has implemented. Furthermore, as a large number of
universities do not report their construction waste figures the Green League Oversight Group has questioned whether all universities are reporting their construction waste figures accurately. As a result of these concerns the People & Planet Green League 2012 will score institutions based on figures for waste mass and waste recycling excluding construction waste. As waste from construction is responsible for significant environmental impacts People & Planet is committed to finding more appropriate ways to assess this area in future years.

How is this criteria assessed?
Total: 8 points

11 a) Percentage of waste an institution recycles 0-4 Points

Clarifications:
- Point allocation is calculated by comparing percentage with other institutions
- Does not include construction waste

11 b) Waste mass per head 0-4 Points

Clarifications:
- Point allocation is calculated by comparing waste mass per head with other institutions
- Data taken from “D73.C01 Waste mass”, “D73.C15 Construction waste mass”, “D04 Student FTE” and “D05 FTE staff” of EMS
- Does not include construction waste

12. Carbon Reduction

Why measure this?
As well as monitoring institutions’ carbon management plans and targets the People & Planet Green League aims to track actual performance in reducing emissions. This criteria recognises those institutions whose ‘low-carbon transition pathway’ indicates they are delivering carbon reductions in line with the sector-wide cuts required. As in previous years, the People & Planet Green League awards points according to how closely an institution’s actual carbon reductions are to the linear trajectory that an institution would need to take to reduce emissions by 43% by 2020, from a 2005 baseline.

The allocation of points for this criteria is based on two different measurements of carbon emissions using data from the Estates Management Statistics: carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) emissions per head for each institution, as well as the total emissions from the institution.
Carbon emissions per head is a measurement of the total kg of CO₂ equivalent emitted from energy use (oil, coal, gas, grid electricity, steam/hot water) divided by the population of the institution. Population is calculated according to a ‘full time equivalent’ measurement, for both staff and students. For the institution’s total emissions, this is taken from EMS data.

The criteria only quantifies direct emissions from energy, heating and electricity. It excludes significant other indirect emissions, for example from procurement, travel or flying as these are not currently measured or reported in an accurate or uniform way. This criteria does not take into account the varying circumstances on campus such as the age of buildings, more energy-intensive research, how many animals are kept on site or the extent of campus-provided accommodation. Alternative indicators such as CO₂ per metre squared of building space or per pound spent are equally open to such criticism.

**How is this criteria assessed?**

**Total: 10 points**

12 a) Institution’s carbon emissions per head **0-6 Points**

Clarifications:
- Point allocation is calculated by comparing carbon emissions per head with other institutions
- CO₂e emissions are calculated or taken from sections D38a and D38c of the Estates Management Statistics and Defra’s latest recommended conversion factors. Full details of the calculations, including conversion factors used is available online.

12 b) Institutional carbon emissions reductions compared to sector-wide carbon reduction targets from 2005 baseline **0-4 Points**

Clarifications:
- Current carbon emissions figures taken from “D38c Energy emissions” of EMS. Emissions data for 2005 taken from a variety of sources including EMS.
- A linear trajectory towards the 2020 sector targets is equal to a 14.33% reduction since 2005.
- No points are awarded for an increase in emissions.
13. Water Reduction

Why measure this?
Each person in the UK currently uses about 150 litres of water every day. Our consumption level has been rising by 1% each year since 1930 which is unsustainable in the long-term. On current trends, over the next 20 years humans will use 40% more water than they do now.
Some universities are beginning to take steps to reduce their water consumption by, for example, installing grey water or rainwater systems. We applaud these initial efforts and encourage other institutions to follow suit.

How is this criteria assessed?
Total: 6 points

13 a) Water consumption per head 0-4 Points
Clarifications:
• Point allocation is calculated by comparing water consumption per head with other institutions
• Data taken from “D38b Water consumption”, “D04 Student FTE” and “D05 FTE staff” of EMS

13 b) Percentage total water from grey or rain water 0-2 Points
Clarifications:
• Point allocation is calculated by comparing percentage with other institutions
• Data taken from “D77a.C01 Water consumption”, “D38b.C01 Grey water usage”

Further Information

Grades
Grade boundaries will be set after the scores are collated. You can view grade boundaries from previous Green Leagues here

Which universities are assessed?
People & Planet will assess all eligible UK universities for which appropriate data is available through EMS.

