

## Environmental policy feedback

### Overview

This paper presents a summary of the quantitative feedback received on the draft environmental policy through the online questionnaire and the qualitative feedback from the focus groups.

A handful of emails were also received along with a petition signed by 825 members of staff and students calling on the University to commit to the ideals of environmentalism and to introduce recycling in halls of residence and to pilot an office waste recycling scheme and roll this out campus wide if successful.

The Environmental Working Group is considering the responses received and will recommend amendments to the Ultimate Campus University Steering Group for onward approval at Vice-Chancellor's Committee and Council.

The numerical data from the question shows a strong level of support for the proposals, but the qualitative data reveals a more complicated picture. The following themes are reflected in the feedback received to date.

- An appreciation and support for the University making strides in this area
- A call to be bolder /go further/ be more visionary
- A plea to introduce campus wide recycling
- The desire for a sustainability officer / someone to bring the work together and focus activity (this was particularly strong in the focus groups).

### Online questionnaire

81 responses to the questionnaire have been received. Responses to the questionnaire demonstrate a very high level of support for the guiding principles, targets and the need to take action in the areas identified. However, the further comments submitted as part of the questionnaire indicate a wider range of views than indicated by the numbers below. The additional comments run to over 20 pages and are broadly inline with the focus group feedback, so are not included in detail below.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No answer	Total	Strongly agree or agree as % of total (exc. no answer)
<b>Greening the Curriculum</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	38	33	5	2	2	1	81	89
Do you agree with the targets?	21	42	8	5	1	4	81	82
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	39	27	8	2	1	4	81	86
<b>Promoting Awareness and Public Understanding</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	40	34	3	0	2	2	81	94
Do you agree with the targets?	31	34	9	2	1	4	81	84
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	43	30	6	0	1	1	81	91

<b>Waste Management / Minimising Use</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	52	19	1	2	2	5	81	93
Do you agree with the targets?	38	26	7	2	2	6	81	85
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	40	25	8	1	2	5	81	86
<b>Energy Management</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	41	25	7	1	2	5	81	87
Do you agree with the targets?	33	32	7	2	2	5	81	86
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	43	25	6	1	0	6	81	91
<b>Water Efficiency</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	41	29	3	1	1	6	81	93
Do you agree with the targets?	36	32	7	3	1	2	81	86
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	41	33	3	1	0	3	81	95
<b>Transport</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	35	23	7	2	3	11	81	83
Do you agree with the targets?	24	26	11	3	5	12	81	72
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	33	24	10	0	4	10	81	80
<b>Procurement and Life Cycle Analysis</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	37	28	11	0	1	4	81	84
Do you agree with the targets?	33	30	11	1	2	4	81	82
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	39	28	9	0	0	5	81	88
<b>Sustainable Development</b>								
Do you agree with the guiding principle?	42	28	6	0	2	3	81	90
Do you agree with the targets?	36	28	10	2	2	3	81	82
How important is it to achieve targets in this area?	39	28	10	0	0	4	81	87

## **Focus Groups**

The following focus groups have taken place and one is planned, but yet to take place, with Keele University Students' Union (the KPA Chair submitted a questionnaire on behalf of the KPA). When this has taken place the results will be incorporated into the existing feedback.

1. Faculty of Health: 8 participants, including a representative from Human Resources and Student Support, and Finance and IT
2. Environmental Liaison Group: 6 participants from SPIRE/iLPJ/EPsAM
3. Recycling Working Group: 8 participants; 5 in a face-to-face discussion, an additional 3 from an earlier meeting
4. KEEN (Keele Environmental Network)
5. Academic Services: 4 participants, including one from Finance and IT
6. Faculty of Natural Sciences: collective response submitted by the Dean
7. Keele University Science and Business Park Ltd.
8. Strategic Planning Committee
9. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Faculty Operations Board

## **Section-by-Section Key Points**

*Note: any comments in italics indicate changes to the specific wording or facts of the document.*

