



Lewis & Clark College

STARS REPORT

Date Submitted: June 30, 2017

Rating: Gold

Score: 68.60

Online Report: [Lewis & Clark College](#)

STARS Version: 2.1

Wait, Wait! Don't Print Me!

To reduce paper consumption, this document has been designed to be browsed quickly and easily on computer screens using Adobe Reader. The following special features have been embedded:

Moving Around in the Document

- **Summary of Results Links** - Headings in the Summary of Results are links, which can be clicked to take you directly to the referenced page.
- **Bookmarks** - You can jump to segments of the document quickly and easily using the Bookmarks provided in the document. To access the Bookmarks, click on the "Bookmarks" tab on the left side of the Adobe Reader window – it's the icon that looks like a sheet of paper with a blue ribbon hanging over the upper left corner.
- **Pages** - You can quickly go to any page listed in the Table of Contents simply by typing the page number into the box that displays the current page number in the Adobe Reader window, and pressing "Return/Enter."

Searching

- Adobe Reader's search tool allows you to see the results of your search in a menu format, similar to web search engines. Using the menu, you can choose to go directly to the occurrence of the search term that is most relevant to your interest. To access this search tool, press Shift+Ctrl+F, or choose "Search" from the "Edit" menu.

If these features don't meet your on-screen reading needs, please consider printing only the sections you need, printing double-sided, and using recycled-content paper or paper that has already been printed on one side.

About STARS

The Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS[®]) is a transparent, self-reporting framework for colleges and universities to gauge relative progress toward sustainability. STARS was developed by [AASHE](#) with broad participation from the higher education community.

STARS is designed to:

- Provide a framework for understanding sustainability in all sectors of higher education.
- Enable meaningful comparisons over time and across institutions using a common set of measurements developed with broad participation from the campus sustainability community.
- Create incentives for continual improvement toward sustainability.
- Facilitate information sharing about higher education sustainability practices and performance.
- Build a stronger, more diverse campus sustainability community.

STARS is intended to engage and recognize the full spectrum of colleges and universities—from community colleges to research universities, and from institutions just starting their sustainability programs to long-time campus sustainability leaders. STARS encompasses long-term sustainability goals for already high-achieving institutions as well as entry points of recognition for institutions that are taking first steps toward sustainability.

About AASHE

STARS is a program of AASHE, the [Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education](#). AASHE is a [member-driven organization](#) with a mission to empower higher education to lead the sustainability transformation. [Learn more about AASHE](#).

Table of Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Summary of Results | 5 |
| Institutional Characteristics | 7 |
| Institutional Characteristics | 7 |
| Academics | 14 |
| Curriculum | 14 |
| Research | 34 |
| Engagement | 42 |
| Campus Engagement | 42 |
| Public Engagement | 63 |
| Operations | 77 |
| Air & Climate | 77 |
| Buildings | 88 |
| Energy | 96 |
| Food & Dining | 106 |
| Grounds | 119 |
| Purchasing | 125 |
| Transportation | 138 |
| Waste | 149 |
| Water | 161 |
| Planning & Administration | 168 |
| Coordination & Planning | 168 |
| Diversity & Affordability | 185 |
| Investment & Finance | 201 |
| Wellbeing & Work | 210 |
| Innovation & Leadership | 219 |
| Exemplary Practice | 219 |
| Innovation | 223 |

Summary of Results

Score 68.60

Rating: Gold

Institutional Characteristics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------|
| b | Institutional Characteristics | 0.00 / 0.00 |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------|

Academics

| | | |
|---|------------|---------------|
| b | Curriculum | 23.16 / 37.00 |
|---|------------|---------------|

| | | |
|---|----------|---------------|
| b | Research | 11.17 / 18.00 |
|---|----------|---------------|

Engagement

| | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| b | Campus Engagement | 11.88 / 21.00 |
|---|-------------------|---------------|

| | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| b | Public Engagement | 13.25 / 15.00 |
|---|-------------------|---------------|

Operations

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| b | Air & Climate | 10.50 / 11.00 |
|---|---------------|---------------|

| | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| b | Buildings | 3.48 / 8.00 |
|---|-----------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|--------|--------------|
| b | Energy | 6.05 / 10.00 |
|---|--------|--------------|

| | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|
| b | Food & Dining | 3.48 / 8.00 |
|---|---------------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|---------|-------------|
| b | Grounds | 3.70 / 4.00 |
|---|---------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|------------|-------------|
| b | Purchasing | 4.64 / 6.00 |
|---|------------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| b | Transportation | 4.30 / 7.00 |
|---|----------------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|-------|--------------|
| b | Waste | 5.21 / 10.00 |
|---|-------|--------------|

| | | |
|---|-------|-------------|
| b | Water | 2.20 / 6.00 |
|---|-------|-------------|

Planning & Administration

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------|
| b | Coordination & Planning | 4.25 / 8.00 |
|---|-------------------------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|
| b | Diversity & Affordability | 8.55 / 10.00 |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|

| | | |
|---|----------------------|-------------|
| b | Investment & Finance | 5.75 / 7.00 |
|---|----------------------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| b | Wellbeing & Work | 3.11 / 7.00 |
|---|------------------|-------------|

Innovation & Leadership

| | | |
|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| b | Exemplary Practice | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| b | Innovation | 4.00 / 4.00 |

The information presented in this submission is self-reported and has not been verified by AASHE or a third party. If you believe any of this information is erroneous, please see the [process for inquiring](#) about the information reported by an institution.

Institutional Characteristics

Institutional Characteristics

Points Claimed 0.00

Points Available 0.00

Institutional characteristics include data related to an institution's boundary (defining the campus for purposes of reporting), its operational characteristics (the context in which it operates) and its demographics and academics (programs, students, staff, and faculty). This information provides valuable context for understanding and interpreting STARS data. Thus, all information documented in the sections below will be displayed in the institution's public STARS report.

| Credit | Points |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Institutional Boundary | 0.00 / Total adjusted for non-applicable credits Close |
| Operational Characteristics | 0.00 / Total adjusted for non-applicable credits Close |
| Academics and Demographics | 0.00 / Total adjusted for non-applicable credits Close |

Institutional Boundary

Score

0.00 /

Total adjusted for non-applicable credits

[Close](#)

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Each institution is expected to include its entire main campus when collecting data. Institutions may choose to include any other land holdings, facilities, farms, and satellite campuses, as long as the selected boundary is the same for each credit. If an institution finds it necessary to exclude a particular unit from its submission, the reason for excluding it must be provided in the appropriate reporting field, below.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Institution type (Associate, Baccalaureate, Doctoral/Research, or Master):

Baccalaureate

Institutional control (Public, Private for-profit, or Private non-profit):

Private non-profit

A brief description of the institution's main campus and other aspects of the institutional boundary used to complete this report:

The institution includes three campuses within physical proximity of each other under the ownership and operational control of the organization. Off campus housing not explicitly under operational control of the institution is not included in this boundary. Off campus rental space for clinics is not included in this boundary.

Which of the following features are present on campus and which are included within the institutional boundary?:

| | Present? | Included? |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|
| Agricultural school | No | No |
| Medical school | No | No |

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| Other professional school with labs and clinics (e.g. dental, nursing, pharmacy, public health, veterinary) | No | No |
| Satellite campus | No | No |
| Farm larger than 5 acres or 2 hectares | No | No |
| Agricultural experiment station larger than 5 acres or 2 hectares | No | No |
| Hospital | No | No |

The rationale for excluding any features that are present from the institutional boundary:

Additional documentation to support the submission :

Operational Characteristics

| Score | Responsible Party |
|---|---|
| 0.00 / | |
| Total adjusted for non-applicable credits | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |
| Close | |

Criteria

Operational characteristics are variables that provide information about the context in which the institution operates. Report the most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Endowment size:

218,367,406 US/Canadian \$

Total campus area (i.e. the total amount of land within the institutional boundary):

137 Acres

Locale:

Urban fringe of large city

IECC climate zone:

4 - Mixed

Gross floor area of building space:

1,303,887 Gross Square Feet

Floor area of laboratory space:

67,384 Square Feet

Floor area of healthcare space:

2,907 Square Feet

Floor area of other energy intensive space, e.g. data centers, food production space, convenience stores:

0 Square Feet

Additional documentation to support the submission :

Academics and Demographics

| Score | Responsible Party |
|---|---|
| 0.00 / | |
| Total adjusted for non-applicable credits | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |
| Close | |

Criteria

This section includes variables that provide information about the institution's academic programs, students, faculty and staff. Report the most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. Some population figures are used to calculate "weighted campus user", a measurement of an institution's population that is adjusted to accommodate how intensively certain community members use the campus.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Number of academic divisions (e.g. colleges, schools):

3

Number of academic departments (or the equivalent):

41

Number of students enrolled for credit:

3,419

Total number of employees (staff + faculty):

1,311

Full-time equivalent student enrollment (undergraduate and graduate):

3,250

Full-time equivalent of employees (staff + faculty):

700

Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education:

0

Number of students resident on-site:

1,440

Number of employees resident on-site:

37

Number of other individuals resident on-site, e.g. family members of employees, individuals lodging on-site (by average occupancy rate), and/or staffed hospital beds (if applicable):

0

Weighted campus users, performance year:

3,331.75

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Enrollment report for Fall 2016, IR Data from 10/1/16, HR Data for current January 2016

Academics

Curriculum

Points Claimed 23.16

Points Available 37.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that have formal education programs and courses that address sustainability. One of the primary functions of colleges and universities is to educate students. By training and educating future leaders, scholars, workers and professionals, higher education institutions are uniquely positioned to prepare students to understand and address sustainability challenges. Institutions that offer courses covering sustainability issues help equip their students to lead society to a sustainable future.

| Credit | Points |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Academic Courses | 10.16 / 14.00 |
| Learning Outcomes | 0.00 / 8.00 |
| Undergraduate Program | 3.00 / 3.00 |
| Graduate Program | Not Applicable |
| Immersive Experience | 2.00 / 2.00 |
| Sustainability Literacy Assessment | 2.00 / 4.00 |
| Incentives for Developing Courses | 2.00 / 2.00 |
| Campus as a Living Laboratory | 4.00 / 4.00 |

Academic Courses

| Score | Responsible Party |
|---------------|---|
| 10.16 / 14.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has conducted an inventory during the previous three years to identify its sustainability course offerings for current and prospective students. Sustainability course offerings include:

- Courses that have been identified as “sustainability courses” and “courses that include sustainability” using the definitions provided in *G. Standards and Terms*.
- Courses that have been formally designated as sustainability course offerings in the institution’s standard course listings or catalog.

For each course, the inventory provides:

- The title, department (or equivalent), and level of the course (e.g., undergraduate or graduate).
- A brief description of the course.
- An indication of whether the course is a “sustainability course” or a “course that includes sustainability” (or equivalent terminology).

A course may be a sustainability course or it may include sustainability; no course should be identified as both. Courses for which partial or incomplete information is provided may not be counted toward earning points for this credit. This credit does not include continuing education and extension courses, which are covered by the *Continuing Education* credit in Public Engagement.

For guidance on conducting a course inventory and distinguishing between sustainability courses and courses that include sustainability, see *F. Measurement*, *G. Standards and Terms*, and the Credit Example, below. An institution that has developed a more refined approach to course classification may use that approach as long as it is consistent with the definitions and guidance provided.

Part 1

Institution offers sustainability course content as measured by the percentage of courses offered that are sustainability course offerings.

The total number of courses offered and the number of sustainability course offerings must be counted in the same manner; see *F. Measurement*.

Part 2

Institution offers sustainability course content as measured by the percentage of academic departments (or the equivalent) with sustainability course offerings.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Figures required to calculate the percentage of courses offered by the institution that are sustainability course offerings:

| | Undergraduate | Graduate |
|---|---------------|----------|
| Total number of courses offered by the institution | 989 | 488 |
| Number of sustainability courses offered | 53 | 39 |
| Number of courses offered that include sustainability | 68 | 83 |

Percentage of courses that are sustainability course offerings:

16.45

Total number of academic departments (or the equivalent) that offer courses (at any level):

41

Number of academic departments (or the equivalent) that offer at least one sustainability course and/or course that includes sustainability (at any level):

22

Percentage of academic departments with sustainability course offerings:

53.66

A copy of the institution's inventory of its sustainability course offerings and descriptions:

[16-17_LCSustainabilityCoursesUpdated.xlsx](#)

Do the figures reported above cover one, two, or three academic years?:

Three

A brief description of the methodology used to determine the total number of courses offered and to identify

sustainability course offerings, including the definitions used and the process for reviewing and/or validating the course inventory :

General:

Total course numbers are obtained from registrars and varies by year/term when the data is selected.

Course syllabi or websites are used to determine if the course includes any of the following components: environmental health or issues, economic health/prosperity, social health/well-being. Once these data are determined, the reviewer assesses whether the course examines the issue or subject at global or local scale (spatial extent) and also the temporal scale (is this a long-term solutions oriented course or historic with current implications?). Lastly, the assessor examines the course to see if sustainability is explicitly listed in the course title or description. If the course includes two more 'sustainability components' ie social and environmental, as well as relevant spatial or temporal scale, it is counted as focused. If sustainability is specifically listed in the description or title, it is also counted as focused.

Methodology/Validation:

1. Initial course catalog review
2. follow up with departments to obtain syllabi and further clarify the list
3. follow up with professors to verify list

How were courses with multiple offerings or sections counted for the figures reported above?:

Each course was counted as a single course regardless of the number of offerings or sections

A brief description of how courses with multiple offerings or sections were counted (if different from the options outlined above):

Are the following course types included in the inventory? :

| | Yes (included) or No (not included) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Internships | Yes |
| Practicums | Yes |
| Independent study | Yes |
| Special topics | Yes |
| Thesis / dissertation | No |
| Clinical | Yes |
| Physical education | Yes |

Performance arts

No

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

This course inventory covers three academic years with the last year being AY 2015-16, without duplication.

Learning Outcomes

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 0.00 / 8.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution's students graduate from degree programs that include sustainability as a learning outcome or include multiple sustainability learning outcomes. Sustainability learning outcomes (or the equivalent) may be specified at:

- Institution level (e.g., covering all students)
- Division level (e.g., covering one or more schools or colleges within the institution)
- Program level (e.g., covering all graduates from a degree program)
- Course level (if successful completion of the course is required to complete a degree program)

This credit includes graduate as well as undergraduate programs. For this credit, "degree programs" include majors, minors, concentrations, certificates, and other academic designations. Extension certificates and other certificates that are not part of academic degree programs do not count for this credit; they are covered in the: *Continuing Education* credit in Public Engagement. Programs that include co-curricular aspects may count as long as there is an academic component of the program.

This credit is inclusive of learning outcomes, institutional learning goals, general education outcomes, and graduate profiles that are consistent with the definition of "sustainability learning outcomes" included in *G. Standards and Terms*. While they do not necessarily have to use the term "sustainability", learning outcomes must collectively address sustainability as an integrated concept having social, economic, and environmental dimensions for a program's graduates to count. Mission, vision and values statements are not sufficient unless the above criteria are met.

Institutions that do not specify learning outcomes as a matter of policy or standard practice may count graduates from sustainability-focused programs (i.e., majors, minors, concentrations and the equivalent as reported for the *Undergraduate Program* and *Graduate Program* credits) and other degree programs that do not have specified sustainability learning outcomes, but require the successful completion of one or more sustainability courses (i.e., courses in which the primary and explicit focus is on sustainability as reported for the *Academic Courses* credit).

This credit was marked as **Not Pursuing** so Reporting Fields will not be displayed.

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2014-15 IPEDS data for degree, major and/or minor

Undergraduate Program

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 3.00 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution offers at least one:

- [Sustainability-focused program](#) (major, degree program, or equivalent) for [undergraduate students](#)

And/or

- Undergraduate-level sustainability-focused minor or concentration (e.g. a concentration on sustainable business within a business major).

To count, programs must concentrate on sustainability as an integrated concept, including its social, economic, and environmental dimensions.

Extension certificates and other certificates that are not part of academic degree programs do not count for this credit; they are covered in the *Continuing Education* credit in Public Engagement.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution offer at least one sustainability-focused major, degree program, or the equivalent for undergraduate students (I.e. an interdisciplinary academic program that concentrates on sustainability as an integrated concept)?:

Yes

Name of the sustainability-focused undergraduate degree program:

Environmental Studies

A brief description of the undergraduate degree program:

Environmental studies situates environmental problems and solutions in a scholarly context, working alongside other academic disciplines to build a more livable world.

The Environmental Studies Program at Lewis & Clark, one of a number of interdisciplinary programs on campus, benefits from the participation of many departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as the School of Law and Graduate School of Education and Counseling. We are proud to have hosted the 2010 national Association for Environmental Studies and Sciences Annual Conference, and have sponsored a number of exciting special initiatives, including a three-year, \$600,000 award from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation featuring interdisciplinary situated research spanning the Portland area to international sites.

We offer students opportunities for environmental research and engagement on campus, in the Portland metropolitan area and the Pacific Northwest, and in a variety of international locations, many served by Lewis & Clark's Overseas and Off-Campus Programs. Our students master contemporary scholarship on environmental problems and solutions, and develop a wide range of cutting-edge computer and analytical skills. They learn the latest debates and practices related to biological conservation, climate change, environmental health, natural resource management, sustainability and sustainable development, and other current environmental topics. The Environmental Studies Program thus combines intellectual rigor and breadth with practical experience in this vibrant, transdisciplinary field of scholarly inquiry; here are some recent albums of ENVIS events.

The website URL for the undergraduate degree program:

https://college.lclark.edu/programs/environmental_studies/

Name of the sustainability-focused, undergraduate degree program (2nd program):

A brief description of the undergraduate degree program (2nd program):

The website URL for the undergraduate degree program (2nd program):

Name of the sustainability-focused, undergraduate degree program (3rd program):

A brief description of the undergraduate degree program (3rd program):

The website URL for the undergraduate degree program (3rd program):

The name and website URLs of all other sustainability-focused, undergraduate degree program(s):

Does the institution offer one or more sustainability-focused minors, concentrations or certificates for undergraduate students?:

No

Name of the sustainability-focused undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate:

A brief description of the undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate:

stars.aashe.org

The website URL for the undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate:

Name of the sustainability-focused undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate (2nd program):

A brief description of the undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate (2nd program):

The website URL for the undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate (2nd program):

Name of the sustainability-focused undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate (3rd program):

A brief description of the undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate (3rd program):

The website URL for the undergraduate minor, concentration or certificate (3rd program):

The name and website URLs of all other sustainability-focused undergraduate minors, concentrations and certificates:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Graduate Program

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution offers at least one:

- Sustainability-focused program (major, degree program, or equivalent) for graduate students

And/or

- Graduate-level sustainability-focused minor, concentration or certificate (e.g. a concentration on sustainable business within an MBA program).

To count, programs must concentrate on sustainability as an integrated concept, including its social, economic, and environmental dimensions.

Extension certificates and other certificates that are not part of academic degree programs do not count for this credit; they are covered in the *Continuing Education* credit in Public Engagement.

This credit was marked as **Not Applicable** for the following reason:

Institution offers fewer than 25 distinct graduate programs.

Immersive Experience

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|--|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution offers at least one immersive, sustainability-focused educational study program. The program is one week or more in length and may take place off-campus, overseas, or on-campus.

For this credit, the program must meet one or both of the following criteria:

- It concentrates on sustainability, including its social, economic, and environmental dimensions

And/or

- It examines an issue or topic using sustainability as a lens.

For-credit programs, non-credit programs and programs offered in partnership with outside entities may count for this credit. Programs offered exclusively by outside entities do not count for this credit.

See the Credit Example in the STARS Technical Manual for further guidance.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution offer at least one immersive, sustainability-focused educational study program that is one week or more in length?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainability-focused immersive program(s) offered by the institution, including how each program addresses the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainability:

The Law Schools offers two courses focused specifically on sustainability in the Law and within food systems. Each course is a semester long.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainability Literacy Assessment

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution conducts an assessment of the sustainability literacy of its students. The sustainability literacy assessment focuses on knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges.

Assessments that primarily address sustainability culture (i.e. values, behaviors, beliefs, and awareness of campus sustainability initiatives) or student engagement in sustainability-related programs and activities are excluded. Cultural assessments are recognized in the *Assessing Sustainability Culture* credit in Campus Engagement.

Participation by U.S. and Canadian institutions in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Sustainability Education Consortium does not count for this credit, but may be reported as an Exemplary Practice in Innovation & Leadership.

An institution may use a single instrument that addresses sustainability literacy, culture, and/or engagement to meet the criteria for this credit if at least ten questions or a third of the assessment focuses on student knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution conduct an assessment of the sustainability literacy of its students (i.e. an assessment focused on student knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges)?:

Yes

Which of the following best describes the literacy assessment? The assessment is administered to::

The entire (or predominate) student body, directly or by representative sample

Which of the following best describes the structure of the assessment? The assessment is administered as a::

Standalone evaluation without a follow-up assessment of the same cohort or representative samples

A copy of the questions included in the sustainability literacy assessment(s):

[ShortVersion-LewisClarksustainabilitysurvey.pdf](#)

A sample of the questions included in the sustainability literacy assessment or the website URL where the assessment tool may be found:

See attachment

A brief description of how the literacy assessment was developed and/or when it was adopted:

Assessments from other organizations were reviewed including those in higher education and outside of higher ed.

A brief description of how a representative sample was reached (if applicable) and how the assessment(s) were administered :

Assessment was administered to first year students in the undergraduate college in coordination with other survey mechanisms. All students in this group are surveyed therefore this group is considered representative of the entire undergrad student body who is the predominant student group in the institution.

A brief summary of results from the literacy assessment(s), including a description of any measurable changes over time:

Results included general knowledge on sustainability topics as well as a survey of academic preferences for courses and experiences at LC.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Incentives for Developing Courses

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has an ongoing program or programs that offer incentives for faculty in multiple disciplines or departments to develop new sustainability courses and/or incorporate sustainability into existing courses or departments. The program specifically aims to increase student learning of sustainability.

Incentives may include release time, funding for professional development, and trainings offered by the institution.

Incentives for expanding sustainability offerings in academic, non-credit, and/or continuing education courses count for this credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have an ongoing program or programs that offer incentives for faculty in multiple disciplines or departments to develop new sustainability courses and/or incorporate sustainability into existing courses?:

Yes

A brief description of the program(s), including positive outcomes during the previous three years (e.g. descriptions of new courses or course content resulting from the program):

The institutional sustainability council provides resources and support to faculty and students in the development of cross-collaborative work associated with the broad spectrum of sustainability in the curriculum. Depending on program type and budget available, support is provided in the form of financial incentives or in-kind expertise and/or general program assistance (such as workshops).

A brief description of the incentives that faculty members who participate in the program(s) receive:

Financial or in-kind employee support, or sharing of resources (ie. budget from outside of the home department)

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/council/programs/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Campus as a Living Laboratory

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 4.00 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution is utilizing its infrastructure and operations for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research that contributes to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in at least one of the following areas:

- Air & Climate
- Buildings
- Energy
- Food & Dining
- Grounds
- Purchasing
- Transportation
- Waste
- Water
- Coordination & Planning
- Diversity & Affordability
- Investment & Finance
- Public Engagement
- Wellbeing & Work
- Other (e.g., arts and culture or technology)

This credit includes substantive work by students and/or faculty (e.g. class projects, thesis projects, term papers, published papers) that involves active and experiential learning (see the Credit Example in the *STARS Technical Manual*). On-campus internships and non-credit work that take place under supervision of faculty members, sustainability staff, or sustainability committees may count as long as the work has a formal learning component (i.e., there are opportunities to document and assess what students are learning).