How has the information been collected?

Research for criteria 1-10
Information for criteria 1-10 will be gathered by the People & Planet Green League 2012 questionnaire which is submitted to universities as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act / Environmental Information Regulations. The responses to this questionnaire are analysed by a team of trained volunteer researchers and People & Planet staff.
Data for criteria 6
Fairtrade University accreditation information is supplied directly by the Fairtrade Foundation.

Research for criteria 7
The assessment of evidence and scoring of this criteria will be coordinated in partnership with Sustain - the alliance for better Food and Farming. The Sustain assessors will work closely together with and receive full training from People & Planet.

Data about which institutions are working towards or have achieved the Soil Associations’ Food for Life accreditation will be provided directly by the Soil Association.

Research for criteria 8
Data relating to participating in the Green Impact Unions and Green Impact Universities awards schemes will be provided directly by NUSSL. Data relating to participation in the Student Switch Off scheme will be provided directly by Student Switch Off.

Research for criteria 10-13.
The remaining criteria relate to on-the-ground environmental performance outcomes. This information comes largely from the most recent set of Estate Management Statistics (EMS) which is collected annually by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). People & Planet acquires this data through a freedom of information request but the full data set is also available publicly through the HESA website.

A number of institutions have raised concerns about People & Planet’s use of EMS in the compilation of the Green League ranking, due to their outdated nature (statistics refer to the previous academic year) and concerns over the quality of reporting across the sector. Estates Management Statistics are the only statistics of their kind covering all UK universities.

As such, People & Planet has concluded that they remain the best source of data available upon which to base the performance-related indicators used in compiling the Green League. Furthermore, HESA is carrying out a review of data items and definitions which People & Planet is actively engaging with to improve the scope, accuracy of reporting and timing of EMS in relation to future People & Planet Green League tables.

Guidance to assist universities in reporting their data accurately is provided on the HESA website.

In cases where information is missing from the final EMS data for 2010-2011 which People & Planet uses to calculate its Green League ranking, we have taken the most recently available data (ie. from the previous year), rather than awarding 0 points. Whilst this may not necessarily reflect any increases or decreases in environmental performance in 2010-2011, we believe this to be the fairest approach available to us. In cases where information has not been submitted to HESA for the 2009-2011 EMS and no data is available from the previous year, institutions will automatically receive 0 points for that category.
In developing the methodology for the People & Planet Green League 2012 we have used the most extensive consultation process to date and benefited from the expertise of a large range of stakeholders who have generously donated their time. We thank all stakeholders for their thoughtful input.

Publication
Green League published on 7 June 2011

Green League Stakeholder Consultation Event
We held a review meeting with stakeholders on 24 November 2011. Participants from over 50 institutions provided a wide range of feedback and advice. A podcast and write-ups from this event can be found on our website.

Green League Guide publication
A summary of all decisions made including input from GLOG is published in this guide. Further details are available on request and in the Stakeholder Area.

Internal Review & Online Consultation
Following the publication of Green League 2011 we held an internal evaluation and asked stakeholders to provide us with feedback on the systems and methodology via an online feedback questionnaire. Results from 47 responses were analysed and fed back to participants at the Stakeholder Event on 24 November 2011.

November 2011 - January 2012
Green League Oversight Group
People & Planet established a Green League Oversight Group (GLOG) comprising stakeholders within the Higher Education sector to provide advice and expertise on the methodology and criteria review process. Through a series of papers & conference calls covering stakeholders’ key concerns, the GLOG scrutinised People & Planet’s decision making in the development of the 2012 methodology and provided input to ensure all decisions were informed by the expertise of the sector. Membership of the Green League Oversight Group was open to all and was representative of a wide range of institutions. Further details.

Ongoing Email and Phone Feedback
Since the publication of People & Planet Green League 2011 we have received email & phone feedback on many aspects of the methodology and processes. This was recorded and fed into the review process in developing relevant aspects of the Green League 2012.
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