## **General Comments Common to the Groups**

1. The targets should be more specific and measurable. There are too many targets in certain sections of the document, particularly under waste management/recycling. Too much emphasis on encouraging rather than doing.
2. The majority of group queried why there was no specific commitment to appointing an Environmental/Sustainability Manager to drive initiatives and support this area of the University's work.
3. The policy is not visionary enough and makes few bold statements and includes few bold targets.
4. It was queried why no one on the Environmental Working Group had 'green' credentials, and why the policy had been written without specific 'green' expert input.
5. All references to specific suppliers, groups, and third parties should be removed from the document, as these may change over time, and in some cases were already redundant.
6. There were many queries on how, if accepted, the targets in the policy would be met, specifically how any initiatives, such as recycling, would be funded, specifically those linked to the work of CFM.
7. It was queried whether the policy should be broken down into a statement of principles for each area, backed by an operational document listing targets, how they would be achieved and measured, and who would monitor them.
8. The document does not flow well; it is clear that certain sections were written by different people—this needs to be addressed.
9. Any mention of compliance with legislative requirements should be removed, as this is normal University business. Instead, targets should be included on how we will exceed legislative requirements.
10. Questions were asked by many groups about where the Student's Union fit into the policy—they have their own policy and targets—would we be working together and supporting each other to achieve goals?
11. Also, it was queried how the Science Park fit in to the policy; would they be bound by all of the same targets? Would they receive money to assist them in achieving targets?
12. Who defines best practice? A number of groups mentioned that certain sector comparators were winning green awards, but were not using the most sustainable practices—are we ticking boxes or trying to become a leader even if that means we take a different approach?
13. Individuals want a statement, endorsed by the V-C and the entire senior management team, that Keele is committed to being green and that they support any initiatives such as recycling and will fund them adequately.
14. People questioned the title—is it too bland?
15. A specific target should be included somewhere committing the University or green refurbishment of all its existing buildings.
16. It was queried why there was no specific mention of the Phase 3 developments.
17. A comment was received that a mention of the University's green belt land should be included.

## **Preamble and Environmental Statement**

1. This statement should be bolder, and include a headline target, perhaps to be carbon neutral as a campus by a certain date.
2. It should include a mission and vision statement indicating Keele's direction of travel in this area.

3. There should be a commitment to making the University sustainable, supporting social equity, and reducing carbon footprint.
4. The statement needs to be seen as something to be used internally and externally to show Keele's position.
5. Something could be included saying the university is an open, integrated, sustainable intellectual community.
6. A clear statement of alignment between this policy and other University policies should be included.
7. Paragraph 2.1. should have the phrase 'where applicable' deleted.

### **Greening the Curriculum**

1. Participants felt that 'greening' should be done only where appropriate; some Faculties, such as Health, would be less able to respond to an institutional directive in this area due to external requirements.
2. A target should be included that when the curriculum is reviewed (i.e. through the CARD process), ways of incorporating sustainability should be included in that review.
3. The target on 'green' delivery should be made more explicit—'require' rather than 'encourage'.
4. An explicit target should be included asking Schools and RIs to investigate interdisciplinary links on greening the curriculum.
5. A target to make environment/sustainability electives available to every student should be included.
6. *Reference to the UCU21C Environmental Issues Groups should be removed. Perhaps also Planning and Regeneration?*

### **Promoting Awareness and Public Understanding**

1. This area should be more prominently featured.
2. More emphasis should be given to Keele's local and regional activities and impact.
3. Enhanced publicity for current awareness initiatives and good practice should be a target—it was felt that Keele did not market itself well either internally or externally.
4. A better web presence should be developed, linked to policy implementations, highlighting Keele's achievements and direction of travel—maybe a portal from the homepage?
5. A target should be included related to the marketing of Keele as a 'green' institution; this would include all areas including the Conference business and Science Park.
6. Does the Science Park have its own environmental policy and would it refuse to accept business from environmentally-suspect tenants?
7. An explicit target should be included stating that the senior management will lead by example on sustainable behaviour.
8. The target on current awareness initiatives is not tough enough.
9. There should not be both Energy and Environmental Champions—there should be only one and they should support the whole range of environmental awareness, not just energy.
10. The Champions should be given a much higher profile and more publicity.
11. A target that every new member of staff receive training on waste management, recycling, and energy-saving as part of their induction should be included.