This credit does not include immersive education programs, co-curricular activities, or community service, which are covered by the *Immersive Experience* credit, credits in Campus Engagement, and the *Community Service* credit in Public Engagement, respectively.

Projects that utilize the local community as a living laboratory to advance sustainability may be included under “Public Engagement”. A single, multidisciplinary living lab project may simultaneously address up to three of the areas listed above.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Air & Climate?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Air & Climate:

Several undergraduate students have interned with our Green Energy Institute, to assist in internal and external outreach, project management and policy research related to renewable energy.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Buildings?:

No

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Buildings:

Working with Facilities Services, students have conducted comparative research of existing buildings on campus to new, LEED-certified buildings. This research was presented at a national conference.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Energy?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Energy:

In a work study position, a student researched energy management practices, surveyed students and employees, and created a summary of recommendations for the institutions' Energy Management Program.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Food & Dining?:

No

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Food & Dining:

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Grounds?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability

challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Grounds:

Students in a Biology course working with students in an Environmental Studies course, are working to develop a tree map and survey to determine current tree canopy, assess tree health and work toward increasing tree diversity.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Purchasing?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Purchasing:

In an internship position, a student researched, attended seminars and collaborated with various departments and external entities to develop a robust purchasing program and policy.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Transportation?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Transportation:

Several students, in their coursework and overseas studies, researched and developed a bike sharing program.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Waste?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Waste:

A student intern is reviewing waste behavior studies and determining how the research and methods could be applied on campus.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Water?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Water:

A Physics student, working with Facilities staff, researched and prepared cost benefit analysis of the potential for toilet regulators and dual flush retrofit kits across campus.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Coordination & Planning?:

No

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Coordination & Planning:

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Diversity & Affordability?:

No

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Diversity & Affordability:

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Investment & Finance?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Investment & Finance:

A student academic research project was developed to review existing student run socially-responsible investment funds and propose a strategy for the institution. This student reported to the Sustainability Director but engaged with stakeholders across campus and in the community. This student helped establish the creation of an SRI student club.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Public Engagement?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Public Engagement:

In a intern position, a student is working with multiple departments, student groups and staff to develop an intentional living guide and website for public engagement.

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to Wellbeing & Work?:

No

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to Wellbeing & Work:

Is the institution utilizing its campus as a living laboratory for multidisciplinary student learning and applied research in relation to other areas (e.g. arts & culture or technology)?:

Yes

A brief description of the student/faculty projects and how they contribute to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus in relation to other areas:

Several students have engaged in training and development of environmental education associated with the College Outdoors program. These students have created these programs utilizing outside training courses, developing methods in credit-based courses, and working in the College Outdoors program.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/initiatives/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Research

Points Claimed 11.17

Points Available 18.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are conducting research on sustainability topics. Conducting research is a major function of many colleges and universities. By researching sustainability issues and refining theories and concepts, higher education institutions can continue to help the world understand sustainability challenges and develop new technologies, strategies, and approaches to address those challenges.

| Credit | Points |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Research and Scholarship | 8.17 / 12.00 |
| Support for Research | 3.00 / 4.00 |
| Open Access to Research | 0.00 / 2.00 |

Research and Scholarship

Score

8.17 / 12.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution has conducted an inventory during the previous three years to identify its sustainability research activities and initiatives and makes the inventory publicly available. The research inventory should be based on the definition of “sustainability research” outlined in *G. Standards and Terms* and include, at minimum, the names and department affiliations of all faculty and staff members engaged in sustainability research. Research for which partial or incomplete information is provided may not be counted toward earning points for this credit.

Part 1

Institution produces sustainability research as measured by the percentage of faculty and staff engaged in research that are engaged in sustainability research.

Part 2

Institution produces sustainability research as measured by the percentage of academic departments that conduct research that include at least one faculty member who conducts sustainability research.

Any level of sustainability research is sufficient to be included for this credit. In other words, a researcher who conducts both sustainability research and other research may be included.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total number of the institution’s faculty and/or staff that are engaged in research (headcount):

272

Number of the institution’s faculty and/or staff that are engaged in sustainability research (headcount):

37

Percentage of the institution's faculty and staff researchers that are engaged in sustainability research :

13.60

Total number of academic departments (or the equivalent) that include at least one faculty or staff member that conducts research:

41

Number of academic departments (or the equivalent) that include at least one faculty or staff member that conducts sustainability research:

14

Percentage of research-producing departments that are engaged in sustainability research:

34.15

A copy of the institution's inventory of its sustainability research that includes names and department affiliations of faculty and staff engaged in sustainability research:

[16-17_LCSustainabilityCoursesResearch_1.xlsx](#)

The institution's inventory of its sustainability research that includes names and department affiliations of faculty and staff engaged in sustainability research:

Morrill Susanna Associate Professor of Religious Studies and Department Chair

Lycan Deborah Biology College of Arts & Sciences

Clifton Kenneth Biology College of Arts & Sciences

Bierzchudek Paulette Biology College of Arts & Sciences

Metz Margaret Biology College of Arts & Sciences

Balko Barbara Chemistry College of Arts & Sciences

Sloan Tod Counseling Psychology Graduate School

McDowell Teresa Counseling Psychology Graduate School

Hernandez-Wolfe Pilar Counseling Psychology Graduate School

Rohlf Daniel Earthrise Law Center - Law Law School

Johnston Craig Earthrise Law Center - Law Law School

O'Sullivan Arthur Economics College of Arts & Sciences

Torres Danielle Educational Leadership Graduate School

Galloway Mollie Educational Leadership Graduate School

Proctor James Environmental Studies College of Arts & Sciences

Kleiss Jessica Environmental Studies College of Arts & Sciences

Brand Philippe Foreign Languages College of Arts & Sciences

Young Elliott History College of Arts & Sciences

Mandel Robert International Affairs College of Arts & Sciences

Bennett Elizabeth International Affairs College of Arts & Sciences

Funk William Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Bushaw Amy Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Bogdanski John Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Blumm Michael Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Abrams Paula Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Stumpf Juliet Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Ryan Erin Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Jones Jeffrey Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Fromherz Nicholas Law School Faculty - Law Law School

LaPlante Allison Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Powers Melissa Law School Faculty - Law Law School

Wold Chris Law School Faculty - Law Law School

stars.aashe.org

Tung Yin Law School Faculty - Law
Johansen Steven Legal Analysis and Writing Law School
Mache Jens Mathematical Sciences College of Arts & Sciences
Odenbaugh Jay Philosophy College of Arts & Sciences
Podobnik Bruce Sociology/Anthropology College of Arts & Sciences
Heath Deborah Sociology/Anthropology College of Arts & Sciences
Smith Gregory Teacher Education Graduate School
Shagoury Ruth Teacher Education Graduate School
Finkel Liza Teacher Education Graduate School
Watson Dyan Teacher Education Graduate School

A brief description of the methodology the institution followed to complete the research inventory (including the types of faculty and staff included as researchers):

Each faculty member involved in teaching a course with a sustainability component is reviewed to determine if their scholarship includes sustainability research. In addition, research databases or reports are also used as provided by each school. The AASHE STARS research definition is used to determine applicability.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2015-16 AY data

Support for Research

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 3.00 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution encourages and/or supports sustainability research through one or more of the following:

- An ongoing program to encourage students in multiple disciplines or academic programs to conduct research in sustainability. The program provides students with incentives to research sustainability. Such incentives may include, but are not limited to, fellowships, financial support, and mentorships. The program specifically aims to increase student sustainability research.
 - An ongoing program to encourage faculty from multiple disciplines or academic programs to conduct research in sustainability topics. The program provides faculty with incentives to research sustainability. Such incentives may include, but are not limited to, fellowships, financial support, and faculty development workshops. The program specifically aims to increase faculty sustainability research.
 - Written policies and procedures that give positive recognition to interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research during faculty promotion and/or tenure decisions.
 - Ongoing library support for sustainability research and learning in the form of research guides, materials selection policies and practices, curriculum development efforts, sustainability literacy promotion, and/or e-learning objects focused on sustainability.
-

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have an ongoing program to encourage students in multiple disciplines or academic programs to conduct research in sustainability? :

Yes

A brief description of the student research program, including the incentives provided and any positive outcomes during the previous three years:

Research Incentive Program

The Sustainability Council provides funding for faculty and students interested in sustainability research.

Sustainability research is research that leads toward solutions that simultaneously support social well-being, economic prosperity, and/or ecological health. It includes academic research that:

Explicitly addresses sustainability and/or furthers our understanding of the interconnectedness of social, economic and environmental issues;

Contributes directly toward solving one or more major sustainability challenges and/or

Engages community members with the aim of combining knowledge and action to achieve positive social, economic and environmental outcomes (e.g. participatory and community-based research and engaged scholarship)

Does the institution have a program to encourage faculty from multiple disciplines or academic programs to conduct research in sustainability topics?:

Yes

A brief description of the faculty research program, including the incentives provided and any positive outcomes during the previous three years:

* In previous three years, direct financial incentives were provided for this program. Financial incentives vary according to funding available in each budget year.

Research Incentive Program

The Sustainability Council provides funding for faculty and students interested in sustainability research.

Sustainability research is research that leads toward solutions that simultaneously support social well-being, economic prosperity, and/or ecological health. It includes academic research that:

Explicitly addresses sustainability and/or furthers our understanding of the interconnectedness of social, economic and environmental issues;

Contributes directly toward solving one or more major sustainability challenges and/or

Engages community members with the aim of combining knowledge and action to achieve positive social, economic and environmental outcomes (e.g. participatory and community-based research and engaged scholarship).

Has the institution published written policies and procedures that give positive recognition to interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research during faculty promotion and/or tenure decisions?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's support for interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research, including any positive outcomes during the previous three years:

Interdisciplinary program participation required as part of tenure (could be teaching or research)

Does the institution have ongoing library support for sustainability research and learning?:

No

A brief description of the institution's library support for sustainability research, including any positive outcomes during the previous three years:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/council/programs/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

This incentive was provided during the 2015-16 academic year.

Open Access to Research

Score

0.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution has a published open access policy that ensures that versions of future scholarly articles by faculty and staff are deposited in a designated open access repository.

The policy may allow for publisher embargoes and/or provide a waiver option that allows faculty to opt-out of the open access license/program for individual articles. Open access policies and programs that are strictly voluntary (opt-in) in nature (including open access policies published by external funding agencies) do not earn points unless the institution also provides financial incentives to support faculty members with article processing and other open access publication charges.

Policies and programs adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g. government or university system) may count for this credit as long as the policies apply to and are followed by the institution.

The open access repository may be managed by the institution or the institution may participate in a consortium with a consortial and/or outsourced open access repository.

This credit was marked as **Not Pursuing** so Reporting Fields will not be displayed.

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Ask Mark Dahl

Engagement

Campus Engagement

Points Claimed 11.88

Points Available 21.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that provide their students with sustainability learning experiences outside the formal curriculum. Engaging in sustainability issues through co-curricular activities allows students to deepen and apply their understandings of sustainability principles. Institution-sponsored co-curricular sustainability offerings, often coordinated by student affairs offices, help integrate sustainability into the campus culture and set a positive tone for the institution.

In addition, this subcategory recognizes institutions that support faculty and staff engagement, training, and development programs in sustainability. Faculty and staff members' daily decisions impact an institution's sustainability performance. Equipping faculty and staff with the tools, knowledge, and motivation to adopt behavior changes that promote sustainability is an essential activity of a sustainable campus.

| Credit | Points |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Student Educators Program | 0.00 / 4.00 |
| Student Orientation | 1.38 / 2.00 |
| Student Life | 2.00 / 2.00 |
| Outreach Materials and Publications | 2.00 / 2.00 |
| Outreach Campaign | 4.00 / 4.00 |
| Assessing Sustainability Culture | 0.00 / 1.00 |
| Employee Educators Program | 0.00 / 3.00 |
| Employee Orientation | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Staff Professional Development | 1.50 / 2.00 |

Student Educators Program

Score

0.00 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution coordinates an ongoing peer-to-peer sustainability outreach and education program for students enrolled for credit. The institution:

- Selects or appoints students to serve as peer educators and formally designates the students as educators (paid and/or volunteer);
- Provides formal training to the student educators in how to conduct peer outreach; and
- Supports the program with financial resources (e.g. by providing an annual budget) and/or administrative coordination by faculty or staff.

This credit focuses on programs for degree-seeking students enrolled in a for-credit program. Continuing education students, non-credit students, and other students who are not recognized by the institution as seeking a degree, certificate, or other formal award are excluded.

This credit recognizes ongoing student educator programs that engage students as peers on a regular basis. For example, student educators may be responsible for serving (i.e. directly targeting) a particular subset of students, such as those living in residence halls or enrolled in certain academic subdivisions. Thus, a group of students may be served by a program even if not all of these students actively participate.

Sustainability outreach campaigns, sustainability events, and student clubs or groups are not eligible for this credit unless the criteria outlined above are met. These programs are covered by the *Outreach Campaign* and *Student Life* credits.

This credit was marked as **Not Pursuing** so Reporting Fields will not be displayed.

Student Orientation

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|--|
| 1.38 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution includes sustainability prominently in its student orientation activities and programming. Sustainability activities and programming are intended to educate about the principles and practices of sustainability. The topics covered include multiple dimensions of sustainability (i.e. social, environmental and economic).

As this credit is intended to recognize programming and student learning about sustainability, incorporating sustainability strategies into event planning (e.g. making recycling bins accessible or not serving bottled water) is not, in and of itself, sufficient for this credit. Such strategies may count if they are highlighted and are part of the educational offerings. For example, serving local food would not, in and of itself, be sufficient for this credit; however, serving local food and providing information about sustainable food systems during meals could contribute to earning this credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Are the following students provided an opportunity to participate in orientation activities and programming that prominently include sustainability? :

| | Yes or No |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| First-year students | Yes |
| Transfer students | Yes |
| Entering graduate students | Yes |

Percentage of all entering (i.e. new) students (including transfers and graduate students) that are provided an opportunity to participate in orientation activities and programming that prominently include sustainability (0-100):

69

A brief description of how sustainability is included prominently in new student orientation (including how multiple dimensions of sustainability are addressed):

Sustainability has been a component of undergraduate and graduate NSO informational sessions, serving local food, making composting available, bags with info about programs, tabling, NSO student trips, and presentations to student groups.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives. The programs and initiatives fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Active student groups focused on sustainability
- Gardens, farms, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery programs, and urban agriculture projects where students are able to gain experience in organic agriculture and sustainable food systems
- Sustainable enterprises that include sustainability as part of their mission statements or stated purposes (e.g. cafés through which students gain sustainable business skills)
- Sustainable investment funds, green revolving funds or sustainable microfinance initiatives through which students can develop socially, environmentally and fiscally responsible investment and financial skills
- Conferences, speaker series, symposia or similar events related to sustainability that have students as the intended audience
- Cultural arts events, installations or performances related to sustainability that have students as the intended audience
- Wilderness or outdoors programs (e.g. that organize hiking, backpacking, kayaking, or other outings for students and follow Leave No Trace principles)
- Sustainability-related themes chosen for themed semesters, years, or first-year experiences (e.g. choosing a sustainability-related book for common reading)
- Programs through which students can learn sustainable life skills (e.g. a series of sustainable living workshops, a model room in a residence hall that is open to students during regular visitation hours and demonstrates sustainable living principles, or sustainability-themed housing where residents and visitors learn about sustainability together)
- Sustainability-focused student employment opportunities offered by the institution
- Graduation pledges through which students pledge to consider social and environmental responsibility in future job and other decisions
- Other co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives

Multiple programs and initiatives may be reported for each category and each category may include institution-governed and/or student-governed programs.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have one or more active student groups focused on sustainability?:

Yes

A brief description of active student groups focused on sustainability:

The website URL where information about the student groups is available (optional):

Does the institution have gardens, farms, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery programs, and/or urban agriculture projects where students are able to gain experience in organic agriculture and sustainable food systems?:

Yes

A brief description of the gardens, farms, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery programs, and/or urban agriculture projects:

LC has two student gardens that provide various opportunities to engage in alternative farming and gardening practices.

The website URL where information about the gardens, farms or agriculture projects is available (optional):

Does the institution have student-run enterprises that include sustainability as part of their mission statements or stated purposes (e.g. cafés through which students gain sustainable business skills)?:

No

A brief description of the student-run enterprises:

The website URL where information about the student-run enterprises is available (optional):

<http://www.lccoop.org/the-co-op-bylaws/>

Does the institution have sustainable investment funds, green revolving funds or sustainable microfinance initiatives through which students can develop socially, environmentally and fiscally responsible investment and financial skills?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainable investment funds, green revolving funds or sustainable microfinance initiatives:

Student run Socially Responsible Investment Fund

The website URL where information about the sustainable investment funds, green revolving funds or sustainable microfinance initiatives is available (optional):

Does the institution have conferences, speaker series, symposia or similar events related to sustainability that have students as the intended audience?:

Yes

A brief description of the conferences, speaker series, symposia or similar events related to sustainability:

For example, Spring term 2017 - an inauguration day symposia was held that included a session on environmental justice and climate change. The audience was primarily students for this particular event.

The website URL where information about the conferences, speaker series, symposia or similar events related to sustainability is available (optional):

Does the institution have cultural arts events, installations or performances related to sustainability that have students as the intended audience?:

Yes

A brief description of the cultural arts events, installations or performances related to sustainability:

ENVX included art installations focused on environmental themes in 2015

The website URL where information about the cultural arts events, installations or performances is available (optional):

Does the institution have wilderness or outdoors programs (e.g. that organize hiking, backpacking, kayaking, or other outings for students) that follow Leave No Trace principles?:

Yes

A brief description of the wilderness or outdoors programs that follow Leave No Trace principles:

College Outdoors provides the Lewis & Clark College community with access to the spectacular outdoor environments of the Pacific Northwest and beyond in a variety of activities including cross-country skiing, backpacking, whitewater sports, sea kayaking, and hiking. The group also provides on-campus events which include slide programs, films and seminars on outdoor topics.

The website URL where information about the wilderness or outdoors programs is available (optional):

http://www.lclark.edu/programs/college_outdoors/

Does the institution have sustainability-related themes chosen for themed semesters, years, or first-year experiences (e.g. choosing a sustainability-related book for common reading)?:

No

A brief description of the sustainability-related themes chosen for themed semesters, years, or first-year experiences:

The website URL where information about the sustainability-related themes is available (optional):

Does the institution have programs through which students can learn sustainable life skills?:

Yes

A brief description of the programs through which students can learn sustainable life skills:

Environmental Action Living Learning Community

The website URL where information about the sustainable life skills programs is available (optional):

Does the institution offer sustainability-focused student employment opportunities?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainability-focused student employment opportunities offered by the institution:

Student Sustainability Coordinator - Coordinate the Renewable Energy Fee Fund grant program, Sustainable Operations Intern - focused on operational sustainability issues and projects, Sustainability Council Intern - provides administrative and research support

The website URL where information about the student employment opportunities is available:

Does the institution have graduation pledges through which students pledge to consider social and environmental responsibility in future job and other decisions?:

No

A brief description of the graduation pledges:

The website URL where information about the graduation pledges is available (optional):

Does the institution have other co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives?:

Yes

A brief description of the other co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives:

An initiative to promote professional skill-building around sustainability is available to student and includes experiential learning with off-campus organizations.

The website URL where information about other co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives is available (optional):

Estimated percentage of students (full-time and part-time) that participate annually in sustainability-focused co-curricular education and outreach programs (0-100):

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Outreach Materials and Publications

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution produces outreach materials and/or publications that foster sustainability learning and knowledge. The publications and outreach materials include at least one the following:

- A central sustainability website that consolidates information about the institution's sustainability efforts
- A sustainability newsletter
- Regular coverage of sustainability in the main student newspaper, either through a regular column or a reporter assigned to the sustainability beat
- Social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, interactive blogs) that focus specifically on campus sustainability
- A vehicle to publish and disseminate student research on sustainability
- Building signage that highlights green building features
- Signage and/or brochures that include information about sustainable food systems
- Signage on the grounds about sustainable groundskeeping and/or landscaping strategies employed
- A sustainability walking map or tour
- A guide for commuters about how to use more sustainable methods of transportation
- Navigation and educational tools for bicyclists and pedestrians (e.g. covering routes, inter-modal connections, policies, services, and safety)
- A guide for green living and/or incorporating sustainability into the residential experience
- Other sustainability outreach materials and publications not covered above

This credit is focused on ongoing outreach efforts. Materials and publications designed to promote a specific event or time-limited campaign are excluded and covered by other credits in this subcategory.

A single outreach material or publication that serves multiple purposes may be counted more than once. For example, a sustainability website that includes tools for bicyclists and pedestrians may be counted in both categories.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have a central sustainability website that consolidates information about the institution's sustainability efforts?:

Yes

A brief description of the central sustainability website (optional):

LC has a sustainability website under our About Us page of our Home webpage. This page provides the primary content for our academic sustainability programs with links and brief descriptions to other components of sustainability on campus.

The website URL for the central sustainability website:

<http://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/>

Does the institution have a sustainability newsletter?:

No

A brief description of the sustainability newsletter:

The website URL for the sustainability newsletter:

Does the institution have social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, interactive blogs) that focus specifically on campus sustainability?:

Yes

A brief description of the social media platforms that focus on sustainability:

Sustainability Council Facebook page

The website URL of the primary social media platform focused on sustainability:

<http://facebook.com/Lcsustainabilitycouncil>

Does the institution have regular coverage of sustainability in the main student newspaper, either through a regular column or a reporter assigned to the sustainability beat?:

Yes

A brief description of the regular coverage of sustainability in the main student newspaper:

There are regular event-based or special topic coverage of sustainability on campus in the student paper, The PioLog.

The website URL for regular coverage of sustainability in the main student newspaper:

Does the institution produce a vehicle to publish and disseminate student research on sustainability?:

Yes

A brief description of the vehicle to publish and disseminate student research on sustainability:

Student research is disseminated through various departments websites and semi-annual poster sessions, conferences. Additionally, the undergraduate library hosts a student and faculty collaborative research page that includes all types of research in addition to sustainability-related scholarship.

The website URL for the vehicle to publish and disseminate student research on sustainability:

<http://collaborativeresearch.lclark.edu/projects/>

Does the institution have building signage that highlights green building features?:

Yes

A brief description of building signage that highlights green building features :

Yes, green buildings on campus include signage describing the features of the building during construction and occupancy.

The website URL for building signage that highlights green building features :

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/edna_holmes/

Does the institution have signage and/or brochures that include information about sustainable food systems?:

Yes

A brief description of the signage and/or brochures that include information about sustainable food systems:

Our dining halls display information on sustainability issues associated with our food service; permanent fixtures on the wall, table tents, a website and brochure.

The website URL for food service area signage and/or brochures that include information about sustainable food systems:

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/sustainability/natural_resources/food/

Does the institution have signage on the grounds about sustainable groundskeeping and/or landscaping strategies employed?:

Yes

A brief description of the signage on the grounds about sustainable groundskeeping and/or landscaping strategies employed:

Yes, for example, signs regarding bee cultivation and native plant projects.

The website URL for the signage on the grounds about sustainable groundskeeping and/or landscaping strategies

stars.aashe.org

employed:

<https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/>

Does the institution produce a sustainability walking map or tour?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainability walking map or tour:

Sustainability features are included on our primary walking tour map. Sustainability features walking tours are provided for classes and visiting groups.

The website URL of the sustainability walking map or tour:

Does the institution produce a guide for commuters about how to use more sustainable methods of transportation?:

Yes

A brief description of the guide for commuters about how to use more sustainable methods of transportation:

The Parking and Transportation website includes links to various modes of alternative transportation including bike, shuttle, transit, walking, carpool, and rent-a-car service. Of these links several include guide maps and/or trip advisory services.

The website URL for the guide for commuters about how to use more sustainable methods of transportation:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/transportation_and_parking/transportation_options/

Does the institution produce navigation and educational tools for bicyclists and pedestrians (e.g. covering routes, inter-modal connections, policies, services, and safety)? :

No

A brief description of the navigation and educational tools for bicyclists and pedestrians:

The website URL for navigation and educational tools for bicyclists and pedestrians:

Does the institution produce a guide for green living and/or incorporating sustainability into the residential experience?:

Yes

A brief description of the guide for green living and incorporating sustainability into the residential experience:

A green guide for living was developed for our newest residence hall on campus. Currently, a broader 'lifestyles' guide is being developed for the campus whole.

The website URL for the guide for green living and incorporating sustainability into the residential experience:

Does the institution produce other sustainability outreach materials or publications not covered above?:

No

A brief description of these materials or publications:

The website URL for these materials or publications:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Outreach Campaign

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 4.00 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution holds at least one sustainability-related outreach campaign directed at students that yields measurable, positive results in advancing sustainability. The sustainability-related outreach campaign may be conducted by the institution, a student organization, or by students in a course.

Part 2

Institution holds at least one sustainability-related outreach campaign directed at employees that yields measurable, positive results in advancing sustainability. The sustainability-related outreach campaign may be conducted by the institution or by an employee organization.

The campaign(s) reported for this credit could take the form of a competition (e.g. a residence hall conservation competition), a rating or certification program (e.g. a green dorm or green office rating program), and/or a collective challenge (e.g. a campus-wide drive to achieve a specific sustainability target). A single campus-wide campaign may meet the criteria for both parts of this credit if educating students is a prime feature of the campaign and it is directed at both students and employees.

Measurable, positive results typically involve reductions in energy, waste or water use, cost savings and/or other benefits. To measure if a campaign yields measurable, positive results, institutions should compare pre-campaign performance to performance during or after the campaign. Increased awareness or increased membership of a mailing list or group is not sufficient in the absence of other positive results.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Has the institution held at least one sustainability-related outreach campaign during the previous three years that was directed at students and yielded measurable, positive results in advancing sustainability? :

Yes

Has the institution held at least one sustainability-related outreach campaign during the previous three years that was directed at employees and yielded measurable, positive results in advancing sustainability?:

Yes

Name of the campaign:

Energy Management Program

A brief description of the campaign, including how students and/or employees were engaged:

Over the previous three years, the institution has engaged in a Strategic Energy Management program that has decreased our energy use by more than 10%.

A brief description of the measured positive impact(s) of the campaign:

Reduction in energy use by more than 10%.

The website URL where information about the campaign is available:

Name of the campaign (2nd campaign):

Transportation & Parking program improvements

A brief description of the campaign, including how students and/or employees were engaged (2nd campaign):

Over the last two years, the institution has launched several T&P related projects to reduce our transportation related impacts.

A brief description of the measured positive impact(s) of the campaign (2nd campaign):

In AY 2016-17, we found that our public transit commuting trips were increased by 25%.

The website URL where information about the campaign is available (2nd campaign):

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/transportation_and_parking/

A brief description of other sustainability-related outreach campaigns, including measured positive impacts:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Assessing Sustainability Culture

Score

0.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Criteria

Institution conducts an assessment of campus sustainability culture. The cultural assessment focuses on sustainability values, behaviors and beliefs, and may also address awareness of campus sustainability initiatives.

An assessment that covers a single sustainability topic (e.g. a transportation survey) does not count in the absence of a more comprehensive cultural assessment.

Assessments that exclusively address sustainability literacy (i.e. knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges) or student engagement in sustainability-related programs and activities are excluded. Literacy assessments are recognized in the *Sustainability Literacy Assessment* credit in Curriculum.

Participation by U.S. and Canadian institutions in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Sustainability Education Consortium does not count, but may be reported as an Exemplary Practice in Innovation & Leadership.

An institution may use a single instrument that addresses sustainability literacy, culture, and/or engagement to meet the criteria for this credit if at least ten questions or a third of the assessment focuses on sustainability values, behaviors and beliefs.

This credit was marked as **Not Pursuing** so Reporting Fields will not be displayed.

Employee Educators Program

Score

0.00 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution administers or oversees an ongoing staff/faculty peer-to-peer sustainability outreach and education program that meets the following criteria:

- Employee sustainability educators are formally designated and receive formal training or participate in an institution-sponsored orientation to prepare them to conduct peer outreach to other employees;
- The institution supports the program with financial resources (e.g. by providing an annual budget) and/or administrative coordination by staff or faculty; and
- The peer educators represent diverse areas of campus; the outreach and education efforts of sustainability staff or a sustainability office do not count in the absence of a broader network of peer educators.

This credit recognizes ongoing programs that engage employees as peers on a regular basis. For example, employee educators may represent or be responsible for engaging workers in certain departments or buildings. Thus, a group of employees may be served (i.e. directly targeted) by a program even if not all of these employees actively participate.

Ongoing green office certification programs and the equivalent may count for this credit if they include formally designated and trained peer employee educators (e.g. “green leaders”).

Employee orientation activities and training and/or professional development opportunities in sustainability for staff are excluded from this credit. These activities are covered in the *Employee Orientation* and *Staff Professional Development* credits.

This credit was marked as **Not Pursuing** so Reporting Fields will not be displayed.

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

talk with Janice, Dan, Vanessa

Employee Orientation

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution covers sustainability topics in new employee orientation and/or in outreach and guidance materials distributed to new employees, including faculty and staff. The topics covered include multiple dimensions of sustainability (i.e. social, environmental and economic).

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Percentage of new employees (faculty and staff) that are offered orientation and/or outreach and guidance materials that cover sustainability topics (0-100):

100

A brief description of how sustainability is included in new employee orientation (including how multiple dimensions of sustainability are addressed):

Sustainability is included in new employee orientation (transportation, recycling, etc). More in depth resources are linked on the HR website for new employees.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/human_resources/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Staff Professional Development

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.50 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution makes available professional development and training opportunities in sustainability to all staff at least once per year.

Part 2

Institution's regular (full-time and part-time) staff participate in sustainability professional development and training opportunities that are either provided or supported by the institution.

For both Part 1 and Part 2 of this credit, the opportunities may be provided internally (e.g. by departments or by the sustainability office) or externally as long as they are specific to sustainability. The opportunities may include:

- Training to integrate sustainability knowledge and skills into the workplace.
- Lifelong learning and continuing education in sustainability.
- Sustainability accreditation and credential maintenance (e.g. LEED AP/GA).

This credit focuses on formal professional development and training opportunities, for example as delivered by trainers, managers, sustainability staff, and external organizations. Peer-to-peer educator programs and employee outreach campaigns are recognized in the *Employee Educators Program* and *Outreach Campaign* credits, respectively and should only be reported in this credit if such programs are formally recognized by the institution as professional development and training, for example in employee performance reviews.

For an external professional development and training opportunity to count, the institution must offer financial or other support (e.g. payment, reimbursement, or subsidy).

This credit applies to staff members only; it does not include faculty members. Faculty professional development in sustainability is recognized in the *Incentives for Developing Courses* credit in Curriculum.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution make available professional development and training opportunities in sustainability to all staff at least once per year?:

Yes

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 2 of this credit (the rate of employee participation in sustainability professional development and training)?:

Yes

Estimated percentage of regular staff (full-time and part-time) that participates annually in sustainability professional development and training that is either provided or supported by the institution (0, 1-24%, 25-49%, 50-74%, 75% or more):

25-49%

A brief description of any internal sustainability professional development and training opportunities that the institution makes available to staff:

The institution holds several events that include training and education components. For example, a sustainability course is included in staff training, Staff Development Days, which is open to all employees. Sustainability program elements are also included in the Benefits and Wellness Fair, through the CARE committee, and via tours/annual events.

A brief description of any external professional development and training opportunities in sustainability that are supported by the institution(e.g. through payment, reimbursement, or subsidy):

Classes offered are free of charge at the institution

Estimated percentage of regular staff (full-time and part-time) for which sustainability is included in performance reviews (0, 1-24%, 25-49%, 50-74%, 75% or more) :

1-24%

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Public Engagement

Points Claimed 13.25

Points Available 15.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that help catalyze sustainable communities through public engagement, community partnerships and service. Engagement in community problem-solving is fundamental to sustainability. By engaging with community members and organizations in the governmental, non-profit and for-profit sectors, institutions can help solve sustainability challenges. Community engagement can help students develop leadership skills while deepening their understandings of practical, real-world problems and the process of creating solutions. Institutions can contribute to their communities by harnessing their financial and academic resources to address community needs and by engaging community members in institutional decisions that affect them. In addition, institutions can contribute toward sustainability broadly through inter-campus collaboration, engagement with external networks and organizations, and public policy advocacy.

| Credit | Points |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Community Partnerships | 3.00 / 3.00 |
| Inter-Campus Collaboration | 2.50 / 3.00 |
| Continuing Education | Not Applicable |
| Community Service | 3.75 / 5.00 |
| Participation in Public Policy | 2.00 / 2.00 |
| Trademark Licensing | 2.00 / 2.00 |

Community Partnerships

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 3.00 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has one or more formal community partnership(s) with school districts, government agencies, non-profit organizations, NGOs, businesses and/or other external entities, to work together to advance sustainability.

This credit recognizes campus-community partnerships that the institution supports (materially or financially) and that address sustainability challenges in the broader community. This may be demonstrated by having an active community partnership that meets one or more of the following criteria:

- The partnership is multi-year or ongoing, rather than a short-term project or event;
- The partnership simultaneously supports all three dimensions of sustainability, i.e. social equity and wellbeing, economic prosperity, and ecological health; and/or
- The partnership is inclusive and participatory, i.e. underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations are engaged as equal partners in strategic planning, decision-making, implementation and review.

A partnership is considered to be “transformative”, “collaborative”, or “supportive” based on the number of criteria that are met (see *D. Scoring*).

This credit is inclusive of partnerships with local and distant communities.

Participatory, community-based research and engaged scholarship around issues of sustainability may be included if it involves formal partnership(s). Although community service activities (e.g. academic service learning, co-curricular service learning and volunteer activities, Work-Study community service and paid community service internships) may involve partnerships and contribute toward sustainability, they are not included in this credit. Community service is covered by the *Community Service* credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Name of the institution’s formal community partnership to advance sustainability :

West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

Does the institution provide financial or material support for the partnership? :

Yes

Which of the following best describes the partnership timeframe?:

Multi-year or ongoing

Which of the following best describes the partnership’s sustainability focus?:

The partnership supports at least one, but not all three, dimensions of sustainability

Are underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations engaged as equal partners in strategic planning, decision-making, implementation and review? (Yes, No, or Not Sure):

Yes

A brief description of the institution’s formal community partnership to advance sustainability, including website URL (if available) and information to support each affirmative response above:

Lewis & Clark and the Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District over the course of the previous three years and counting have jointly developed, funded, and implemented removal of invasive on our and contiguous properties (Tryon Creek State Park, City of Portland’s Riverview Natural Area, and L&C residential properties). This ongoing partnership has led to watershed and bioregion effort to improve habitat over a large and biologically significant area. In addition to our work, we have jointly held workshops and open houses in the area for community members.

Name of the institution’s formal community partnership to advance sustainability (2nd partnership):

Intentional Endowments Network

Does the institution provide financial or material support for the partnership? (2nd partnership):

Yes

Which of the following best describes the partnership timeframe? (2nd partnership):

Multi-year or ongoing

Which of the following best describes the partnership’s sustainability focus? (2nd partnership):

The partnership simultaneously supports social equity and wellbeing, economic prosperity, and ecological health

Are underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations engaged as equal partners in strategic planning, decision-making, implementation and review? (2nd partnership) (Yes, No, or Not Sure):

Not Sure

A brief description of the institution’s formal community partnership to advance sustainability, including website URL (if available) and information to support each affirmative response above (2nd partnership):

The institution is a founding member of the Intentional Endowments Network. Our Chief Investment Officer serves as a steering committee member for the Intentional Endowments Network as well as on the committee addressing the Paris Climate Accord. Our CIO assisted in preparing the Paris Climate Agreement draft guidance to assist institutions in adapting their investment strategies/policies in light of the Paris Climate Agreement.

Name of the institution’s formal community partnership to advance sustainability (3rd partnership):

GPSEN

stars.aashe.org

Does the institution provide financial or material support for the partnership? (3rd partnership):

Yes

Which of the following best describes the partnership timeframe? (3rd partnership):

Multi-year or ongoing

Which of the following best describes the partnership's sustainability focus? (3rd partnership):

The partnership simultaneously supports social equity and wellbeing, economic prosperity, and ecological health

Are underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations engaged as equal partners in strategic planning, decision-making, implementation and review? (3rd partnership) (Yes, No, or Unknown):

Yes

A brief description of the institution's formal community partnership to advance sustainability, including website URL (if available) and information to support each affirmative response above (3rd partnership):

Our institution faculty, staff and students have formally and informally participated in and supported GPSEN since its founding. Providing assistance in planning, participating in student-led groups, and conferences.

A brief description of the institution's other community partnerships to advance sustainability:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Inter-Campus Collaboration

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.50 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution collaborates with other colleges and universities in one or more of the following ways to support and help build the campus sustainability community. The institution:

- Is an active member of a national or international sustainability network;
 - Is an active member of a regional, state/provincial or local sustainability network;
 - Has presented at a sustainability conference during the previous year;
 - Has submitted a case study during the previous year to a sustainability resource center or awards program that is inclusive of multiple campuses;
 - Has had staff, students, or faculty serving on a board or committee of a sustainability network or conference during the previous three years;
 - Has an ongoing mentoring relationship with another institution through which it assists the institution with its sustainability reporting and/or the development of its sustainability program;
 - Has had staff, faculty, or students serving as peer reviewers of another institution's sustainability data (e.g. GHG emissions or course inventory) and/or STARS submission during the previous three years; and/or
 - Has participated in other collaborative efforts around sustainability during the previous year, e.g. joint planning or resource sharing with other institutions.
-

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Is the institution an active member of a national or international sustainability network?:

Yes

The name of the national or international sustainability network(s):

GPSEN

Is the institution an active member of a regional, state/provincial or local sustainability network?:

Yes

The name of the regional, state/provincial or local sustainability network(s):

OHESC, Oregon

Has the institution presented at a sustainability conference during the previous year? :

Yes

A list or brief description of the conference(s) and presentation(s):

Yes, GPSEN conference in January 2017.

Has the institution submitted a case study during the previous year to a sustainability awards program that is inclusive of multiple campuses? :

No

A list or brief description of the awards program(s) and submission(s):

Has the institution had staff, students or faculty serving on a board or committee of a sustainability network or conference during the previous three years? :

Yes

A list or brief description of the board or committee appointment(s):

OHESC conference steering committee

Does the institution have an ongoing mentoring relationship with another institution through which it assists the institution with its sustainability reporting and/or the development of its sustainability program?:

No

A brief description of the mentoring relationship and activities:

Has the institution had staff, faculty, or students serving as peer reviewers of another institution's sustainability data (e.g. GHG emissions or course inventory) and/or STARS submission during the previous three years?:

No

A brief description of the peer review activities:

Has the institution participated in other collaborative efforts around sustainability during the previous year, e.g. joint planning or resource sharing with other institutions? :

Yes

A brief description of other collaborative efforts around sustainability during the previous year:

OHESC group shares and collaborates via listserv and also with in-person meetings twice per year, on average.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Continuing Education

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has conducted an inventory during the previous three years to identify its continuing education courses that address sustainability. These course offerings may include:

- Continuing education courses that have been identified as sustainability course offerings using the definitions provided in *G. Standards and Terms*; and/or
- Continuing education courses that have been formally designated as sustainability course offerings in the institution's standard course listings or catalog.

For each course, the inventory provides:

- The title and department (or equivalent) of the course.
- A brief description of the course. Courses for which partial or incomplete information is provided may not be counted toward earning points for Part 1 of this credit.

Courses that are typically taken for academic credit are not included in this credit; they are covered in the Curriculum subcategory

Part 2

Institution has at least one sustainability-themed certificate program through its continuing education or extension department.

Degree-granting programs (e.g. programs that confer Baccalaureate, Masters, and Associates degrees) and certificates that are part of academic degree programs are not included in this credit; they are covered in the Curriculum subcategory.

This credit was marked as **Not Applicable** for the following reason:

Institution does not offer continuing education or community education programs.

Community Service

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|--|
| 3.75 / 5.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution engages its student body in community service, as measured by the percentage of students who participate in community service.

Part 2

Institution engages students in community service, as measured by the average hours contributed per student per year.

Institutions may exclude non-credit, continuing education, part-time, and/or graduate students from this credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Number of students enrolled for credit (headcount; part-time students, continuing education, and/or graduate students may be excluded):

3,419

Number of students engaged in community service (headcount):

1,990

Percentage of students engaged in community service:

58.20

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 2 of this credit (community service hours)? (if data not available, respond 'No'):

Yes

Total number of student community service hours contributed during the most recent one-year period:

358,422

Number of annual community service hours contributed per student :

104.83

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Does the institution include community service achievements on student transcripts?:

No

**Does the institution provide incentives for employees to participate in community service (on- or off-campus)?
(Incentives may include voluntary leave, compensatory time, or other forms of positive recognition):**

Yes

A brief description of the institution's employee community service initiatives:

Internal recognition programs, t-shirts, prizes and other awards are provided to employees volunteers.

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2016 Presidential Honor Roll Application - 2014-15 data

Participation in Public Policy

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution advocates for public policies that support campus sustainability or that otherwise advance sustainability. The advocacy may take place at one or more of the following levels:

- Municipal/local,
- State/provincial/regional,
- National, and/or
- International.

The policy advocacy must have the implicit or explicit support of the institution's top administrators and/or governing bodies to count. For example, advocacy by administrators, students, staff, or faculty who are acting as representatives of the institution or its governance bodies may count. Advocacy by students, staff, or faculty conducted in a personal capacity does not count unless it is formally endorsed at the institutional level.

Examples of advocacy efforts include supporting or endorsing legislation, ordinances, and public policies that advance sustainability; active participation in campaigns aiming to change public policy; and discussions with legislators in regard to the above.

This credit acknowledges institutions that advocate for policy changes and legislation to advance sustainability broadly. Advocacy efforts that are made exclusively to advance the institution's interests or projects may not be counted. For example, advocating for government funding for campus sustainability may be counted, whereas lobbying for the institution to receive funds that have already been appropriated may not.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution advocate for public policies that support campus sustainability or that otherwise advance sustainability at the municipal/local level?:

Yes

A brief description of how the institution engages in public policy advocacy for sustainability at the municipal/local level, including the issues, legislation, and ordinances for or against which the institution has advocated:

The institution provided support and advocacy for transportation policies and infrastructure that would provide for safe biking and pedestrian access on a main thoroughfare in the City.

Does the institution advocate for public policies that support campus sustainability or that otherwise advance

sustainability at the state/provincial/regional level?:

Yes

A brief description of how the institution engages in public policy advocacy for sustainability at the state/provincial/regional level, including the issues, legislation, and ordinances for or against which the institution has advocated:

The institution has advocated for changes in green building policy to support changes in code at the state level that would permit the use of composting toilets on commercial properties.

Does the institution advocate for public policies that support campus sustainability or that otherwise advance sustainability at the national level?:

No

A brief description of how the institution engages in public policy advocacy for sustainability at the national level, including the issues, legislation, and ordinances for or against which the institution has advocated:

Does the institution advocate for public policies that support campus sustainability or that otherwise advance sustainability at the international level?:

Yes

A brief description of how the institution engages in public policy advocacy for sustainability at the international level, including the issues, legislation, and ordinances for or against which the institution has advocated:

The President recently signed the We Are Still In open letter to the international community demonstrating our commitment to continuing to pursue climate action.

<http://www.wearestillin.com/>

A brief description of other political positions the institution has taken during the previous three years (if applicable):

A brief description of political donations the institution made during the previous three years (if applicable):

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

stars.aashe.org

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Trademark Licensing

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution is a member of the Fair Labor Association (FLA) and/or the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC).

Please note that other initiatives to support fair labor standards in the supply chain are recognized in the *Sustainable Procurement* credit in Purchasing.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Is the institution a member of the Worker Rights Consortium?:

Yes

Is the institution a member of the Fair Labor Association? :

Yes

A brief description of the institution's WRC or FLA membership, including the year membership was last established or renewed:

annual renewal

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Operations

Air & Climate

Points Claimed 10.50

Points Available 11.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are measuring and reducing their greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions. Global climate change is having myriad negative impacts throughout the world, including increased frequency and potency of extreme weather events, sea level rise, species extinction, water shortages, declining agricultural production, and spread of diseases. The impacts are particularly pronounced for low-income communities and countries. In addition, institutions that inventory and take steps to reduce their air pollutant emissions can positively impact the health of the campus community, as well as the health of their local communities and regions.

| Credit | Points |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 9.50 / 10.00 |
| Outdoor Air Quality | 1.00 / 1.00 |

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Score

9.50 / 10.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has conducted a publicly available greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory that includes, at minimum, Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions and may also include Scope 3 GHG emissions.

The inventory may also be verified by an independent, external third party and/or validated internally by campus personnel who are independent of the GHG accounting and reporting process.

Part 2

Institution reduced its adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions per weighted campus user compared to a baseline.

Part 3

Institution's annual adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions are less than the minimum performance threshold of 0.02 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO_{2e}) per gross square foot (0.215 MtCO_{2e} per gross square metre) of floor area.

Performance for Part 3 of this credit is assessed using EUI-adjusted floor area, a figure that accounts for significant differences in energy use intensity (EUI) between types of building space (see *G. Standards and Terms*).

For this credit, the following carbon offsets may be counted:

- Third-party verified purchased carbon offsets
- Institution-catalyzed carbon offsets (popularly known as “local offsets”)
- Carbon sequestration due to land that the institution manages specifically for sequestration (as documented in policies, land management plans or the equivalent)
- Carbon storage from on-site composting

Purchased Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) or Guarantees of Origin (GOs) may not be counted as carbon offsets. Emissions reductions attributable to RECs and GOs that are either Green-e Energy certified or meet Green-e Energy's technical requirements and are verified as such by a third party are reported separately (see *E. Reporting Fields*). Purchased carbon offsets and RECs/GOs that have not been third-party verified do not count.

Institution-catalyzed offsets, on-site composting, and carbon sequestration projects (on and off campus) that are to be counted as offsets must be third party verified or, at minimum, quantified using a method that addresses all of the following accounting issues:

- Selection of a baseline scenario (i.e. what would have happened in the absence of the project?);

- Demonstration of additionality (i.e. the project has resulted in emission reductions or removals in addition to what would have happened in the absence of the project);
- Identification and quantification of relevant secondary effects (i.e. small, unintended GHG consequences of a project, include leakage and changes in GHG emissions up- and downstream of the project);
- Consideration of reversibility (i.e. assessing the risk of reversibility, together with any mitigation or compensation measures included in the project design);
- Avoidance of double-counting (i.e. the reductions giving rise to the offset must occur at sources or sinks not included in the target or cap for which the offset is used).