### **Waste Management/Minimising Use**

1. Recycling should be more prominently featured.

2. The most common phrase in this area is not just recycle but 'Reduce, Reuse, Recycle.' The policy should focus more on this strategy rather than just focussing on recycling.
3. The policy should include all University sites, including the hospital site. There would be an issue of liaison with our external partners on policy harmonisation.
4. *The statement that recycling facilities are provided to all staff housing is incorrect and should be removed.*
5. A target on green waste composting should be included.
6. A number of comments were received on the nature and wording of the target 'Printing, where unavoidable, should be double sided and minimum font.' It was noted that this was poorly worded as some unavoidable printing has to be large print, etc., due to our obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act. A target on a commitment to recycle office paper was seen as more important and measurable. A statement could be added to the target above on electronic communication to highlight that there are ways to minimise the use of paper through printing techniques.
7. A number of focus groups commented that the final target on a University-wide scheme should actually be the first stated target, and that we should not use the phrase 'should be considered', but rather 'will or must be considered'.
8. Any such recycling scheme would need to be made convenient, as current solutions discourage participation.
9. A target should be included on plastic bags.
10. A number of comments were received that a target in relation to the engagement of front-line staff such as cleaners and shop workers in supporting schemes should be included.
11. *Reference to the Groundwork Trust should be removed as negotiations are still ongoing.*
12. A specific target on office recycling should be included and not just mentioned in the introductory statement of the section.
13. If agreed, how would a recycling scheme be implemented? Who would be responsible for waste collection?
14. A document management policy, re: archiving, needs to be a target, with a commitment to explore alternatives to paper storage.
15. A target on committing to on-site power generation such as wind energy should be included.
16. If the target on legislative requirements remains in the document, it should be moved to the top of the target list for this section.

### **Energy Management**

1. A number of groups mentioned the issue of the installation of automatic sensor lights as a tool to save energy, though it was acknowledged that there were issues of health and safety involved.
2. Groups queried what the government target was for energy saving, and whether it should be incorporated in Keele's targets.

### **Water Efficiency**

1. Installing sensor technology for sink taps was suggested as a target for water preservation.
2. An annual email detailing the University's use of water and other energy sources was suggested as a monitoring tool.
3. A target should be included for an immediate audit of water use in building taps and cisterns to identify current leakages.

### **Transport**

1. Better promotion of public transport options, including the hospital bus, was suggested as a target.
2. More explicit targets should be incorporated into the policy once the results of the public dialogue are known, including on car parking and pricing, flexible working, and car sharing.
3. Again, no mention is made that Keele is a multi-campus site—this needs to be addressed throughout the policy.
4. A target on the provision of bike racks and making the campus cycle-friendly should be included.
5. The university should support the development of its own lift-sharing scheme, not just align itself with Share-a-Lift.
6. A target should be included about using space efficiently around campus to support transport solutions.
7. A target should be included that staff should be encouraged to reduce official travel and that they should use technology such as videoconferencing to support it.

### **Procurement and Life Cycle Analysis**

8. It is not planned to produce a procurement policy and the section should be rephrased accordingly with the assistance of the procurement manager.
9. *Reference to Lyreco should be removed. Reference to NWUPC may need to be removed re: comments from Linda Sutton.*
10. Guidelines for waste disposal should be better promoted and signposted to staff; this should be incorporated into the targets.
11. Focus groups requested that a target on the use of recycled paper in offices be included.
12. More prominence should be made of the principle of whole life costing.
13. *The current statement on toner recycling needs clarification and rewriting: currently we have no official policy on this and it is not clear who agrees what the best method/approach is.*
14. *A similar comment was made in relation to computer equipment, which impacts this section and the recycling section. The situation must be clarified before inclusion in the document.*
15. There are issues around including a statement about local sourcing where possible, as the University has to abide by certain legal regulations for tender and procurement, i.e. OJEU. There were a number of comments that a commitment to source locally where possible should be included, but this is problematic.

### **Sustainable Development**

1. A target should be included on an enhanced campus environment that supports a 'green' mission, i.e. a market, charity shop, etc.
2. A target should be included on reducing the University's total carbon footprint by x amount.
3. A target should be included that the University will undergo an environmental audit.

### **Monitoring and Performance**

1. A number of queries were made in relation to the Figure 1 diagram. Some felt it was a completely unnecessary addition to the document and should be removed. Comments were made about who was included and not included, i.e. no mention of the Residents' Association. The use of the diagram also did not reflect the policy as a living document, as the groups that should be key stakeholders may change over time, making the chart redundant. If the chart is included, all of the groups would have to provide membership lists

and up to date terms of reference to facilitate communication and clarify lines of responsibility.

2. It was noted that many campus group responsible for implementation are under the umbrella of CFM, and that wider representation would be welcomed?
3. It was noted that this section was not particularly well-crafted, and they did not like the mention of the specific groups involved without any context.
4. Why are no external partners such as HEFCE/EAUC, etc., mentioned?
5. KUSBPL should be included in figure 1.

**ENDS**

**29.02.08**