Institutions that have sold or transferred emissions reductions, e.g. in the form of verified emissions reductions (VERs), may not count those reductions toward this credit. Those transactions are reported separately and net GHG emissions are automatically adjusted upward to reflect the sale or transfer of any institution-generated offsets that have been included as carbon offsets (see *D. Scoring*).

---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Has the institution conducted a GHG emissions inventory that includes all Scope 1 and 2 emissions? :

Yes

Does the institution’s GHG emissions inventory include all, some or none of its Scope 3 GHG emissions from the following categories?:

| | All, Some, or None |
|--|--------------------|
| Business travel | None |
| Commuting | Some |
| Purchased goods and services | Some |
| Capital goods | Some |
| Waste generated in operations | All |
| Fuel- and energy-related activities not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2 | Some |
| Other categories | Some |

A copy of the most recent GHG emissions inventory:

[Rev2GHG_2016.xlsm](#)

A brief description of the methodology and/or tool used to complete the GHG emissions inventory, including how the

stars.aashe.org

institution accounted for each category of Scope 3 emissions reported above:

clean air cool planet campus calculator

Has the GHG emissions inventory been validated internally by personnel who are independent of the GHG accounting and reporting process and/or verified by an independent, external third party?:

No

A brief description of the internal and/or external verification process:

Documentation to support the internal and/or external verification process:

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 2 and Part 3 of this credit? (reductions in Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions):

Yes

Gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|--|---|
| Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from stationary combustion | 3,369 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 3,818 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from other sources | 57 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 82 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from purchased electricity | 3,596 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 8,342 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from other sources | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Total | 7,022 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 12,242 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |

Start and end dates of the performance year and baseline year (or three-year periods):

| | Start Date | End Date |
|--|------------|----------|
|--|------------|----------|

| | | |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Performance Year | Jan. 1, 2016 | Dec. 31, 2016 |
| Baseline Year | Jan. 1, 2005 | Dec. 31, 2005 |

A brief description of when and why the GHG emissions baseline was adopted (e.g. in sustainability plans and policies or in the context of other reporting obligations):

Earliest, consistently-measured baseline

Figures needed to determine total carbon offsets:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---|--|--|
| Third-party verified carbon offsets purchased (exclude purchased RECs/GOs) | 3,426 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 700 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Institution-catalyzed carbon offsets generated | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Carbon sequestration due to land that the institution manages specifically for sequestration | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Carbon storage from on-site composting | 188 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Carbon offsets included above for which the emissions reductions have been sold or transferred by the institution | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
| Net carbon offsets | 3,614 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 700 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |

A brief description of the offsets in each category reported above, including vendor, project source, verification program and contract timeframes (as applicable):

Offsets:

VCS and CCB certified

Project Name: Cedar Grove Organic Waste Composting

Location: Everett, WA

Start Up Date (Actual or Expected): 2008

Project Type: Waste Composting

Offset Standard: Climate Action Reserve

Description: The Cedar Grove Organic Waste Composting project consists of the diversion of one or more eligible organic residuals, including residential and commercial food-waste, to an aerobic composting facility where the residuals are composted in a system that complies with Best Management Practices that ensure the composting process is operated under optimal conditions. The project encompasses organic residual handling, preprocessing and aerobic composting at the Everett facility in Everett, WA operated by Cedar Grove Composting. The technology employed at this facility is the GORE Cover System.

Project Name: Kasigau Corridor REDD+

Location: Kasigau Corridor, Kenya

Start Up Date (Actual or Expected): 2011

Estimated Reductions: 1.2 million tonnes CO₂e over 30 years

Project Type: REDD+

Offset Standard: Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard, Verified Carbon Standard

Description: The world's 1st REDD+ project to be validated and verified under VCS and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard (CCB). The project was awarded additional distinction of Gold Level status by the CCB for exceptional biodiversity and climate benefits. 500,000 acres of threatened forests are protected. Benefits of direct carbon financing are delivered to more than 100,000 people in the surrounding communities, including 4,000 local landowners. The area is home to over 50 species of large mammals, 300 species of birds, and populations of IUCN Red List species such as Cheetahs, Lions and over 2,000 African Elephants.

On-site composting: carbon storage resulting from on-site composting includes all landscape material removed from campus which is composted on a campus. Material weight is estimated based on the average weight of a cubic yard and the holding capacity of the carbon storage system. Out-going materials are weighed. This on-site carbon storage is not verified by a third-party but is estimated using the climate carbon calculator.

Emissions reductions attributable to Renewable Energy Certificate (REC) or Guarantee of Origin (GO) purchases:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|------------------|---------------|
|--|------------------|---------------|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Emissions reductions attributable to REC/GO purchases | 3,596 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |
|---|--|--|

A brief description of the purchased RECs/GOs including vendor, project source and verification program:

Bonneville Environmental Foundation

RECS: Green-e certified

Project Name: Condon Wind Farm Phase II

Facility Location: Gilliam County, OR

Online Date: May 2002

Capacity: 25.2-Megawatts (MW)

Fuel Source: Wind Energy

Description: Located on private land used for wheat and barley farming and cattle grazing near Condon, this 49.8 MW project is comprised of 83 Mitsubishi 600kW turbines and can generate enough electricity to power about 10,513 homes.

Project Name: Klondike III Wind Farm

Facility Location: Sherman County, OR

Online Date: November 2007

Capacity: 223.6-Megawatts (MW)

Fuel Source: Wind Energy

Description: Located on privately owned farmland near Wasco and built in four phase, this 399 MW project is home to dry-land wheat farming and testing of new wind turbine technology. The project generates enough electricity to power approximately 115,000 homes.

Adjusted net Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|--|---|
| Adjusted net Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 11,542 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |

Figures needed to determine “Weighted Campus Users”:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| Number of students resident on-site | 1,440 | 1,199 |
| Number of employees resident on-site | 37 | 0 |

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| Number of other individuals resident on-site and/or staffed hospital beds | 0 | 0 |
| Total full-time equivalent student enrollment | 3,250 | 3,153 |
| Full-time equivalent of employees (staff + faculty) | 700 | 695 |
| Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education | 0 | 0 |
| Weighted campus users | 3,331.75 | 3,185.75 |

Adjusted net Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions per weighted campus user:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---|--|---|
| Adjusted net Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions per weighted campus user | 0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> | 3.62 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i> |

Percentage reduction in adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions per weighted campus user from baseline (0-100):

100

Gross floor area of building space, performance year:

1,303,887 *Gross Square Feet*

Floor area of energy intensive building space, performance year:

| | Floor Area |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Laboratory space | 67,384 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| Healthcare space | 2,907 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| Other energy intensive space | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |

EUI-adjusted floor area, performance year:

1,444,469 *Gross Square Feet*

Adjusted net Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions per unit of EUI-adjusted floor area, performance year:

0 MtCO₂e / GSF

Scope 3 GHG emissions, performance year:

| | Emissions |
|--|--|
| Business travel | 0 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |
| Commuting | 771.50 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |
| Purchased goods and services | 256.40 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |
| Capital goods | 0 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |
| Fuel- and energy-related activities not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2 | 0 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |
| Waste generated in operations | 10.70 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |
| Other categories | 341 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent |

A brief description of the institution’s GHG emissions reduction initiatives, including efforts made during the previous three years:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Outdoor Air Quality

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has written policies or guidelines to improve outdoor air quality and minimize air pollutant emissions from mobile sources on campus. Policies and/or guidelines may include prohibiting vehicle idling, restrictions on the use of powered lawn care equipment, and similar strategies.

Policies and guidelines that support cleaner and more fuel-efficient fleet vehicles and more sustainable commuting options are covered by credits in the Transportation subcategory.

Policies adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g. government or university system) may count for Part 1 of this credit as long as the policies apply to and are followed by the institution.

Part 2

Institution has completed an inventory of significant air emissions from stationary sources on campus or else verified that no such emissions are produced. Significant emissions include nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur oxides (SOx), and other standard categories of air emissions identified in environmental permits held by the institution, international conventions, and/or national laws or regulations.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have policies and/or guidelines in place to improve outdoor air quality and minimize air pollutant emissions from mobile sources on campus?:

Yes

A brief description of the policies and/or guidelines to improve outdoor air quality and minimize air pollutant emissions from mobile sources:

Policies include smoking limited to designated areas, use of equipment during specified times, deliberate and ongoing reductions in natural gas use, no idling policy, fuel alternatives used in some fleet vehicles and contractor fleets.

Has the institution completed an inventory of significant air emissions from stationary campus sources or else verified that no such emissions are produced?:

Yes

Weight of the following categories of air emissions from stationary sources::

| | Weight of Emissions |
|---|---------------------|
| Nitrogen oxides (NOx) | 2.71 Tons |
| Sulfur oxides (SOx) | 0.33 Tons |
| Carbon monoxide (CO) | 2.26 Tons |
| Particulate matter (PM) | 0.07 Tons |
| Ozone (O3) | 0 Tons |
| Lead (Pb) | 0 Tons |
| Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) | 0 Tons |
| Ozone-depleting compounds (ODCs) | 0 Tons |
| Other standard categories of air emissions identified in permits and/or regulations | 0.15 Tons |

A brief description of the methodology(ies) the institution used to complete its air emissions inventory:

Stationary and on-campus mobile air emission sources are accounted for each year and reported to local agencies per their reporting standards.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[ACDP annual rpt 2016.pdf](#)

Buildings

Points Claimed 3.48

Points Available 8.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are taking steps to improve the sustainability performance of their buildings. Buildings are generally the largest user of energy and the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions on campuses. Buildings also use significant amounts of potable water. Institutions can design, build, and maintain buildings in ways that provide a safe and healthy indoor environment for inhabitants while simultaneously mitigating the building's impact on the outdoor environment.

| Credit | Points |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Building Operations and Maintenance | 1.06 / 5.00 |
| Building Design and Construction | 2.42 / 3.00 |

Building Operations and Maintenance

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.06 / 5.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution owns and operates buildings that are:

1) Certified under a green building rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings, e.g. LEED®: Building Operations + Maintenance (O+M)

And/or

2) Operated and maintained in accordance with published sustainable operations and maintenance guidelines and policies that include one or more of the following:

- Indoor air quality (IAQ) management policy or protocol
- Green cleaning policy, program or contract
- Energy management or benchmarking program
- Water management or benchmarking program

Energy and water management and benchmarking programs include dashboards, analytics tools, and other mechanisms to assess performance, set goals, create and implement action plans, and evaluate progress. See, for example [ENERGY STAR Guidelines for Energy Management](#) and [U.S. EPA Portfolio Manager](#).

Building space that meets multiple criteria listed above should not be double-counted.

Building space that is certified under a green building rating system for new construction and major renovation must also be certified under a rating system focusing on operations and maintenance to count as certified space for this credit. For example, a building that is certified under LEED: Building Design + Construction (BD+C) but not LEED: Building Operations + Maintenance (O+M) should not be counted as certified space. Sustainability in new construction and major renovation projects is covered in the *Building Design and Construction* credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total floor area of building space:

1,303,887 *Square Feet*

Floor area of building space that is certified at each level under a green building rating system for the operations and maintenance of existing buildings used by an Established Green Building Council:

| | Certified Floor Area |
|---|----------------------|
| LEED O+M Platinum or the highest achievable level under another GBC rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| LEED O+M Gold or the 2nd highest level under another 4- or 5-tier GBC rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| Certified at mid-level under a 3- or 5-tier GBC rating system (e.g. BREEAM-In Use, CASBEE for Existing Buildings, DGNB, Green Star Performance) | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| LEED O+M Silver or at a step above minimum level under another 4 -or 5–tier GBC rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| LEED O+M Certified or certified at minimum level under another GBC rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |

Floor area of building space that is certified under a non-GBC rating system for the operations and maintenance of existing buildings, e.g. BOMA BEST, Green Globes CIEB:

52,000 *Square Feet*

Percentage of building space certified under a green building rating system for the operations and maintenance of existing buildings:

3.99

A brief description of the green building rating system(s) used and/or a list or sample of certified buildings and ratings:

Green Globes; Holmes Hall

Of the institution's uncertified building space, what percentage of floor area is maintained in accordance with a published indoor air quality (IAQ) management policy or protocol? (0-100):

0

A copy of the IAQ management policy or protocol:

The website URL where the IAQ policy/protocol may be found:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/risk_management/

Of the institution's uncertified building space, what percentage of floor area is maintained in accordance with a published green cleaning policy, program or contract ? (0-100):

100

A copy or the green cleaning policy:

A brief description of how green cleaning is incorporated into cleaning contracts:

Green cleaning is incorporated as a required element of the current cleaning contract. Continuous improvement is an element of this requirement.

Of the institution's uncertified building space, what percentage of floor area is maintained in accordance with an energy management or benchmarking program? (0-100):

100

A brief description of the energy management or benchmarking program:

Energy Trust of Oregon, Strategic Energy Management program

Of the institution's uncertified building space, what percentage of floor area is maintained in accordance with a water management or benchmarking program? (0-100):

0

A brief description of the water management or benchmarking program:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Building Design and Construction

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.42 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution-owned buildings that were constructed or underwent major renovations in the previous five years are:

1) Certified under a green building rating system for new construction and major renovations, e.g. LEED[®]: Building Design & Construction (BD+C)

2) Certified Living under the Living Building Challenge

And/or

3) Designed and built in accordance with published green building codes, guidelines and/or policies that cover one or more of the following:

- Impacts on the surrounding site (e.g. guidelines to reuse previously developed land, protect environmentally sensitive areas, and otherwise minimize site impacts)
- Energy consumption (e.g. policies requiring a minimum level of energy efficiency for buildings and their systems)
- Building-level energy metering
- Use of environmentally preferable materials (e.g. guidelines to minimize the life cycle impacts associated with building materials)
- Indoor environmental quality (i.e. guidelines to protect the health and comfort of building occupants)
- Water consumption (e.g. requiring minimum standards of efficiency for indoor and outdoor water use)
- Building-level water metering

Building space that meets multiple criteria listed above should not be double-counted.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space (include projects completed within the previous five years) :

56,442 Square Feet

Floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space certified Living under the Living Building Challenge:

0 Square Feet

Floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space certified at each level under a rating system for design and construction used by an Established Green Building Council (GBC) :

| | Certified Floor Area |
|---|---------------------------|
| LEED BD+C Platinum or at the highest achievable level under another rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| LEED BD+C Gold or at the 2nd highest level under another 4- or 5-tier GBC rating system | 53,231 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| Certified at mid-level under a 3- or 5-tier GBC rating system for design and construction (e.g. BREEAM, CASBEE, DGNB, Green Star) | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| LEED BD+C Silver or at a step above minimum level under another 4- or 5-tier GBC rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| LEED BD+C Certified or certified at minimum level under another GBC rating system | 0 <i>Square Feet</i> |

Floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space certified under a non-GBC rating system for design and construction (e.g. Green Globes NC, Certified Passive House):

0 *Square Feet*

Percentage of newly constructed or renovated building space certified under a green building rating system for design and construction:

94.31

A brief description of the green building rating system(s) used and/or a list of certified buildings and ratings:

Holmes Hall - LEED Gold, Green Globes (3)
 JR Howard Hall - LEED Gold
 East, West, Roberts Residence Halls - LEED Silver
 Wood Hall - LEED Gold

Floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space that is NOT certified, but that was designed and constructed in accordance with published green building guidelines and policies:

3,211 *Square Feet*

A copy of the green building guidelines or policies :

[219-cap.doc](#)

The green building guidelines or policies:

The Climate Action Plan in addition to the Conditional Use Master Plan and Salmon Safe, Strategic Energy Management program cover the below in some form.

Do the green building guidelines or policies cover the following?:

| | Yes or No |
|--|-----------|
| Impacts on the surrounding site (e.g. guidelines to reuse previously developed land, protect environmentally sensitive areas, and otherwise minimize site impacts) | Yes |
| Energy consumption (e.g. policies requiring a minimum level of energy efficiency for buildings and their systems) | Yes |
| Building-level energy metering | Yes |
| Use of environmentally preferable materials (e.g. guidelines to minimize the life cycle impacts associated with building materials) | No |
| Indoor environmental quality (i.e. guidelines to protect the health and comfort of building occupants) | Yes |
| Water consumption (e.g. requiring minimum standards of efficiency for indoor and outdoor water use) | Yes |
| Building-level water metering | Yes |

A brief description of the green building guidelines or policies and/or a list or sample of buildings covered:

L&C's Climate Action Plan established LEED or its equivalent as a working standard for new construction certification. Currently, LEED Gold is the base level required for all new major construction.

A brief description of how the institution ensures compliance with green building design and construction guidelines and policies:

Compliance with the green building design policy is ensured through the Facilities Services Capital budgeting process. Buildings or building space that is not certified must be documented via the USGBC standard for internal purposes.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Energy

Points Claimed 6.05

Points Available 10.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are reducing their energy consumption through conservation and efficiency, and switching to cleaner and renewable sources of energy such as solar, wind, geothermal, and low-impact hydropower. For most institutions, energy consumption is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, which cause global climate change. Global climate change is having myriad negative impacts throughout the world, including increased frequency and potency of extreme weather events, sea level rise, species extinction, water shortages, declining agricultural production, ocean acidification, and spread of diseases. The impacts are particularly pronounced for vulnerable and poor communities and countries. In addition to causing global climate change, energy generation from fossil fuels, especially coal, produces air pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, mercury, dioxins, arsenic, cadmium and lead. These pollutants contribute to acid rain as well as health problems such as heart and respiratory diseases and cancer. Coal mining and oil and gas drilling can also damage environmentally and/or culturally significant ecosystems. Nuclear power creates highly toxic and long-lasting radioactive waste. Large-scale hydropower projects flood habitats and disrupt fish migration and can involve the relocation of entire communities.

Implementing conservation measures and switching to renewable sources of energy can help institutions save money and protect them from utility rate volatility. Renewable energy may be generated locally and allow campuses to support local economic development. Furthermore, institutions can help shape markets by creating demand for cleaner, renewable sources of energy.

| Credit | Points |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Building Energy Consumption | 4.49 / 6.00 |
| Clean and Renewable Energy | 1.56 / 4.00 |

Building Energy Consumption

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 4.49 / 6.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has reduced its total building energy consumption per gross square foot/metre of floor area compared to a baseline.

Part 2

Institution's annual building energy consumption is less than the minimum performance threshold of 65 Btu per gross square foot per Fahrenheit degree day (389 Btu per gross square metre per Celsius degree day).

Performance for Part 2 of this credit is assessed using EUI-adjusted floor area, a figure that accounts for significant differences in energy use intensity (EUI) between types of building space (see *G. Standards and Terms*).

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Figures needed to determine total building energy consumption:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Grid-purchased electricity | 40,103 <i>MMBtu</i> | 64,271 <i>MMBtu</i> |
| Electricity from on-site renewables | 57.70 <i>MMBtu</i> | 0 <i>MMBtu</i> |
| District steam/hot water (sourced from offsite) | 62,595 <i>MMBtu</i> | 71,863 <i>MMBtu</i> |
| Energy from all other sources (excluding transportation fuels) | 0 <i>MMBtu</i> | 0 <i>MMBtu</i> |
| Total | 102,755.70 <i>MMBtu</i> | 136,134 <i>MMBtu</i> |

Start and end dates of the performance year and baseline year (or 3-year periods):

| | Start Date | End Date |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Performance Year | Jan. 1, 2016 | Dec. 31, 2016 |
| Baseline Year | Jan. 1, 2005 | Dec. 31, 2005 |

A brief description of when and why the building energy consumption baseline was adopted (e.g. in sustainability plans and policies or in the context of other reporting obligations):

2005 baseline used as standard where data is available

Gross floor area of building space:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Gross floor area of building space | 1,303,887 <i>Gross Square Feet</i> | 1,245,427 <i>Gross Square Feet</i> |

Source-site ratio for grid-purchased electricity:

3.14

Total building energy consumption per unit of floor area:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Site energy | 0.08 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i> | 0.11 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i> |
| Source energy | 0.15 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i> | 0.23 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i> |

Percentage reduction in total building energy consumption (source energy) per unit of floor area from baseline (0-100):

33.32

Degree days, performance year (base 65 °F / 18 °C):

| | Degree days (see help icon above) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Heating degree days | 3,934 <i>Degree-Days (°F)</i> |
| Cooling degree days | 392 <i>Degree-Days (°F)</i> |

Floor area of energy intensive space, performance year:

| | Floor Area |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Laboratory space | 67,384 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| Healthcare space | 2,907 <i>Square Feet</i> |
| Other energy intensive space | |

EUI-adjusted floor area, performance year:

1,444,469 *Gross Square Feet*

Building energy consumption (site energy) per unit of EUI-adjusted floor area per degree day, performance year:

16.44 *Btu / GSF / Degree-Day (°F)*

Documentation (e.g. spreadsheet or utility records) to support the performance year energy consumption figures reported above:

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to shift individual attitudes and practices in regard to energy efficiency (e.g. outreach and education efforts):

Employee fairs, student events/activities

A brief description of energy use standards and controls employed by the institution (e.g. building temperature standards, occupancy and vacancy sensors):

The buildings are set to specific temperature range based on occupancy hours and time of year.

A brief description of Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting and other energy-efficient lighting strategies employed by the institution:

LEDs are standard for any retrofit or upgrade project. Current LED use includes: outdoor stadium, indoor gyms, library, some hallway/public space light, desk lamps, residence halls, exterior lighting.

A brief description of passive solar heating, geothermal systems, and related strategies employed by the institution:

A brief description of co-generation employed by the institution, e.g. combined heat and power (CHP):

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to replace energy-consuming appliances, equipment and systems with high efficiency alternatives (e.g. building re-commissioning or retrofit programs):

Strategic energy management program includes retro commissioning as a standard component.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Clean and Renewable Energy

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 1.56 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution supports the development and use of clean and renewable energy sources, using any one or combination of the following options.

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Option 1: | Generating electricity from clean and renewable energy sources on campus and retaining or retiring the rights to the environmental attributes of such electricity. (In other words, if the institution has sold Renewable Energy Credits for the clean and renewable energy it generated, it may not claim such energy here.) The on-site renewable energy generating devices may be owned and/or maintained by another party as long as the institution has contractual rights to the associated environmental attributes. |
| Option 2: | Using renewable sources on-site to generate energy other than electricity, such as biomass for heating. |
| Option 3: | Catalyzing the development of off-site clean and renewable energy sources (e.g. an off-campus wind farm that was designed and built to supply electricity to the institution) and retaining the environmental attributes of that energy. |
| Option 4: | Purchasing the environmental attributes of electricity in the form of Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs) or similar renewable energy products that are either Green-e Energy certified or meet Green-e Energy’s technical requirements (or local equivalents) and are verified as such by a third party, or purchasing renewable electricity through the institution’s electric utility through a certified green power purchasing option. |

Since this credit is intended to recognize institutions that are actively supporting the development and use of clean and renewable energy, neither the electric grid mix for the region in which the institution is located nor the grid mix reported by the electric utility that serves the institution (i.e. the utility’s standard or default product) count for this credit.

The following renewable systems are eligible for this credit:

- Concentrated solar thermal

- Geothermal systems that generate electricity
- Low-impact hydroelectric power
- Solar photovoltaic
- Wave and tidal power
- Wind

Biofuels from the following sources are eligible:

- Agricultural crops
- Agricultural waste
- Animal waste
- Landfill gas
- Untreated wood waste
- Other organic waste

Technologies that reduce the amount of energy used but do not generate renewable energy do not count for this credit (e.g. daylighting, passive solar design, ground-source heat pumps). The benefits of such strategies, as well as the improved efficiencies achieved through using cogeneration technologies, are captured by the *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and *Building Energy Consumption* credits.

Transportation fuels, which are covered by the *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and *Campus Fleet* credits, are not included.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total energy consumption (all sources, excluding transportation fuels), performance year :

102,755.70 MMBtu

Total clean and renewable electricity generated on site during the performance year and for which the institution retains or has retired the associated environmental attributes:

57.70 MMBtu

A brief description of on-site renewable electricity generating devices :

The institution has a 100 kw solar array on campus for which we receive the power however we do not own the green tags for this installation. The institution also hosts a 15 kw carport array and does own the environmental attributes.

Non-electric renewable energy generated on-site, performance year:

0 MMBtu

A brief description of on-site renewable non-electric energy devices:

Total clean and renewable electricity generated by off-site projects that the institution catalyzed and for which the

institution retains or has retired the associated environmental attributes, performance year:

0 MMBtu

A brief description of off-site, institution-catalyzed, renewable electricity generating devices:

Total third-party certified RECs, GOs and/or similar renewable energy products (including renewable electricity purchased through a utility-provided certified green power option) purchased during the performance year:

40,103 MMBtu

A brief description of the RECs, GOs and/or similar renewable energy products, including contract timeframes:

L&C undergraduate students purchase RECs to cover 100% of our energy usage each year. This year's purchase:

Bonneville Environmental Foundation

CERTIFICATE #8397

Smoky Hills Wind Project II

Located in Lincoln and Ellsworth counties Kansas, the Smokey Hills Wind II Project consists of 99 GE turbines and has a nameplate capacity of 148.5 MW.

PRODUCTION DATE

2015 Sept

CLEAN MWh GENERATED

12,462

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

https://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/campus/green_power/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Electricity use, by source (percentage of total, 0-100):

| | Percentage of total electricity use (0-100) |
|-------------|---|
| Biomass | --- |
| Coal | 22 |
| Geothermal | --- |
| Hydro | 16 |
| Natural gas | 25 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Nuclear | --- |
| Solar photovoltaic | 5 |
| Wind | 6 |
| Other (please specify and explain below) | 26 |

A brief description of other sources of electricity not specified above:

'market purchases' and 'long-term market contracts' make up the 'other' category and are sourced from the regional grid. Source:

<https://www.portlandgeneral.com/our-company/energy-strategy/how-we-generate-electricity>

Energy used for heating buildings, by source::

| | Percentage of total energy used to heat buildings (0-100) |
|--|---|
| Biomass | --- |
| Coal | --- |
| Electricity | 7 |
| Fuel oil | --- |
| Geothermal | --- |
| Natural gas | 93 |
| Other (please specify and explain below) | --- |

A brief description of other sources of building heating not specified above:

Percentage of total energy consumption from clean and renewable sources:

39.08

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

100 of our energy and gas use is offset by purchased RECS and greenhouse gas offsets.

Food & Dining

Points Claimed 3.48

Points Available 8.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are supporting a sustainable food system. Modern industrial food production often has deleterious environmental and social impacts. Pesticides and fertilizers used in agriculture can contaminate ground and surface water and soil, which can in turn have potentially dangerous impacts on wildlife and human health. The production of animal-derived foods often subjects animals to inhumane treatment and animal products have a higher per-calorie environmental intensity than plant-based foods. Additionally, farm workers are often directly exposed to dangerous pesticides, subjected to harsh working conditions, and paid substandard wages. Furthermore, food is often transported long distance to institutions, producing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution, as well as undermining the resiliency of local communities.

Institutions can use their purchasing power to require transparency from their distributors and find out where the food comes from, how it was produced, and how far it traveled. Institutions can use their food purchases to support their local economies; encourage safe, environmentally friendly and humane farming methods; and help eliminate unsafe working conditions and alleviate poverty for farmers. These actions help reduce environmental impacts, preserve regional farmland, improve local food security, and support fair and resilient food systems.

Dining services can also support sustainable food systems by preventing food waste and diverting food materials from the waste stream, by making low impact dining options available, and by educating its customers about more sustainable options and practices.

| Credit | Points |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| Food and Beverage Purchasing | 1.48 / 6.00 |
| Sustainable Dining | 2.00 / 2.00 |

Food and Beverage Purchasing

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 1.48 / 6.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution and/or its primary dining services contractor conducts an inventory to identify food and beverage purchases that have the following attributes:

Third Party Verified. The product is sustainably and/or ethically produced as determined by one or more recognized food and beverage sustainability standards (see G. Standards and Terms).

Local & Community Based. The product does not qualify as Third Party Verified, but meets the criteria outlined in the table below. This category provides a path for campus farms and gardens and small and mid-sized producers to be recognized in the absence of third party certification.

Consistent with the [Real Food Standards](#), a product must meet the following criteria to qualify as Local & Community Based:

| | |
|--|---|
| Single-Ingredient Products | <p>A single-ingredient product must meet ALL of the following criteria:</p> <p>Ownership. Producer must be a privately or cooperatively owned enterprise. Wild-caught seafood must come from owner-operated boats.</p> <p>Size. Produce: Gross annual sales for individual farms must not exceed \$5 million (US/Canadian). Meat, poultry, eggs, dairy, fish/seafood, grocery/staple items (e.g., grains): Producing company's gross annual sales must not exceed \$50 million (US/Canadian).</p> <p>Distance. All production, processing, and distribution facilities must be within a 250 mile (400 kilometre) radius of the institution. This radius is extended to 500 miles (800 kilometres) for meat (i.e., beef, lamb, pork, game).</p> |
| Single-Ingredient Products Aggregated From Multiple Sources (e.g., fluid milk) | At least 75 percent of the product (by volume) must meet the Ownership, Size, and Distance criteria outlined above. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Multi-Ingredient Products (e.g., baked goods) | <p>Producing company must meet ALL of the following criteria:</p> <p>Ownership. Company must be a privately or cooperatively owned enterprise.</p> <p>Size. Company’s gross annual sales must be less than or equal to \$50 million (US/Canadian).</p> <p>Distance. All processing and distribution facilities must be within a 250 mile (400 kilometre) radius of the institution.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>At least 50 percent of the ingredients must come from farms meeting the Ownership, Size, and Distance criteria for Single-Ingredient Products outlined above.</p> |
|---|---|

Products from intensive livestock operations (e.g., CAFO-permitted facilities in the U.S.) are excluded. Due to the prevalence of industrial livestock production, meat, poultry, egg, and dairy producers should be assumed to be intensive operations unless the institution can verify otherwise through third party certification, transparent information from the supplier, and/or an appropriate regulatory body.

For additional guidance in identifying products that are Local & Community Based, see the [Real Food Calculator](#).

The institution may also choose to identify purchases that have Other Sustainability Attributes (see E. Reporting Fields), i.e., that are environmentally or socially preferable in ways that are not recognized above. Examples include expenditures on products with credible sustainability claims and labels not formally recognized in the Third Party Verified category and products from local companies and regional farms that do not fully meet the Local & Community Based criteria. Although products reported in this category are considered to be conventionally produced and do not count toward scoring, identifying them can provide a more comprehensive picture of the institution’s sustainable purchasing efforts.

Products that meet more than one of the criteria outlined above (e.g., products from small and mid-sized local producers that are Certified Organic) should not be double-counted.

While products with sustainability attributes may be sourced through distributors or other third parties, the attributes of distributors do not count. For example, a product purchased from a local distributor may only be considered local if the product itself meets the criteria outlined above.

Transparency in the supply chain is a fundamental component of a sustainable food system. Products without verifiable sustainability attributes do not count in any of the categories outlined above. For each product that has one or more verifiable sustainability attributes, the inventory provides (at minimum):

Product description/type.

Label, brand or producer.

The category in which the product is being counted (e.g., Third Party Verified, Local & Community-Based), and/or a brief description of the specific sustainability attribute(s) for which it is being counted (i.e., information about the producer and any sustainability certifications or claims justifying its inclusion, e.g., “Certified Organic”, “local farm-to-institution program”).

Institutions in the U.S. and Canada with students running the [Real Food Calculator](#) may upload Calculator results to fulfill the inventory requirement. Likewise, products that have been formally verified through the use of the Real Food Calculator to be "Real Food A" or "Real Food B" may be counted as "third party verified... or Local & Community-Based" (see E. Reporting Fields).

For transparency and to help ensure comparability across institutions, it is strongly recommended that institutions not reporting Real Food Calculator results use the [STARS Food and Beverage Purchasing Inventory template](#) to record their purchases, and upload the results as documentation.

This credit includes food and beverage purchases for on-campus dining halls and catering services operated by the institution or the institution's primary dining services contractor (e.g., Aramark, Bon Appetit Management Company, Chartwells, Sodexo). Outlets that are unique to the institution or its primary contractor (e.g., retail concepts developed and managed by the institution or contractor) are included. On-site franchises (e.g., national or global brands), convenience stores, vending services, and concessions may be excluded; they are covered in the Sustainable Procurement credit in Purchasing

Part 1

Institution's dining services purchase food and beverage products that are third party verified under one or more recognized food and beverage sustainability standards or Local & Community-Based.

Part 2

Institution's dining services minimize the purchase of conventional animal products, as measured by the percentage of total dining services food and beverage expenditures on such products.

Conventional animal products include all meat, fish/seafood, poultry, eggs, and dairy products that do NOT qualify in either the Third Party Verified category or the Local & Community-Based category (as outlined above). Please note that products reported in the "other sustainability attributes" category are considered to be conventionally produced.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Percentage of dining services food and beverage expenditures on products that are third party verified under one or more recognized food and beverage sustainability standards or Local & Community-Based (0-100):

28

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 2 of this credit (expenditures on conventional animal products)? (If data is not available, respond "No"):

No

Percentage of total dining services food and beverage expenditures on conventional animal products (meat, poultry, fish/seafood, eggs, and dairy products that do NOT qualify in either the Third Party Verified or Local & Community-Based category):

4

A brief description of the sustainable food and beverage purchasing program, including how the sustainability impacts of products in specific categories are addressed (e.g. meat, poultry, fish/seafood, eggs, dairy, produce, tea/coffee):

Please see this website:

<http://lewisandclark.cafebonappetit.com/curious/sustainability/local-food/>

An inventory of the institution's sustainable food and beverage purchases that includes for each product: the description/type; label, brand or producer; and the category in which it is being counted and/or a description of its sustainability attribute(s):

[2016_BonApetitPurchasingUpdates.xlsx](#)

A brief description of the methodology used to conduct the inventory, including the timeframe and how representative samples accounted for seasonal variation (if applicable):

Food and beverage purchases are tracked by the institution's dining vendor through their sustainable food program.

Percentage of total dining services expenditures on Real Food A (0-100):

Percentage of total dining services expenditures on Real Food B (0-100):

Which of the following food service providers are present on campus and included in the total food and beverage expenditure figures?:

| | Present? | Included? |
|---|----------|-----------|
| Dining operations and catering services operated by the institution | No | No |
| Dining operations and catering services operated by a contractor | Yes | Yes |
| Student-run food/catering services | No | No |
| Franchises (e.g. national or global brands) | No | No |
| Convenience stores | No | No |
| Vending services | Yes | No |

| | | |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| Concessions | Yes | Yes |
|-------------|-----|-----|

A brief description of purchased food and beverage products that have other sustainability attributes not recognized above :

Additional percentage of dining services food and beverage expenditures on conventional products with other sustainability attributes not recognized above (0-100) :

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<http://lewisandclark.cafebonappetit.com/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2016_BonApetitPurchasingUpdates.xlsx](#)

Sustainable Dining

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution's dining services support sustainable food systems in one or more of the following ways. The institution or its primary dining services contractor:

- Has a published sustainable dining policy that includes specific criteria to support the procurement of environmentally and socially preferable food and beverage products and/or includes guidelines to reduce or minimize the adverse environmental and social impacts of dining operations;
- Sources food from a campus garden or farm;
- Hosts a farmers market, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery program, and/or urban agriculture project, or supports such a program in the local community;
- Has a vegan dining program that makes diverse, complete-protein vegan options available to every member of the campus community at every meal;
- Hosts low impact dining events (e.g. Meatless Mondays);
- Hosts sustainability-themed meals (e.g. local harvest dinners);
- Hosts a sustainability-themed food outlet on-site, either independently or in partnership with a contractor or retailer;
- Informs customers about low impact food choices and sustainability practices through labeling and signage in dining halls;
- Engages in outreach efforts to support learning and research about sustainable food systems; and/or
- Other sustainability-related initiatives (e.g. health and wellness initiatives, making culturally diverse options available)

Part 2

Institution's dining services minimize food and dining waste in one or more of the following ways. The institution or its primary dining services contractor:

- Participates in a competition or commitment program (e.g. U.S. EPA Food Recovery Challenge) and/or uses a food waste prevention system (e.g. LeanPath) to track and improve its food management practices;
- Has implemented trayless dining (in which trays are removed from or not available in dining halls) and/or modified menus/portions to reduce post-consumer food waste;
- Donates food that would otherwise go to waste to feed people;
- Diverts food materials from the landfill, incinerator or sewer for animal feed or industrial uses (e.g. converting cooking oil to fuel, on-site anaerobic digestion);
- Has a pre-consumer composting program;
- Has a post-consumer composting program;
- Utilizes reusable service ware for "dine in" meals;
- Provides reusable and/or third party certified compostable containers and service ware for "to-go" meals (in conjunction with an on-site composting program);

- Offers discounts or other incentives to customers who use reusable containers (e.g. mugs) instead of disposable or compostable containers in “to-go” food service operations; and/or
- Other materials management initiatives to minimize waste not covered above (e.g. working with vendors and other entities to reduce waste from food packaging).

This credit includes on-campus dining operations and catering services operated by the institution and the institution’s primary dining services contractor.

“---” indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor have a published sustainable dining policy?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainable dining policy:

<http://lewisandclark.cafebonappetit.com/wellness/>

Farm to Fork is a company-wide initiative to buy locally, formalized in 1999. Our first choice is to purchase seasonal ingredients from small, owner-operated farms and ranches within a 150-mile radius of your café. Food grown locally is fresher, better tasting, and often has greater nutritional value. Our commitment to local food is about preserving biodiversity, protecting open space, supporting family farmers, and keeping money invested in your community. Bon Appétit aims to spend at least 20 cents of every dollar with our network of over a thousand Farm to Fork suppliers. By doing so, we aim to strengthen our regional food systems so that everyone in our communities can eat well not just today, but for the future.

A sustainable future for food service means flavorful food that’s healthy and economically viable for all, produced through practices that respect farmers, workers, and animals; nourish the community; and replenish our shared natural resources for future generations.
—Bon Appétit Management Company’s definition of sustainability

Our path toward greater social responsibility and sustainability started as a quest for flavor. When you cook from scratch, you want the freshest ingredients. That led us to launch our Farm to Fork program back in 1999, long before local food became the phenomenon it is today. Working directly with farmers and ranchers opened our eyes to the many problems of our modern food supply: while it is abundant and cheap, it has many hidden costs, such as environmental pollution and worker abuse.

We want to play a part in making it better.
Leading by example

We are proud to be the first food service company to commit to:
Supporting local agriculture (with a defined purchasing target), since 1999
Striving to serve only seafood that meets Seafood Watch® sustainability guidelines for commercial buyers, since 2002
Reducing antibiotic use in farm animals (2003)
Serving rBGH-free milk (2003)

Switching to cage-free shell eggs (2005) and cage-free liquid eggs (2016)
Tackling food’s role in climate change (2007)

Addressing farmworkers' rights (2009)
Switching to humanely raised ground beef (2012)
Phasing out pork raised with gestation crates (early 2016)

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor source food from a campus garden or farm?:

No

A brief description of the program to source food from a campus garden or farm:

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor host a farmers market, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery program, and/or urban agriculture project, or support such a program in the local community?:

Yes

A brief description of the farmers market, CSA or urban agriculture project:

The institution hosts a CSA and/or supports local CSAs. The dining services contractor works with local food providers - often leading farms tours for students.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor have a vegan dining program that makes diverse, complete-protein vegan options available to every member of the campus community at every meal?:

Yes

A brief description of the vegan dining program:

Vegan options are provided in numerous locations throughout campus everyday including the primary food services location, Fields Dining. Vegan dishes as well as vegetarian, gluten free, local, etc are labeled. Bon Appetit at L&C has received numerous awards for its vegan-friendliness.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor host low impact dining events (e.g. Meatless Mondays)?:

Yes

A brief description of the low impact dining events:

Yes, low carbon and meatless mondays are both events/marketing programs that occur in the dining facilities.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor host sustainability-themed meals (e.g. local harvest dinners)?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainability-themed meals:

Associated with sustainability events.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor host a sustainability-themed food outlet on-site, either independently or in partnership with a contractor or retailer?:

No

A brief description of the sustainability-themed food outlet:

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor inform customers about low impact food choices and sustainability practices through labeling and signage in dining halls?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainability labeling and signage in dining halls:

Table tents, daily menus, and informational boards all demonstrate sustainable food information.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor engage in outreach efforts to support learning and research about sustainable food systems?:

Yes

A brief description of the outreach efforts to support learning and research about sustainable food systems:

The dining services contractor hosts numerous events throughout the year to showcase local food, reduce food waste and highlight food donation activities. The institution supports students interested in learning and research around food. Specifically, students are provided with monthly data on food waste.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor have other sustainability-related initiatives (e.g. health and wellness initiatives, making culturally diverse options available)?:

Yes

A brief description of the other sustainability-related dining initiatives:

Yes, wellness and nutrition information is made available via the website.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor participate in a competition or commitment program and/or use a food waste prevention system to track and improve its food management practices?:

Yes

A brief description of the food recovery competition or commitment program or food waste prevention system:

A proprietary system for tracking and reducing pre-consumer food waste is employed by the institution's dining/food services provider.

Has the institution or its primary dining services contractor implemented trayless dining (in which trays are removed from or not available in dining halls) and/or modified menus/portions to reduce post-consumer food waste?:

Yes

A brief description of the trayless dining or modified menu/portion program:

Trays are removed from some dining areas at specified times.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor donate food that would otherwise go to waste to feed people?:

Yes

A brief description of the food donation program:

The institution currently donates usable food to a local organization for low-income K-12 student populations.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor divert food materials from the landfill, incinerator or sewer for animal feed or industrial uses (e.g. converting cooking oil to fuel, on-site anaerobic digestion)?:

Yes

A brief description of the food materials diversion program:

Oil is reclaimed for fuel.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor have a pre-consumer composting program?:

Yes

A brief description of the pre-consumer composting program:

The institution composts approximately 25,000 lbs of food each month from both pre and post consumer waste, this includes a campus wide composting in student and employee kitchens.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor have a post-consumer composting program?:

Yes

A brief description of the post-consumer composting program:

The institution composts approximately 25,000 lbs of food each month from both pre and post consumer waste, this includes a campus wide composting in student and employee kitchens.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor utilize reusable service ware for “dine in” meals?:

Yes

A brief description of the reusable service ware program:

Reusable service ware is available in dining locations however disposable is also available in to-go food areas.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor provide reusable and/or third party certified compostable containers and service ware for “to-go” meals (in conjunction with an on-site composting program)?:

No

A brief description of the compostable containers and service ware:

Compostable to go containers are no longer approved by our municipality for composting in commercial settings.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor offer discounts or other incentives to customers who use reusable containers (e.g. mugs) instead of disposable or compostable containers in “to-go” food service operations?:

Yes

A brief description of the reusable container discount or incentives program:

Discounts are provided in food service locations for the use of reusable containers.

Has the institution or its primary dining services contractor implemented other materials management initiatives to minimize waste not covered above (e.g. working with vendors and other entities to reduce waste from food packaging)?:

Yes

A brief description of other dining services materials management initiatives:

The food services contractor works with multiple vendors to reduce food waste upstream of their facilities.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2016 data

Grounds

Points Claimed 3.70

Points Available 4.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that plan and maintain their grounds with sustainability in mind. Beautiful and welcoming campus grounds can be planned, planted, and maintained in any region while minimizing the use of toxic chemicals, protecting wildlife habitat, and conserving resources.

| Credit | Points |
|----------------------|---|
| Landscape Management | 1.70 / 2.00 |
| Biodiversity | <p data-bbox="1425 688 1537 716">2.00 / 2.00</p> <p data-bbox="857 764 1537 831">This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions that own or manage land that includes or is adjacent to any of the following:</p> <ul data-bbox="818 877 1537 1167" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="818 877 1537 905">• Legally protected areas (e.g. IUCN Category I-VI) <li data-bbox="818 926 1537 993">• Internationally recognized areas (e.g. World Heritage, Ramsar, Natura 2000) <li data-bbox="818 1014 1537 1081">• Priority sites for biodiversity (e.g. Key Biodiversity Areas, Alliance for Zero Extinction sites) <li data-bbox="818 1102 1537 1169">• Regions of conservation importance (e.g. Endemic Bird Areas, Biodiversity Hotspots, High Biodiversity Wilderness Areas) <p data-bbox="841 1215 1537 1442">Institutions may identify legally protected areas, internationally recognized areas, priority sites for biodiversity, and regions of conservation importance using the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) for Research & Conservation Planning, the U.S. Information, Planning, and Conservation (IPaC) decision support system, or an equivalent resource or study.</p> <p data-bbox="1479 1488 1537 1516">Close</p> |

Landscape Management

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.70 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution's grounds include areas that are managed in accordance with:

- 1) An Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program;

Or

- 2) An organic land care standard or landscape management program that has eliminated the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides and herbicides in favor of ecologically preferable materials.

To count, an IPM program must use a four-tiered approach as outlined in *G. Standards and Terms*. Management programs that employ some IPM principles or techniques but do not include a four-tiered approach should be counted as conventional programs.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total campus area (i.e. the total amount of land within the institutional boundary):

137 Acres

Figures required to calculate the total area of managed grounds:

| | Area (double-counting is not allowed) |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Area managed in accordance with an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program that uses a four-tiered approach | 10 Acres |
| Area managed in accordance with an organic land care standard or sustainable landscape management program that has eliminated the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides and herbicides in favor of ecologically preferable materials | 80 Acres |
| Area managed using conventional landscape management practices (which may include some IPM principles or techniques) | 10 Acres |

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Total area of managed grounds | 100 Acres |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

A brief description of any land excluded from the area of managed grounds (e.g. the footprint of buildings and impervious surfaces, experimental agricultural land, areas that are not regularly managed or maintained):

Impervious surfaces, buildings, natural areas where most activities/management are not permitted

Percentage of grounds managed in accordance with an IPM program:

10

A copy of the IPM plan or program:

A brief description of the IPM program:

The grounds department controls pests that are harmful to the health or aesthetic value of the College's plantings in a manner that is cost-effective, safe and environmentally responsible. To accomplish this, the principles of IPM are endorsed campus-wide. Chemical and fertilizer use has been reduced to two turf fields maintained for softball and baseball.

Percentage of grounds managed in accordance with an organic program:

80

A brief description of the organic land standard or landscape management program that has eliminated the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides and herbicides in favor of ecologically preferable materials:

Across the remaining acreage, organic land care practices are used in accordance with EcoPro principles which certifies practitioners rather than the land. Grounds staff are certified under EcoPro.

<https://ecoprocertified.org/about/ecopro-guiding-principles/>

EcoPro Principles: Sustainable Landscape Practice is the use of ecologically sound principles to work in concert with natural ecoregional systems. It encourages working within closed systems with regard to organic matter and nutrient cycling. It aims to be pesticide-free. The goal of sustainable landscape practice is to design, construct, and maintain landscapes that will continue to be aesthetically pleasing, ecologically resilient, and enduring in the ecoregion in which they are located. ecoPRO Certified Sustainable Landscape Professionals have passed an exam that tests their knowledge of sustainable landscaping principles and best practices. They abide by the ecoPRO Code of Ethics to design, construct, and manage landscapes using the most current, ecologically sound principles and practices. Where possible, ecoPRO Certified Sustainable Landscape Professionals collaborate across the disciplines of design, construction, and maintenance.

A brief description of the institution's approach to plant stewardship:

The campus is largely native plants and habitat including several nearby environmental zones, approaching 90% of the total lands. Beginning in late 2013, the institution began a long term process to eradicate non-native species and replace those plants with natives.

A brief description of the institution's approach to hydrology and water use:

The institution intends to infiltrate, through natural methods stormwater generated on campus, increasing the percent infiltrated over time with new construction and renovations. Upcoming projects include increasing the number of bioswales on the main street bordering campus, disconnecting several downspouts, adding rainbarrels for water reuse.

A brief description of the institution's approach to materials management and waste minimization (e.g. composting and/or mulching on-site waste):

Compost all grounds waste: leaves are composted on site, trees/large branches are chipped on campus and used on site, any other material is composted through the waste hauler.

A brief description of the institution's approach to energy-efficient landscape design:

LED outdoor lighting

A brief description of other sustainable landscape management practices employed by the institution (e.g. use of environmentally preferable landscaping materials, initiatives to reduce the impacts of ice and snow removal, wildfire prevention):

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/initiatives/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Score

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions that own or manage land that includes or is adjacent to any of the following:

- Legally protected areas (e.g. IUCN Category I-VI)
- Internationally recognized areas (e.g. World Heritage, Ramsar, Natura 2000)
- Priority sites for biodiversity (e.g. Key Biodiversity Areas, Alliance for Zero Extinction sites)
- Regions of conservation importance (e.g. Endemic Bird Areas, Biodiversity Hotspots, High Biodiversity Wilderness Areas)

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Institutions may identify legally protected areas, internationally recognized areas, priority sites for biodiversity, and regions of conservation importance using the [Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool \(IBAT\) for Research & Conservation Planning](#), the U.S. [Information, Planning, and Conservation \(IPaC\)](#) decision support system, or an equivalent resource or study.

[Close](#)

Criteria

Institution conducts one or both of the following:

- An assessment to identify endangered and vulnerable species (including migratory species) with habitats on institution-owned or -managed land;

And/or

- An assessment to identify environmentally sensitive areas on institution-owned or -managed land.

The institution has plans or programs in place to protect or positively affect the species, habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas identified.

Assessments conducted and programs adopted by other entities (e.g. government, university system, NGO) may count for this credit as long as the assessments and programs apply to and are followed by the institution.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution own or manage land that includes or is adjacent to legally protected areas, internationally recognized areas, priority sites for biodiversity, and/or regions of conservation importance?:

Yes

A brief description of the legally protected areas, internationally recognized areas, priority sites for biodiversity, and/or regions of conservation importance:

The institution is adjacent to and includes land in conservation and environmental zones designated by the city as well as city and state parks with active restoration projects.

Has the institution conducted an assessment or assessments to identify endangered and vulnerable species (including migratory species) with habitats on institution-owned or –managed land?:

Yes

Has the institution conducted an assessment or assessments to identify environmentally sensitive areas on institution-owned or –managed land?:

Yes

The methodologies used to identify endangered and vulnerable species and/or environmentally sensitive areas (including most recent year assessed) and any ongoing assessment and monitoring mechanisms:

The institution has assessed the campus for impacts to downstream salmonids through the Salmon Safe assessment process and protocols. This assessment includes annual progress reports and monitoring.

A brief description of identified species, habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas:

The institution's most recent assessment included identifying native plant species, invasive plant species, and sensitive riparian areas.

A brief description of plans or programs in place to protect or positively affect identified species, habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas:

Strategies to protect habitat include: reduction in the use of pesticides/herbicides, increasing the percentage of pervious surface, use of Oregon Tilth/organic land care practices, construction and building practices to protect stormwater, increasing/improving native habitat.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Purchasing

Points Claimed 4.64

Points Available 6.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are using their purchasing power to help build a sustainable economy. Collectively, colleges and universities spend many billions of dollars on goods and services annually. Each purchasing decision represents an opportunity for institutions to choose environmentally and socially preferable products and services and support companies with strong commitments to sustainability.

| Credit | Points |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Sustainable Procurement | 2.25 / 3.00 |
| Electronics Purchasing | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Cleaning and Janitorial Purchasing | 0.83 / 1.00 |
| Office Paper Purchasing | 0.56 / 1.00 |

Sustainable Procurement

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 2.25 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has written policies, guidelines or directives that seek to support sustainable purchasing across commodity categories institution-wide, for example:

- A stated preference for post-consumer recycled or bio-based content or to otherwise minimize the negative environmental impacts of products and services.
- A stated intent to support disadvantaged businesses, social enterprises and/or local small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) or otherwise support positive social and economic impacts and minimize negative impacts.
- A vendor code of conduct or equivalent policy that sets expectations about the social and environmental responsibility of the institution's business partners (i.e. product and service providers).

Part 2

Institution employs Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) as a matter of policy and practice when evaluating energy- and water-using products, systems and building components (e.g. HVAC systems). Practices may include structuring RFPs so that vendors compete on the basis of lowest total cost of ownership (TCO) in addition to (or instead of) purchase price.

Please note that LCCA is a method for assessing the *total cost of ownership* over the life cycle of a product or system (i.e. purchase, installation, operation, maintenance, and disposal). Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), by contrast, is a method for assessing the *environmental impacts* of a product or service over its life cycle. While LCAs may inform the sustainability criteria recognized in Part 3 of this credit, Part 2 specifically recognizes institutions that employ LCCA.

Part 3

Institution has published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating products and services in one or more of the following categories. The criteria address the specific sustainability challenges and impacts associated with products and services in each category, e.g. by requiring or giving preference to multi-criteria sustainability standards, certifications and labels appropriate to the category.

| Category | Examples |
|--|--|
| 1) Chemically intensive products and services (e.g. building and facilities maintenance, cleaning and sanitizing, landscaping and grounds maintenance) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Published measures to minimize the use of chemicals.• A stated preference for green cleaning services and third party certified products. |
| 2) Construction and renovation (e.g. furnishings and building materials). | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A stated preference for materials that meet LEED requirements. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 3) Information technology (IT) (e.g. computers, imaging equipment, mobile phones, data centers and cloud services) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published measures to reduce the demand for equipment. • A stated preference for ENERGY STAR or EPEAT registered products. |
| 4) Food services (i.e. franchises, vending services, concessions, convenience stores) (Note that dining halls and catering services operated by the institution or the institution's primary dining services contractor are covered in Food & Dining). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including sustainability objectives in contracts with on-site franchises. • Requiring that franchises pay a living wage to employees. |
| 5) Garments and linens | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published labor and human rights standards that suppliers must meet. |
| 6) Professional services (e.g. architectural, engineering, public relations, financial) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stated preference for disadvantaged or community-based service providers. • A stated preference for B Corporations. |
| 7) Transportation and fuels (e.g. travel, vehicles, delivery services, long haul transport, generator fuels, steam plants) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published measures to minimize the size of the campus fleet or otherwise reduce the impacts of travel or transport. • A stated preference for clean and renewable technologies. |
| 8) Wood and paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stated preference for post-consumer recycled, agricultural residue or third party certified content. • A stated preference for FSC certified printing services. |
| 9) Other commodity categories that the institution has determined to have significant sustainability impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies designed to address the specific impacts of the commodities, e.g. a stated preference for relevant multi-criteria sustainability standards. |

Policies and directives adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g. government or the university system) may count for this credit as long as the policies apply to and are followed by the institution.

---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have written policies, guidelines or directives that seek to support sustainable purchasing across commodity categories institution-wide?:

Yes

A copy of the policies, guidelines or directives:

The policies, guidelines or directives:

Lewis & Clark is a leader in environmental education and shall make procurement decisions that embody our commitment including local, national and global issues affecting ecological, social and economic sustainability.

Purchasing decisions should balance economic, social and environmental factors and consider the impacts resulting from production, transportation, use and disposal of products or services.

Grant Purchases of Supplies and Equipment (see Grant Webpage)

Sustainable Procurement Policy

Oregon Certification Office for Business Inclusion & Diversity to find small business, minority-owned, and women's business enterprises.

<http://www.lclark.edu/offices/business/purchasing-procurement/>

Does the institution employ Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) when evaluating energy- and water-using products and systems?:

Yes

Which of the following best describes the institution's use of LCCA?:

Institution employs LCCA as a matter of policy and standard practice when evaluating all energy- and water-using products, systems and building components

A brief description of the LCCA policy and/or practices:

LCCA is used to determine the purchase of goods and systems for building projects. This is demonstrated in a number of areas including:
- our capital projects process, which includes an evaluation section on sustainability:

<https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form?EQBCT=ca785bea65a54573a1850a810ffa44ad>

- our description on our operations & maintenance page:

<http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/operations-maintenance/>

- our participation in a number of external programs such as the Strategic Energy Management program
- our campus Master Plan:

https://webdisk.lclark.edu/planning/WebPageDocs/LC_MasterPlan_CUMP_2009.pdf

- Salmon Safe certification requirements:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating chemically intensive products and services (e.g. building and facilities maintenance, cleaning and sanitizing, landscaping and grounds maintenance)?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for chemically intensive products and services:

Published criteria do not exist to evaluate chemically intensive products. For cleaning products, a green certification label is required in the housekeeping contract. This contract is not published however.

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating construction and renovation products (e.g. furnishings and building materials)?:

Yes

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for construction and renovation products:

The institution's construction contract outlines certification required for renovations and new construction. The certification outlines products criteria.

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating Information technology (IT) products and services (e.g. computers, imaging equipment, mobile phones, data centers and cloud services)?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for IT products and services:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating food services (i.e. franchises, vending services, concessions, convenience stores)?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for food services:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating garments and linens?:

Yes

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for garments and linens:

http://books.lclark.edu/site_values.asp?

The Lewis & Clark Bookstore is owned and operated by Lewis & Clark College. We maintain that any item bearing the Lewis & Clark name be manufactured by partners who take pride in ethical, social, cultural, economic, and environmental standards. Striving for social responsibility helps everyone from the individual to the community in which she or he lives. We are proud to have these standards set to such a high bar and will relentlessly work to raise it higher.

The Bookstore also places a heavy emphasis on obtaining as many used textbooks as possible. Through our partnerships with wholesalers throughout the country, we are able to offer hundreds of titles for rent, reducing the cost by as much as 50% to both undergraduate and graduate students.

To learn more about social responsibility and values shared by our partners and vendors, please visit the links below.

Associations

Workers Rights Consortium

Fair Labor Association

Connect2One

Vendors

Alta Gracia

JanSport

The Cotton Exchange (All products made in the U.S.)

Nike

Earth Divas

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating professional services (e.g. architectural, engineering, public relations, financial)?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for professional services:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating transportation and fuels (e.g. travel, vehicles, delivery services, long haul transport, generator fuels, steam plants)?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for transportation and fuels:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating wood and paper products?:

Yes

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for wood and paper products:

We have published criteria and policies for paper products specifically, and wood products generally (locally-sourced, sustainably managed) under our Sustainable Procurement Policy:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/files/16648-sustainable-procurement-policy>

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating products and services in other commodity categories that the institution has determined to have significant sustainability impacts?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for other commodity categories:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Electronics Purchasing

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|--|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution purchases EPEAT registered products for desktop and notebook/laptop computers, displays, thin clients, tablets/slates, televisions and imaging equipment (copiers, digital duplicators, facsimile machines, mailing machines, multifunction devices, printers and scanners).

This credit does not include servers, smartphones, or specialized equipment for which no EPEAT certified products are available.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total expenditures on desktop and laptop computers, displays, thin clients, tablets/slates, televisions, and imaging equipment:

436,071 US/Canadian \$

Expenditures on EPEAT registered desktop and laptop computers, displays, thin clients, tablets/slates, televisions, and imaging equipment::

| | Expenditure Per Level |
|--------------|------------------------|
| EPEAT Gold | 436,071 US/Canadian \$ |
| EPEAT Silver | 0 US/Canadian \$ |
| EPEAT Bronze | 0 US/Canadian \$ |

Percentage of expenditures on electronic products that are EPEAT Gold registered:

100

Do the figures reported above include leased equipment?:

No

A brief description of the time period from which the figures reported above are drawn (i.e. one-year time period or representative sample):

calendar year 2016

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/files/16648-sustainable-procurement-policy>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

2016 Replacement EPEAT.gsheet

Cleaning and Janitorial Purchasing

Score

0.83 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution's main cleaning or housekeeping department(s) and/or contractor(s) purchase cleaning and janitorial paper products that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified
- Green Seal certified
- UL ECOLOGO certified
- U.S. EPA Safer Choice labeled (formerly Design for the Environment)
- Local equivalents for institutions outside the U.S. and Canada

Cleaning products include general purpose bathroom, glass and carpet cleaners; degreasing agents; biologically-active cleaning products (enzymatic and microbial products); floor-care products (e.g. floor finish and floor finish strippers); hand soaps and hand sanitizers, disinfectants, and metal polish and other specialty cleaning products.

Janitorial paper products include toilet tissue, tissue paper, paper towels, hand towels, and napkins.

Other janitorial products and materials (e.g. cleaning devices that use only ionized water or electrolyzed water) should be excluded from both total expenditures and expenditures on environmentally preferable products to the extent feasible.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total expenditures on cleaning products:

46,621.56 US/Canadian \$

Expenditures on cleaning products that are Green Seal or UL ECOLOGO certified and/or Safer Choice labeled (or local equivalents for institutions outside the U.S. and Canada):

38,630.12 US/Canadian \$

Total expenditures on janitorial paper products:

46,621.56 US/Canadian \$

Expenditures on janitorial paper products that are FSC, Green Seal, and/or UL ECOLOGO certified (or local equivalents for institutions outside the U.S. and Canada):

38,630.12 US/Canadian \$

Percentage of expenditures on cleaning and janitorial products that are third party certified to meet recognized sustainability standards:

82.86

A brief description of the time period from which the figures reported above are drawn (i.e. one-year time period or representative sample):

calendar year

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/sustainability/built_environment/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2016 Sustainable Cleaning Product Spend Calculator.xlsx](#)

Office Paper Purchasing

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 0.56 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution purchases office paper with post-consumer recycled, agricultural residue, and/or Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified content.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total expenditures on office paper :

53,069.27 US/Canadian \$

Expenditures on office paper with the following levels of post-consumer recycled, agricultural residue, and/or FSC certified content::

| | Expenditure Per Level |
|--|--------------------------|
| 10-29 percent | 2,387.42 US/Canadian \$ |
| 30-49 percent | 34,979.77 US/Canadian \$ |
| 50-69 percent | 0 US/Canadian \$ |
| 70-89 percent (or FSC Mix label) | 0 US/Canadian \$ |
| 90-100 percent (or FSC Recycled label) | 15,285.76 US/Canadian \$ |

Percentage of expenditures on office paper that is 90-100 percent post-consumer recycled and/or agricultural residue content and/or FSC Recycled label:

28.80

A brief description of the time period from which the figures reported above are drawn (i.e. one-year time period or representative sample):

Calendar year 2016

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2016_PaperPurchases.xlsx](#)

Transportation

Points Claimed 4.30

Points Available 7.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are moving toward sustainable transportation systems. Transportation is a major source of greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants that contribute to health problems such as heart and respiratory diseases and cancer. Due to disproportionate exposure, these health impacts are frequently more pronounced in low-income communities next to major transportation corridors. In addition, the extraction, production, and global distribution of fuels for transportation can damage environmentally and/or culturally significant ecosystems and may financially benefit hostile and/or oppressive governments.

At the same time, campuses can reap benefits from modeling sustainable transportation systems. Bicycling and walking provide human health benefits and mitigate the need for large areas of paved surface, which can help campuses to better manage storm water. Institutions may realize cost savings and help support local economies by reducing their dependency on petroleum-based fuels for transportation.

| Credit | Points |
|--|---------------|
| Campus Fleet | 0.32 / 1.00 |
| Student Commute Modal Split | 1.60 / 2.00 |
| Employee Commute Modal Split | 0.38 / 2.00 |
| Support for Sustainable Transportation | 2.00 / 2.00 |

Campus Fleet

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 0.32 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution supports alternative fuel and power technology by including in its motorized vehicle fleet vehicles that are:

- A. Gasoline-electric hybrid
- B. Diesel-electric hybrid
- C. Plug-in hybrid
- D. 100 percent electric (including electric assist utility bicycles and tricycles)
- E. Fueled with Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)
- F. Hydrogen fueled
- G. Fueled with B20 or higher biofuel for more than 4 months of the year

And/or

- H. Fueled with locally produced, low-level (e.g. B5) biofuel for more than 4 months of the year (e.g. fuel contains cooking oil recovered and recycled on campus or in the local community)

For this credit, the institution's motorized fleet includes all cars, carts, trucks, tractors, buses, electric assist cycles, and similar vehicles used for transporting people and/or goods, including both leased vehicles and vehicles that are institution-owned and operated. Heavy construction equipment (e.g. excavators and pavers), maintenance equipment (e.g. lawn-mowers and leaf blowers), and demonstration/test vehicles used for educational purposes are not included in this credit.

Vehicles that meet multiple criteria (e.g. hybrid vehicles fueled with biofuel) should not be double-counted.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total number of vehicles (e.g. cars, carts, trucks, tractors, buses, electric assist cycles) in the institution's fleet:

60

Number of vehicles in the institution's fleet that are:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| | Number of Vehicles |
|--|--------------------|

| | |
|--|----|
| Gasoline-electric, non-plug-in hybrid | 3 |
| Diesel-electric, non-plug-in hybrid | 0 |
| Plug-in hybrid | 0 |
| 100 percent electric | 16 |
| Fueled with compressed natural gas (CNG) | 0 |
| Hydrogen fueled | 0 |
| Fueled with B20 or higher biofuel for more than 4 months of the year | 0 |
| Fueled with locally produced, low-level (e.g. B5) biofuel for more than 4 months of the year | 0 |

Do the figures reported above include leased vehicles?:

No

A brief description of the institution’s efforts to support alternative fuel and power technology in its motorized fleet:

The institution now has four EV charging stations as well as a secure parking are for electric fleet vehicles.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Fleet Vehicle list 2015.xlsx](#)

Student Commute Modal Split

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.60 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution's students commute to and from campus using more sustainable commuting options such as walking, bicycling, vanpooling or carpooling, taking public transportation, riding motorcycles or scooters, riding a campus shuttle, or a combination of these options.

Students who live on campus should be included in the calculation based on how they get to and from their classes.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total percentage of students (graduate and undergraduate) that use more sustainable commuting options as their primary means of transportation (0-100):

80

A brief description of the method(s) used to gather data about student commuting, including the timeframe for when the analysis was conducted and how a representative sample was reached, if applicable:

The following data sources were used to calculate these percentages: permits sold by type, daily permits sold by type, motorcycle/scooter permit, bus pass sales and campus shuttle statistics. All students not identified in one of these categories was included in walk or bike modes. Residential students walk to class, so those with residential SOV permits were removed from the commuting number and counted as non-motorized.

The percentage of students that use each of the following modes as their primary means of transportation to get to and from campus::

| | Percentage (0-100) |
|--|--------------------|
| Commute with only the driver in the vehicle (excluding motorcycles and scooters) | 20 |
| Walk, bicycle, or use other non-motorized means | 66 |
| Vanpool or carpool | 10 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Take a campus shuttle or public transportation | 4 |
| Use a motorcycle, scooter or moped | --- |

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Copy of permit_sales_subclass_Fall2016.xls.gsheet](#)

Employee Commute Modal Split

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 0.38 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution's employees (faculty, staff, and administrators) get to and from campus using more sustainable commuting options such as walking, bicycling, vanpooling or carpooling, taking public transportation, riding motorcycles or scooters, riding a campus shuttle, telecommuting, or a combination of these options.

Employees who live on campus should be included in the calculation based on how they get to and from their workplace.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Total percentage of the institution's employees that use more sustainable commuting options as their primary method of transportation:

19

A brief description of the method(s) used to gather data about employee commuting, including the timeframe for when the analysis was conducted and how a representative sample was reached, if applicable:

This information was gathered from the transportation and parking database that includes the total number of parking permits and transit permits sold as well as bike registrations.

The percentage of the institution's employees that use each of the following modes as their primary means of transportation to and from campus::

| | Percentage (0-100) |
|--|--------------------|
| Commute with only the driver in the vehicle (excluding motorcycles and scooters) | 81 |
| Walk, bicycle, or use other non-motorized means | 2 |
| Vanpool or carpool | 7 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Take a campus shuttle or public transportation | 8 |
| Use a motorcycle, scooter or moped | 1 |
| Telecommute for 50 percent or more of their regular work hours | 1 |

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Copy of permit_sales_subclass_Fall2016.xls.gsheet](#)

Support for Sustainable Transportation

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has implemented one or more of the following strategies to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation and reduce the impact of student and employee commuting. The institution:

- Provides secure bicycle storage (not including office space), shower facilities, and lockers for bicycle commuters. The storage, shower facilities and lockers are co-located in at least one building/location that is accessible to all commuters.
 - Provides short-term bicycle parking (e.g. racks) for all occupied buildings and makes long-term bicycle storage available for students who live on-site (if applicable). Long-term bicycle storage may include bicycle depots/hubs/stations, indoor bicycle rooms, and/or bicycle cages/secure bicycle parking areas. Standard public bicycle racks are not sufficient for long-term storage.
 - Has a bicycle and pedestrian plan or policy (or adheres to a local community plan/policy) that sets standards and practices for campus streets to enable safe access for all users (e.g. a “complete streets” or bicycle accommodation policy)
 - Has a bicycle-sharing program or participates in a local bicycle-sharing program.
 - Offers free or reduced price transit passes and/or operates a free campus shuttle for commuters. The transit passes may be offered by the institution itself, through the larger university system of which the institution is a part, or through a regional program provided by a government agency.
 - Offers a guaranteed return trip (GRT) program to regular users of alternative modes of transportation
 - Participates in a car/vanpool or ride sharing program and/or offers reduced parking fees or preferential parking for car/vanpoolers
 - Participates in a car sharing program, such as a commercial car-sharing program, one administered by the institution, or one administered by a regional organization
 - Has one or more Level 2 or Level 3 electric vehicle recharging stations that are accessible to student and employee commuters
 - Offers a telecommuting program for employees, either as a matter of policy or as standard practice
 - Offers a condensed work week option, for employees, either as a matter of policy or as standard practice, that reduces employee commuting
 - Has incentives or programs to encourage employees to live close to campus
 - Other strategies to reduce the impact of commuting (e.g. preferred parking for fuel-efficient vehicles, cash-out of parking programs)
-

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution provide secure bicycle storage (not including office space), shower facilities, and lockers for bicycle commuters?:

Yes

A brief description of the facilities for bicycle commuters:

Does the institution provide short-term bicycle parking for all occupied buildings and makes long-term bicycle storage available for students who live on-site (if applicable)?:

Yes

A brief description of the bicycle parking and storage facilities:

Bike facilities are located throughout the institution including, covered, uncovered, locked, etc. Residence halls include long-term storage.

Does the institution have a bicycle and pedestrian plan or policy (or adhere to a local community plan/policy) that sets standards and practices for campus streets to enable safe access for all users?:

Yes

A brief description of the bicycle and pedestrian plan or policy:

The institution's academic core is maintained as pedestrian and bicycle corridors with access provided to service vehicles only.

Does the institution have a bicycle-sharing program or participate in a local bicycle-sharing program?:

Yes

A brief description of the bicycle sharing program:

The institutions is beginning a third party run bike share program in the Spring of 2017.

Does the institution offer free or reduced price transit passes and/or operate a free campus shuttle for commuters?:

Yes

A brief description of the mass transit programs:

Shuttle runs seven days a week and is free to all employees and students. We currently offer a 75% subsidy on transit passes for faculty, staff and students.

Does the institution offer a guaranteed return trip program to regular users of alternative modes of transportation?:

Yes

A brief description of the guaranteed return trip program:

'Safe ride home' program is available to the campus community through cooperation with outside agencies.

Does the institution participate in a car/vanpool or ride sharing program and/or offer reduced parking fees or

preferential parking for car/vanpoolers?:

Yes

A brief description of the carpool/vanpool program:

The institution participates in an external carpool matching program and offers reduced parking fee and preferential parking for carpoolers.

Does the institution participate in a car sharing program, such as a commercial car-sharing program, one administered by the institution, or one administered by a regional organization?:

Yes

A brief description of the car sharing program:

ZipCar

Does the institution have one or more Level 2 or Level 3 electric vehicle recharging stations that are accessible to student and employee commuters?:

Yes

A brief description of the electric vehicle recharging stations:

Four electric vehicle charging station is available to the campus community and visitors.

Does the institution offer a telecommuting program for employees as a matter of policy or as standard practice?:

Yes

A brief description of the telecommuting program:

Some employees are able to telecommute, however this program is job/department dependent.

Does the institution offer a condensed work week option that reduces employee commuting (as a matter of policy or standard practice)?:

Yes

A brief description of the condensed work week option:

Some employees work four-day work weeks.

Does the institution have incentives or programs to encourage employees to live close to campus?:

Yes

A brief description of the incentives or programs to encourage employees to live close to campus:

College owned homes are made available for rent or purchase by staff/faculty.

Does the institution employ other strategies to reduce the impact of commuting (e.g. preferred parking for fuel-efficient vehicles, cash-out of parking programs)?:

Yes

A brief description of other strategies to reduce the impact of commuting:

Bike Commute Challenge, Sustainability Incentives Program

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/transportation_and_parking/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Waste

Points Claimed 5.21

Points Available 10.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are moving toward zero waste by reducing, reusing, recycling, and composting. These actions mitigate the need to extract virgin materials, such as trees and metals. It generally takes less energy and water to make a product with recycled material than with virgin resources. Reducing waste generation also reduces the flow of waste to incinerators and landfills which produce greenhouse gas emissions, can contaminate air and groundwater supplies, and tend to have disproportionate negative impacts on low-income communities. Waste reduction and diversion also save institutions costly landfill and hauling service fees. In addition, waste reduction campaigns can engage the entire campus community in contributing to a tangible sustainability goal.

| Credit | Points |
|---|---------------|
| Waste Minimization and Diversion | 4.27 / 8.00 |
| Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion | 0.44 / 1.00 |
| Hazardous Waste Management | 0.50 / 1.00 |

Waste Minimization and Diversion

Score

4.27 / 8.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has implemented source reduction strategies to reduce the total amount of waste generated (materials diverted + materials disposed) per weighted campus user compared to a baseline.

Part 2

Institution's total annual waste generation (materials diverted and disposed) is less than the minimum performance threshold of 0.50 tons (0.45 tonnes) per weighted campus user.

Part 3

Institution diverts materials from the landfill or incinerator by recycling, composting, donating or re-selling.

For scoring purposes, up to 10 percent of total waste generated may also be disposed through post-recycling residual conversion. To count, residual conversion must include an integrated materials recovery facility (MRF) or equivalent sorting system to recover recyclables and compostable material prior to conversion.

This credit includes on-campus dining services operated by the institution or the institution's primary on-site contractor.

Waste includes all materials that the institution discards, intends to discard or is required to discard (i.e. all materials that are recycled, composted, donated, re-sold, or disposed of as trash) except construction, demolition, electronic, hazardous, special (e.g. coal ash), universal and non-regulated chemical waste, which are covered in the *Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion* and *Hazardous Waste Management* credits.

Consistent with the U.S Environmental Protection Agency's Waste Reduction Model (WARM), the on-site reuse of materials is treated as a form of source reduction for scoring purposes. All materials that are reused on campus are automatically recognized in scoring for Part 1 and Part 2 of this credit. To avoid double counting, reuse therefore does not also contribute to scoring for Part 3 as waste diversion.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Figures needed to determine total waste generated (and diverted):

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---|------------------|---------------|
| Materials recycled | 249.33 Tons | 481 Tons |
| Materials composted | 121.40 Tons | 0 Tons |
| Materials donated or re-sold | 7.23 Tons | 0 Tons |
| Materials disposed through post-recycling residual conversion | 0 Tons | 0 Tons |
| Materials disposed in a solid waste landfill or incinerator | 358 Tons | 515 Tons |
| Total waste generated | 735.96 Tons | 996 Tons |

A brief description of the residual conversion facility, including affirmation that materials are sorted prior to conversion to recover recyclables and compostable materials:

Start and end dates of the performance year and baseline year (or three-year periods):

| | Start Date | End Date |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Performance Year | Jan. 1, 2016 | Dec. 31, 2016 |
| Baseline Year | Jan. 1, 2012 | Dec. 31, 2012 |

A brief description of when and why the waste generation baseline was adopted (e.g. in sustainability plans and policies or in the context of other reporting obligations):

A 2012 baseline was adopted because that was the earliest available with quality data.

Figures needed to determine "Weighted Campus Users":

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---|------------------|---------------|
| Number of students resident on-site | 1,440 | 1,318 |
| Number of employees resident on-site | 37 | 5 |
| Number of other individuals resident on-site and/or staffed hospital beds | 0 | 0 |
| Total full-time equivalent student enrollment | 3,250 | 3,428 |
| Full-time equivalent of employees (staff + faculty) | 700 | 730 |
| Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education | 0 | 0 |
| Weighted campus users | 3,331.75 | 3,449.25 |

Total waste generated per weighted campus user:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|------------------|---------------|
|--|------------------|---------------|

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Total waste generated per weighted campus user | 0.22 Tons | 0.29 Tons |
|--|-----------|-----------|

Percentage reduction in total waste generated per weighted campus user from baseline (0-100):

23.50

Percentage of materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator by recycling, composting, donating or re-selling, performance year:

51.36

Percentage of materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator (including up to 10 percent attributable to post-recycling residual conversion):

51.36

In the waste figures reported above, has the institution recycled, composted, donated and/or re-sold the following materials?:

| | Yes or No |
|---|-----------|
| Paper, plastics, glass, metals, and other recyclable containers | Yes |
| Food | Yes |
| Cooking oil | Yes |
| Plant materials | Yes |
| Animal bedding | No |
| White goods (i.e. appliances) | Yes |
| Laboratory equipment | Yes |
| Furniture | Yes |
| Residence hall move-in/move-out waste | Yes |
| Scrap metal | Yes |
| Pallets | Yes |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Tires | No |
| Other (please specify below) | Yes |

A brief description of other materials the institution has recycled, composted, donated and/or re-sold:

Tennis balls are donated to a local animal shelter

Materials intended for disposal but subsequently recovered and reused on campus, performance year (e.g. materials that are actively diverted from the landfill or incinerator and refurbished/repurposed) :

150 Tons

Does the institution use single stream recycling (a single container for commingled recyclables) to collect standard recyclables (i.e. paper, plastic, glass, metals) in common areas?:

No

Does the institution use dual stream (two separate containers for recyclables, e.g. one for paper and another for plastic, glass, and metals) to collect standard recyclables (i.e. paper, plastic, glass, metals) in common areas?:

Yes

Does the institution use multi-stream recycling (multiple containers that further separate different types of materials) to collect standard recyclables (i.e. paper, plastic, glass, metals) in common areas?:

Yes

Average contamination rate for the institution's recycling program (percentage, 0-100):

A brief description of any recycling quality control mechanisms employed, e.g. efforts to minimize contamination and/or monitor the discard rates of the materials recovery facilities and mills to which materials are diverted:

A brief description of the institution's waste-related behavior change initiatives, e.g. initiatives to shift individual attitudes and practices such as signage and competitions:

A brief description of the institution's waste audits and other initiatives to assess its materials management efforts and identify areas for improvement:

A brief description of the institution's procurement policies designed to prevent waste (e.g. by minimizing packaging and purchasing in bulk):

A brief description of the institution's surplus department or formal office supplies exchange program that facilitates reuse of materials:

The College maintains a surplus of materials and furniture that are reused primarily by faculty and staff. At the end of the year a clean out is complete through a 'garage sale'.

A brief description of the institution's platforms to encourage peer-to-peer exchange and reuse (e.g. of electronics, furnishings, books and other goods):

A brief description of the institution's limits on paper and ink consumption (e.g. restricting free printing and/or mandating doubled-sided printing in libraries and computer labs):

Printing is limited for most students.

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to make materials (e.g. course catalogs, course schedules, and directories) available online by default rather than printing them:

We are currently transitioning all departments to multi-function printers to allow for more electronic work flow processing.

A brief description of the institution's program to reduce residence hall move-in/move-out waste:

Arc and Goodwill available for students to donate used and/or unwanted goods as well as an appliance take back program run by student volunteers. Additionally, the College maintains a website which provides a space for students to connect and exchange goods on an on-going basis.

A brief description of the institution's programs or initiatives to recover and reuse other materials intended for disposal:

Recycling education, bottle water reduction initiative, water bottle/mug distribution to new employees/students

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion

Score

0.44 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution diverts non-hazardous construction and demolition waste from the landfill and/or incinerator.

Soil and organic debris from excavating or clearing the site do not count for this credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Construction and demolition materials recycled, donated, or otherwise recovered during the most recent year for which data is available within the previous three years:

16.10 *Tons*

Construction and demolition materials landfilled or incinerated during the most recent year for which data is available within the previous three years:

20.70 *Tons*

Percentage of construction and demolition materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator through recycling, donation and/or other forms of recovery:

43.75

A brief description of programs, policies, infrastructure investments, outreach efforts, and/or other factors that contributed to the diversion rate for construction and demolition waste:

LEED building standards

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Copy of 12.2016 Lewis & Clark Waste Composition.xls](#)

Hazardous Waste Management

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|--|
| 0.50 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has strategies in place to safely dispose of all hazardous, special (e.g. coal ash), universal, and non-regulated chemical waste and seeks to minimize the presence of these materials on campus.

Part 2

Institution has a program in place to recycle, reuse, and/or refurbish electronic waste generated by the institution and/or its students. Institution ensures that the electronic waste is recycled responsibly by using a recycler certified under the e-Stewards[®] and/or Responsible Recycling (R2) standards.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have strategies in place to safely dispose of all hazardous, special (e.g. coal ash), universal, and non-regulated chemical waste and seek to minimize the presence of these materials on campus?:

Yes

A brief description of steps taken to reduce hazardous, special (e.g. coal ash), universal, and non-regulated chemical waste:

Lewis and Clark College is committed to protecting the safety and health of all employees working with hazardous chemicals. It is recognized that accurate labeling of all containers of hazardous chemicals and the maintenance of current Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS's) are essential elements when informing employees of known chemical hazards.

It is further recognized that the use of chemicals from unlabeled containers or the use of chemicals for which there is no current MSDS in possession poses an unacceptable risk to the safety and health of College employees.

These chemicals will be limited to the extent feasible.

A brief description of how the institution safely disposes of hazardous, universal, and non-regulated chemical waste:

All hazardous wastes generated in the course of educational and operational activities of Lewis & Clark shall be accumulated, stored, and disposed in a manner which avoids discharge to the environment and which meets federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. No hazardous wastes shall be accumulated, stored, or removed from Lewis & Clark premises without prior notification of the Lewis & Clark

Risk Management Coordinator. More specific information regarding disposal can be found here:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/2410>

A brief description of any significant hazardous material release incidents during the previous three years, including volume, impact and response/remediation:

none

A brief description of any inventory system employed by the institution to facilitate the reuse or redistribution of laboratory chemicals:

A database is used to manage all laboratory chemicals.

Does the institution have or participate in a program to responsibly recycle, reuse, and/or refurbish electronic waste generated by the institution?:

Yes

Does the institution have or participate in a program to responsibly recycle, reuse, and/or refurbish electronic waste generated by students?:

Yes

A brief description of the electronic waste recycling program(s), including information about how electronic waste generated by the institution and/or students is recycled:

Institutional material is collected by IT and recycled with Ecobinary

Is the institution's electronic waste recycler certified under the e-Stewards and/or Responsible Recycling (R2) standards?:

Electronic waste recycled or otherwise diverted from the landfill or incinerator during the most recent year for which data is available during the previous three years:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/policies/chemical_safety/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

stars.aashe.org

Water

Points Claimed 2.20

Points Available 6.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are conserving water, making efforts to protect water quality and treating water as a resource rather than a waste product. Pumping, delivering, and treating water is a major driver of energy consumption, so institutions can help reduce energy use and the greenhouse gas emissions associated with energy generation by conserving water. Likewise, conservation, water recycling and reuse, and effective rainwater management practices are important in maintaining and protecting finite groundwater supplies. Water conservation and effective rainwater and wastewater management also reduce the need for effluent discharge into local surface water supplies, which helps improve the health of local water ecosystems.

| Credit | Points | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----|---|---------------------|-----|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>Water Use</p> | <p style="text-align: right;">1.20 / 4.00</p> <p>This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions located in areas of water stress and scarcity and less heavily for institutions in areas with relative water abundance. The points available for this credit are determined by the level of "Physical Risk QUANTITY" for the institution's main campus,, as indicated by the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas and detailed in the following table:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="813 1066 1544 1493"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="813 1066 1057 1203">Physical Risk QUANTITY</th> <th data-bbox="1057 1066 1300 1203">Points Available For Each Part</th> <th data-bbox="1300 1066 1544 1203">Total Available Points For This Credit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1203 1057 1297">Low and Low to Medium Risk</td> <td data-bbox="1057 1203 1300 1297">1 ■</td> <td data-bbox="1300 1203 1544 1297">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1297 1057 1392">Medium to High Risk</td> <td data-bbox="1057 1297 1300 1392">1 ■</td> <td data-bbox="1300 1297 1544 1392">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1392 1057 1493">High and Extremely High Risk</td> <td data-bbox="1057 1392 1300 1493">2</td> <td data-bbox="1300 1392 1544 1493">6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">Close</p> | Physical Risk QUANTITY | Points Available For Each Part | Total Available Points For This Credit | Low and Low to Medium Risk | 1 ■ | 4 | Medium to High Risk | 1 ■ | 5 | High and Extremely High Risk | 2 | 6 |
| Physical Risk QUANTITY | Points Available For Each Part | Total Available Points For This Credit | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low and Low to Medium Risk | 1 ■ | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Medium to High Risk | 1 ■ | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High and Extremely High Risk | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Rainwater Management</p> | <p style="text-align: right;">1.00 / 2.00</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Water Use

Score

1.20 / 4.00

Responsible Party

This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions located in areas of water stress and scarcity and less heavily for institutions in areas with relative water abundance. The points available for this credit are determined by the level of "Physical Risk QUANTITY" for the institution's main campus,, as indicated by the World Resources Institute's [Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas](#) and detailed in the following table:

| Physical Risk QUANTITY | Points Available For Each Part | Total Available Points For This Credit |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Low and Low to Medium Risk | 1 ■ | 4 |
| Medium to High Risk | 1 ■ | 5 |
| High and Extremely High Risk | 2 | 6 |

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

[Close](#)

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has reduced its potable water use per weighted campus user compared to a baseline.

Part 2

Institution has reduced its potable water use per gross square foot/metre of floor area compared to a baseline.

Part 3

Institution has reduced its total water use (potable + non-potable) per acre/hectare of vegetated grounds compared to a baseline.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Level of "Physical Risk QUANTITY" for the institution's main campus as indicated by the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas:

Low to Medium

Total water use (potable and non-potable combined):

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Total water use | 31,702,484 <i>Gallons</i> | 33,811,844 <i>Gallons</i> |

Potable water use:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Potable water use | 31,702,484 <i>Gallons</i> | 33,811,844 <i>Gallons</i> |

Start and end dates of the performance year and baseline year (or three-year periods):

| | Start Date | End Date |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Performance Year | Jan. 1, 2013 | Dec. 31, 2013 |
| Baseline Year | Jan. 1, 2005 | Dec. 31, 2005 |

A brief description of when and why the water use baseline was adopted:

Figures needed to determine "Weighted Campus Users":

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---|------------------|---------------|
| Number of students resident on-site | 1,440 | 1,199 |
| Number of employees resident on-site | 37 | 0 |
| Number of other individuals resident on-site and/or staffed hospital beds | 0 | 0 |
| Total full-time equivalent student enrollment | 3,250 | 3,153 |

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| Full-time equivalent of employees (staff + faculty) | 700 | 695 |
| Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education | 0 | 0 |
| Weighted campus users | 3,331.75 | 3,185.75 |

Potable water use per weighted campus user:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Potable water use per weighted campus user | 9,515.26 <i>Gallons</i> | 10,613.46 <i>Gallons</i> |

Percentage reduction in potable water use per weighted campus user from baseline (0-100):

10.35

Gross floor area of building space:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Gross floor area | 1,303,887 <i>Gross Square Feet</i> | 1,245,427 <i>Gross Square Feet</i> |

Potable water use per unit of floor area:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Potable water use per unit of floor area | 24.31 <i>Gallons / GSF</i> | 27.15 <i>Gallons / GSF</i> |

Percentage reduction in potable water use per unit of floor area from baseline (0-100):

10.44

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 3 of this credit? (reductions in total water use per acre/hectare of vegetated grounds):

Yes

Area of vegetated grounds:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|-------------------|------------------|---------------|
| Vegetated grounds | 137 Acres | 137 Acres |

Total water use (potable + non-potable) per unit of vegetated grounds:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Total water use per unit of vegetated grounds | 231,404.99 Gallons / Acre | 246,801.78 Gallons / Acre |

Percentage reduction in total water use per unit of vegetated grounds from baseline (0-100):

6.24

A brief description of the institution's water-related behavior change initiatives, e.g. initiatives to shift individual attitudes and practices such as signage and competitions:

A brief description of the institution's water recovery and reuse initiatives:

Non-potable water is reclaimed in JR Howard and diverted to fountains for storage and ultimately for use in irrigation

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to replace plumbing fixtures, fittings, appliances, equipment, and systems with water-efficient alternatives (e.g. building retrofits):

High efficiency aerators, showerheads

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2013_CityWaterUsage.xls](#)

Rainwater Management

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution uses green infrastructure and low impact development (LID) practices to help mitigate stormwater run-off impacts and treat rainwater as a resource rather than as a waste product.

Policies adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g. state/provincial government or the university system) may count for this credit as long as the policies apply to and are followed by the institution.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Which of the following best describes the institution's approach to rainwater management?:

Less comprehensive policies, plans or guidelines that incorporate green infrastructure

A brief description of the institution's green infrastructure and LID practices:

The application of LEED guidelines and Salmon Safe certification on campus development has improved the overall awareness of the environmental impacts of new construction and renovation projects. The rethinking of rainwater as a resource has led to innovative solutions regarding storm water management on campus in keeping with the City's goal to manage storm water on-site and reduce overload on city infrastructure. LEED Certified buildings such as Roberts Hall (Residential) and J.R. Howard Hall (Academic), Holmes Residence Hall have served as model projects incorporating on-site storm water infiltration.

A copy of the institution's rainwater management policy, plan, and/or guidelines:

A brief description of the institution's rainwater management policy, plan, guidelines and/or practices that supports the responses above:

Stormwater management policies and practices are incorporated into our Master Plan, municipal permit requirements, and strategies required to maintain Salmon Safe certification.

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

https://webdisk.lclark.edu/planning/WebPageDocs/LC_MasterPlan_CUMP_2009.pdf

Additional documentation to support the submission:

stars.aashe.org

Planning & Administration

Coordination & Planning

Points Claimed 4.25

Points Available 8.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize colleges and universities that are institutionalizing sustainability by dedicating resources to sustainability coordination, developing plans to move toward sustainability, and engaging students, staff and faculty in governance. Staff and other resources help an institution organize, implement, and publicize sustainability initiatives. These resources provide the infrastructure that fosters sustainability within an institution. Sustainability planning affords an institution the opportunity to clarify its vision of a sustainable future, establish priorities and help guide budgeting and decision making. Strategic planning and internal stakeholder engagement in governance are important steps in making sustainability a campus priority and may help advocates implement changes to achieve sustainability goals.

| Credit | Points |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Sustainability Coordination | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Sustainability Planning | 2.00 / 4.00 |
| Participatory Governance | 1.25 / 3.00 |

Sustainability Coordination

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has at least one sustainability committee, office, and/or officer tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies and programs related to sustainability on campus. The committee, office, and/or officer focuses on sustainability broadly (i.e. not just one sustainability issue, such as climate change) and covers the entire institution.

An institution that has multiple committees, offices and/or staff with responsibility for subsets of the institution (e.g. schools or departments) may earn points for this credit if it has a mechanism for broad sustainability coordination for the entire campus (e.g. a coordinating committee or the equivalent). A committee, office, and/or officer that focuses on one aspect of sustainability (e.g. an energy efficiency committee) or has jurisdiction over only a part of the institution (e.g. "Academic Affairs Sustainability Taskforce") does not count toward scoring in the absence of institution-wide coordination.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have at least one sustainability committee?:

Yes

The charter or mission statement of the committee(s) or a brief description of each committee's purview and activities:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/news/13044-lewis-amp-clark-sustainability-council>

Members of each committee, including affiliations and role (e.g. staff, student, or faculty):

Michel George, AVP Facilities
Ryan Shannon, Law School student
Alan Finn, VP and CFO
undergrad students
Jay Odenbaugh, Philosophy Faculty
Janice Weis, law staff
Brad Ashwell, Grounds Supervisor
Esme Miller, grad staff
stars.aashe.org

Amy Dvorak, Sustainability Director
Vanessa Holmgren, Public Affairs
Sue Feldman, grad faculty
Pilar Hernandez-Wolfe, grad faculty
Dan Rohlf, Law School faculty

Does the institution have at least one sustainability office that includes more than 1 full-time equivalent (FTE) employee?:

Yes

A brief description of each sustainability office:

Sustainability office reports to the Business Finance Division and supports the whole campus. This office includes one FTE.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) of people employed in the sustainability office(s):

1

Does the institution have at least one sustainability officer?:

Yes

Name and title of each sustainability officer:

Amy Dvorak

Does the institution have a mechanism for broad sustainability coordination for the entire institution (e.g. a campus-wide committee or an officer/office responsible for the entire campus)?:

Yes

A brief description of the activities and substantive accomplishments of the institution-wide coordinating body or officer during the previous three years:

Developed cross-school internship course
Green Move Out
Annual Alumni/Employee/Student Networking Event
Annual Faculty Mixer
Sustainability Incentive Program
Habitat Enhancement program
Take Back the Tap
Proxy Voting

Job title of the sustainability officer position:

Job description for the sustainability officer position:

stars.aashe.org

Job description for the sustainability officer position:

Job title of the sustainability officer position (2nd position):

Job description for the sustainability officer position (2nd position):

Job description for the sustainability officer position (2nd position):

Job title of the sustainability officer position (3rd position):

Job description for the sustainability officer position (3rd position):

Job description for the sustainability officer position (3rd position):

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainability Planning

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has published one or more written plans that include measurable sustainability objectives addressing one or more of the following areas:

- Curriculum
- Research
- Campus Engagement
- Public Engagement
- Air & Climate
- Buildings
- Energy
- Food & Dining
- Grounds
- Purchasing
- Transportation
- Waste
- Water
- Diversity & Affordability
- Investment & Finance
- Wellbeing & Work
- Other (e.g. arts and culture or technology)

The criteria may be met by any combination of published plans, for example:

- Strategic plan or equivalent guiding document
- Campus master plan or physical campus plan
- Sustainability plan
- Climate action plan
- Human resources strategic plan
- Diversity plan

For institutions that are a part of a larger system, plans developed at the system level are eligible for this credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have a published strategic plan or equivalent guiding document that includes sustainability at a high level? :

Yes

A brief description of how the institution's strategic plan or equivalent guiding document addresses sustainability:

Sustainability and environmental education is a key theme of the current strategic plan, our Journey Forward 2020.

A copy of the strategic plan:

The website URL where the strategic plan is publicly available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/20276-our-journey-forward>

Does the institution have a published sustainability plan (apart from what is reported above)? :

No

A copy of the sustainability plan:

The website URL where the sustainability plan is publicly available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/campus/>

Does the institution have a published climate action plan (apart from what is reported above)? :

Yes

A copy of the climate action plan:

The website URL where the climate action plan is publicly available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/campus/>

Does the institution have other published plans that address sustainability or include measurable sustainability objectives (e.g. campus master plan, physical campus plan, diversity plan, human resources plan)? :

Yes

A list of other published plans that address sustainability, including public website URLs (if available):

Campus master plan:

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/campus_planning/master_plan_2008/

Committee on Diversity and Inclusion Formal Action Plan:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/23920-final-cdi-action-planpdf>

Strategic Energy Management plan
Salmon Safe Certification action plan,

<https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/initiatives/>

Invasive Species Removal plan

<https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/initiatives/invasive-species-removal/>

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Curriculum?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Curriculum and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Objective: Promote investigation, debate and action on local, national and global issues affecting ecological, social and economic sustainability.

Goal: creation of two- or three-school courses pertaining to environmental studies (e.g., environmental economics and the law, ecopsychology in theory and practice, etc.) from an integrated perspective that span all three schools.

Strategic Plan: Journey Forward

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Research?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Research and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Objective: Promote investigation, debate and action on local, national and global issues affecting ecological, social and economic sustainability.

Goal: Promote interdisciplinary research on climate related initiatives, program and problems.

Strategic Plan: Journey Forward

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Campus Engagement?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Campus Engagement and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Work with the Sustainability Council and relevant deans across the campus to engender greater cooperation among student governments around sustainability initiatives.

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Public Engagement?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Public Engagement and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Public engagement program was developed for the Tree Campus USA certification, one of the key goals for the Sustainability Council for 2016-17. This includes a committee with off-campus advisors from the City as well as private business.

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Air & Climate?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Air & Climate and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Goal: Carbon Neutral by 2018, Climate Action Plan

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Buildings?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Buildings and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Energy?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Energy and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Goal: 30% reduction in energy use over baseline (2005), Strategic Energy Management Plan

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Food & Dining?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Food & Dining and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Grounds?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Grounds and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Goal: manage 30% of grounds organically, Salmon Safe Certification action plan

Goal: 90% eradication of invasive plant species by 2017, increase native tree plantings and overall tree diversity. Salmon Safe Certification action plan

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Purchasing?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Purchasing and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Transportation?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Transportation and the published plans in which each objective is included:

The Employee Commute Options program, part of the Conditional Use Master Plan, requires a minimum 80% employee single occupancy vehicle mode split. Improvements are measured against previous years. Intention to increase the number of students and

employees who bike/walk/take transit by 100 - 200 individuals in 2016-17 academic year.

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Waste?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Waste and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Reducing waste is a key outcome of the Climate Action Plan, including increasing composting (on and off site)

Goal: increasing recycling and reducing waste generation by 10% in three years from a 2015 baseline.

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Water?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Water and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Diversity & Affordability?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Diversity & Affordability and the published plans in which each objective is included:

We will increase the diversity of the student population we recruit, retain, and graduate. Steps in this effort include assessing where we stand in achieving diversity in our student population; setting achievable goals for increasing meaningful diversity among our students; establishing policies and practices to achieve our goals; allocating the resources necessary to build a student population that best reflects the diverse world into which we send our graduates to live and work.

•We will increase the diversity of the faculty and staff we recruit, retain, and advance in rank. Steps in that effort include assessing where we stand in achieving diversity in our community; setting achievable goals for increasing meaningful diversity on our campus; establishing policies and practices to achieve our goals; allocating the resources necessary to achieve a campus-wide community that best reflects the diverse social environment we want for ourselves and our students.

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/23920-final-cdi-action-planpdf>

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Investment & Finance?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Investment & Finance and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address Wellbeing & Work?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address Wellbeing & Work and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Taken together, do the plan(s) reported above include measurable sustainability objectives that address other areas (e.g. arts and culture or technology)?:

No

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives that address other areas and the published plans in which each objective is included:

Does the institution have a formal statement in support of sustainability endorsed by its governing body (e.g. a mission statement that specifically includes sustainability and is endorsed by the Board of Trustees)? :

The formal statement in support of sustainability:

The institution's definition of sustainability (e.g. as included in a published statement or plan):

Is the institution an endorser or signatory of the following? :

| | Yes or No |
|---|-----------|
| The Earth Charter | --- |
| The Higher Education Sustainability Initiative (HESI) | --- |

| | |
|---|-----|
| ISCN-GULF Sustainable Campus Charter | --- |
| Second Nature's Carbon Commitment (formerly known as the ACUPCC), Resilience Commitment, and/or integrated Climate Commitment | Yes |
| The Talloires Declaration (TD) | Yes |
| UN Global Compact | --- |
| Other multi-dimensional sustainability commitments (please specify below) | --- |

A brief description of the institution's formal sustainability commitments, including the specific initiatives selected above:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Participatory Governance

Score

1.25 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has adopted a framework for engaging internal stakeholders (i.e. students, staff, faculty) in governance. The framework includes:

- Representative bodies through which students, staff and/or faculty can each participate in governance (e.g. student council, staff council, faculty senate);

And/or

- Elected student, staff and/or faculty representatives on the institution's highest governing body. To count, representatives must be elected by their peers or appointed by a representative student, staff or faculty body or organization.

Part 2

Institution has adopted a framework for engaging external stakeholders (i.e. local community members) in the institution's governance, strategy and operations. The framework includes:

- Written policies and procedures to identify and engage local residents in land use planning, capital investment projects, and other institutional decisions that affect the broader community (e.g. development projects that impact adjacent neighborhoods);

And/or

- Formal participatory or shared governance bodies (e.g. seats on the institution's governing body and/or a formally recognized board, council or committee) through which community members representing the interests of the following stakeholder groups can regularly participate in institutional governance:
 - Local government and/or educational organizations;
 - Private sector organizations; and/or
 - Civil society (e.g. non-governmental organizations and non-profit organizations).

The bodies and mechanisms reported for this credit may be managed by the institution (e.g. formal boards, committees, and councils), by stakeholder groups (e.g. independent committees and organizations that are formally recognized by the institution), or jointly (e.g. union/management structures).

Structures or mechanisms adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g. government or university system) may count for this credit as long as they apply and are adhered to by the institution.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Do the institution's students have a representative body through which they can participate in governance (e.g. a student council)? :

Yes

Do the institution's students have an elected representative on the institution's highest governing body?:

Yes

A brief description of the bodies and mechanisms through which students are engaged in governance, including information to support each affirmative response above:

Associated Students of Lewis & Clark is the elected student governance body. Students from this group also serve on the highest governing body for the institution, the Board of Trustees.

Do the institution's staff members have a representative body through which they can participate in governance (e.g. a staff council)?:

Yes

Do the institution's non-supervisory staff members have an elected representative on the institution's highest

governing body?:

No

A brief description of the bodies and mechanisms through which staff are engaged in governance, including information to support each affirmative response above:

Represented staff have an Executive Board and Area Representatives/Stewards that are elected and participate in governance of the groups and the institution broadly.

Do the institution’s teaching and research faculty have a representative body through which they can participate in governance (e.g. a faculty senate)?:

Yes

Do the institution’s teaching and research faculty have an elected representative on the institution’s highest governing body? :

Yes

A brief description of the bodies and mechanisms through which teaching and research faculty are engaged in governance, including information to support each affirmative response above:

The institution has a Faculty Council; elected representatives from this group participate in the Board of Trustees standing committees.

Does the institution have written policies and procedures to identify and engage external stakeholders (i.e. local residents) in land use planning, capital investment projects, and other institutional decisions that affect the community?:

No

A copy of the written policies and procedures:

The policies and procedures:

Does the institution have formal participatory or shared governance bodies through which community members representing the interests of the following stakeholder groups can regularly participate in institutional governance?:

| | Yes or No |
|---|-----------|
| Local government and/or educational organizations | No |
| Private sector organizations | No |

Civil society (e.g. NGOs, NPOs)

No

A brief description of the bodies and mechanisms through which external stakeholders are engaged in institutional governance (including information about each stakeholder group selected above):

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Diversity & Affordability

Points Claimed 8.55

Points Available 10.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are working to advance diversity and affordability on campus. In order to build a sustainable society, diverse groups will need to be able to come together and work collaboratively to address sustainability challenges. Members of racial and ethnic minority groups and immigrant, indigenous and low-income communities tend to suffer disproportionate exposure to environmental problems. This environmental injustice happens as a result of unequal and segregated or isolated communities. To achieve environmental and social justice, society must work to address discrimination and promote equality. The historical legacy and persistence of discrimination based on racial, gender, religious, and other differences makes a proactive approach to promoting a culture of inclusiveness an important component of creating an equitable society. Higher education opens doors to opportunities that can help create a more equitable world, and those doors must be open through affordable programs accessible to all regardless of race, gender, religion, socio-economic status and other differences. In addition, a diverse student body, faculty, and staff provide rich resources for learning and collaboration.

| Credit | Points |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Diversity and Equity Coordination | 1.78 / 2.00 |
| Assessing Diversity and Equity | 0.50 / 1.00 |
| Support for Underrepresented Groups | 3.00 / 3.00 |
| Affordability and Access | 3.27 / 4.00 |

Diversity and Equity Coordination

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.78 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has a diversity and equity committee, office and/or officer (or the equivalent) tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies, programs, and trainings related to diversity, equity, inclusion and human rights on campus. The committee, office and/or officer may focus on students and/or employees.

Part 2

Institution makes cultural competence trainings and activities available to students, staff, and/or faculty.

The trainings and activities help participants build the awareness, knowledge and skills necessary to work effectively in cross-cultural situations. Trainings and activities that focus exclusively on awareness, knowledge or skills do not count.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer tasked to advise on and implement policies, programs, and trainings related to diversity, equity, inclusion and human rights on campus?:

Yes

Does the committee, office and/or officer focus on students, employees, or both?:

Both students and employees

A brief description of the diversity and equity committee, office and/or officer, including purview and activities:

Member of the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion come from all three schools and include faculty, staff, and current students.

Janet Steverson, committee chair, Douglas K. Newell Professor of Teaching Excellence (law school), Dean of Diversity and Inclusion (beginning summer 2016)

Jane Atkinson, vice president and provost (ex-officio)

Nathan Baptiste, director of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement (CAS)

Janet Bixby, associate dean (graduate school)

Anthony Blake, student (law school)

stars.aashe.org

Cathy Busha, associate dean of student engagement (CAS)

Isaac Dixon, associate vice president and director of human resources

Mark Duntley, Dean of Religious and Spiritual Life

Se-ah-dom Edmo, coordinator of the Indigenous Ways of Knowing Program

David Ellis, vice president, secretary and general counsel (ex-officio)

Linda Equiluz-Gonzalez, student (graduate school)

Erik Fast, director of corporate foundation relations

Mark Figueroa, associate provost for institutional research and planning (CAS)

Anna Gonzalez, dean of students (CAS)

JB Kim, assistant dean for diversity and academic resources (law school)

Stacey Kim, director of marketing and communications

Gabriela Rodriguez, student (CAS)

Laura Shier, Director of Academic English Studies/Instructor, CAS

Liz Stanhope, associate professor of mathematical sciences, CAS

Bruce Taft Jr., Diversity and Inclusion Project Manager

Yueping Zhang, associate professor of psychology (CAS)

Estimated proportion of students that has participated in cultural competence trainings and activities (All, Most, Some, or None):

All

Estimated proportion of staff (including administrators) that has participated in cultural competence trainings and activities (All, Most, Some, or None):

Most

Estimated proportion of faculty that has participated in cultural competence trainings and activities (All, Most, Some, or None):

Most

A brief description of the institution's cultural competence trainings and activities:

Multicultural Affairs Symposium, discrimination and harassment training addresses cultural sensitivity and competence issues, Staff Development Days, Supervisor Leadership Training, Training for Unions, a variety of multicultural affairs events, symposiums, talks, etc

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/diversity/diversity-committee/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Assessing Diversity and Equity

Score

0.50 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution has engaged in a structured assessment process during the previous three years to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus. The structured diversity and equity assessment process addresses:

- 1) Campus climate by engaging stakeholders to assess the attitudes perceptions and behaviors of faculty, staff, administrators and students, including the experiences of underrepresented groups;
- 2) Student outcomes related to diversity, equity and success (e.g. graduation/success and retention rates for underrepresented groups); and/or
- 3) Employee outcomes related to diversity and equity (e.g. pay and retention rates for underrepresented groups).

The results of the assessment may be shared with the campus community and/or made publicly available.

An employee satisfaction or engagement survey is not sufficient to meet the campus climate or employee outcome criteria outlined above, but may contribute to the overall structured assessment. Employee satisfaction and engagement surveys are recognized in the *Assessing Employee Satisfaction* credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Has the institution engaged in a structured assessment process during the previous three years to improve diversity, equity and inclusion on campus?:

Yes

A brief description of the assessment process and the framework, scorecard(s) and/or tool(s) used:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/news/34483-deadline-extended-to-dec-9-culturally-engaging-campus-env>

ironments-survey

CECE Project at Indiana University – Bloomington

Does the assessment process address campus climate by engaging stakeholders to assess the attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of faculty, staff, administrators and students, including the experiences of underrepresented groups?:

Yes

Does the assessment process address student outcomes related to diversity, equity and success (e.g. graduation/success and retention rates for underrepresented groups)?:

Yes

Does the assessment process address employee outcomes related to diversity and equity (e.g. pay and retention rates for underrepresented groups)?:

No

A brief description of the most recent assessment findings and how the results are used in shaping policy, programs and initiatives:

Findings not currently available

Are the results of the most recent structured diversity and equity assessment shared with the campus community?:

No

A brief description of how the assessment results are shared with the campus community:

Results have not yet been shared as the survey was delivered into spring term.

Are the results (or a summary of the results) of the most recent structured diversity and equity assessment publicly posted?:

No

The diversity and equity assessment report or summary:

The website URL where the report or summary is publicly posted:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/diversity/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/news/34483-deadline-extended-to-dec-9-culturally-engaging-campus-environments-survey>

Support for Underrepresented Groups

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 3.00 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has one or more of the following policies, programs or initiatives to support underrepresented groups and foster a more diverse and inclusive campus community:

- 1) A publicly posted non-discrimination statement.
 - 2) A discrimination response protocol or committee (sometimes called a bias response team) to respond to and support those who have experienced or witnessed a bias incident, act of discrimination or hate crime.
 - 3) Programs specifically designed to recruit students, staff and/or faculty from underrepresented groups.
 - 4) Mentoring, counseling, peer support, academic support, or other programs to support students, staff and/or faculty from underrepresented groups.
 - 5) Programs that specifically aim to support and prepare students from underrepresented groups for careers as faculty members (sometimes known as pipeline programs). Such programs could take any of the following forms:
 - Teaching fellowships or other programs to support terminal degree students from underrepresented groups in gaining teaching experience. (The terminal degree students may be enrolled at another institution.)
 - Financial and/or other support programs to prepare and encourage undergraduate or other non-terminal degree students from underrepresented groups to pursue further education and careers as faculty members.
 - Financial, and/or other support programs for doctoral and post-doctoral students from underrepresented groups.
-

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have a publicly posted non-discrimination statement? :

Yes

The non-discrimination statement, including the website URL where the policy is publicly accessible:

Discrimination, Harassment, and Hate- or Bias-Motivated Conduct Policy

Policy Statement : Lewis & Clark College seeks to be an inclusive community that welcomes and respects all people. Every member of our community is expected to commit to maintaining a safe, respectful and welcoming community. Acts that are an affront to the core values of the institution are not tolerated. Such actions destroy the sense of community we all share. Additionally, acts of intolerance do untold and unjust harm to the well-being, dignity and safety of those who are victimized by these acts.

We as a community recognize that not all conduct which may stir negative emotions or responses may or should be regulated through a conduct process. Certain conduct, however, will not be tolerated at Lewis & Clark and will result in a conduct process. The following policy describes such conduct.

Does the institution have a discrimination response protocol or committee (sometimes called a bias response team) to respond to and support those who have experienced or witnessed a bias incident, act of discrimination or hate crime?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's discrimination response protocol or team (including examples of actions taken during the previous three years):

Bias Assessment Response Team (BART), more information here:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3660-hate-and-bias-motivated-conduct-policy>

Does the institution have programs specifically designed to recruit students from underrepresented groups?:

Yes

Does the institution have programs specifically designed to recruit staff from underrepresented groups?:

Yes

Does the institution have programs specifically designed to recruit faculty from underrepresented groups?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's programs to recruit students, staff and/or faculty from underrepresented groups:

The Dean of Diversity and Inclusion serves on numerous search committees to increase our hiring of faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. Specifically, she conducted workshops on best practices in diversity hiring for this year's faculty and staff search committees, including the presidential search committee. She also consulted with staff search chairs on the wording of job announcements, the wording of job requirements and the best places for posting job announcements. In addition, I interviewed with most of the faculty candidates and attended their presentations. I also served on several staff search committees. Going forward, I will continue to offer these services to hiring committees.

In mid-January, the Mellon Foundation approved an officer's grant of \$30,000 to support planning initiatives related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in faculty hiring. The Dean of Diversity and Inclusion is the principal investigator on that grant, and will be using it to hire consultants to help us further refine our hiring practices in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The funding will also be used to pass on to our faculty the knowledge gained from the consultants and to provide small grants to departments to help incentivize them to complete plans to manage their future staffing needs.

At the College's expense, travel to our campus to meet current students and faculty, participate in leadership development activities, sit in on classes, spend two nights in a residence hall, try the food, have an admissions interview, visit Portland, and experience life at Lewis & Clark College firsthand. Seniors in high school who are interested in learning more about Lewis & Clark College. Preference will be stars.aashe.org

given to students from historically underrepresented backgrounds including students of color and/or first generation prospective college students.

<http://college.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/compass/fall/>

Does the institution have mentoring, counseling, peer support, academic support, or other programs to support students from underrepresented groups on campus?:

Yes

Does the institution have mentoring, counseling, peer support or other programs to support staff from underrepresented groups on campus?:

Yes

Does the institution have mentoring, counseling, peer support or other programs to support faculty from underrepresented groups on campus?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's programs to support students, staff and/or faculty from underrepresented groups:

The Living List (PDF), maintained by the Office of the Dean of the College, compiles information about many local multicultural resources. The Portland metropolitan area is home to people of diverse backgrounds that enrich the city through an ever-growing number of community groups, cultural events, and businesses. If you have any suggestions or additions you'd like us to make, please get in touch. Campus offices and student groups can also help you get acclimated to our local community:

The Department of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement leads the college's efforts toward building and sustaining a diverse and culturally vibrant campus.

The Office of Religious and Spiritual Life is designed to support all religious life programs that take place on campus.

MOSAIC (Multicultural Organizations Seeking an Inclusive Community) is a collective of the Asian Student Union, Black Student Union, Native Student Union, and Gente Latina Unida. Many more undergraduate student organizations focus on underrepresented communities.

The Student Bar Association includes many law student groups focused on diversity.

The Law School outlines resources available for prospective and current students and faculty.

http://law.lclark.edu/student_life/student-organizations/

Great Expectations (GE) is a program designed to help incoming first-generation college students and/or students of color transition into Lewis & Clark College. As a part of GE, you are invited to attend a two-day retreat where you will have direct access to staff, faculty, students, alumni, and resources. You will meet other students in a small and supportive community, bond with your LEAP peer mentor, find answers to your questions about college, and get guidance in your first year as you navigate campus life. GE is the kickoff retreat,

and the connections made there will continue in the L.E.A.P. Mentorship Program throughout your first year at Lewis & Clark!

The goal of Great Expectations is to facilitate the smooth transition of students of color and first-generation college students into Lewis & Clark by:

Connecting new students with returning students, as well as staff and faculty, to develop a strong sense of community

Providing strategies for academic success

Helping to identify and take advantage of campus resources and opportunities

LEAP Mentors are sophomores, juniors, and seniors at Lewis & Clark College who are here to assist and serve the incoming students in the Class of 2021. With particular focus on first generation and students of color, LEAP mentors are a resource for first year students who can authentically speak from their own perspectives as students on campus.

Mentors are paired with incoming students based on academic and social interests, and are committed to creating a safe and welcoming space for students. Mentors will attend the Great Expectations Retreat with mentees, and then continue building relationships through the entire academic year.

For faculty and staff there are a number of trainings, workshops, affinity groups to support, counsel, and mentor underrepresented groups. These include:

The Lewis & Clark Professionals of Color Network was created to fulfill the need for Lewis & Clark faculty and staff of Color to have opportunities to get together, network, and make connections with one another. The purpose of this network is to provide an opportunity for faculty and staff to make connections with one another and build a community of support. The LC Professionals of Color Network and Allies Google group to receive updates about upcoming events! This group is for Lewis & Clark College employees from underrepresented racial/ethnic backgrounds and their allies. Group members can utilize the list to ask questions and share resources, news and events of interest on and off campus.

Training, workshops, discussions:

Having Courageous Conversations About Race: How do we start?

Communities of Color in Portland: Challenges and Opportunities

Support Out Students of Color: Implications for Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students

Post-Racial in America and Lewis & Clark: Fact or Fiction?

The issue of Critical Mass and Employees of Color: Analyzing Previous Efforts and Identifying Potential New Solutions.

Upcoming Faculty/Staff Searches: Strategies for Representation.

The Bicultural Experience for People of Color at Lewis & Clark

Cultural Competency at Lewis & Clark: What Should We Expect People to Know?

Professional Development for Employees of Color: How Can We Support Each Other for the Next Step?

Other Educators of Color in Portland: How are Their Experiences Similar or Dissimilar?

Does the institution have training and development programs, teaching fellowships and/or other programs that specifically aim to support and prepare students from underrepresented groups for careers as faculty members?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's programs to support and prepare students from underrepresented groups for careers as faculty members:

The institution supports a number of scholarship programs aimed and supporting and preparing students from underrepresented groups. These include students in PhD programs such as the APA Minority Fellowship Program, mentoring for Doctoral Students of Color.

Does the institution produce a publicly accessible inventory of gender-neutral bathrooms on campus?:

Yes

Does the institution offer housing options to accommodate the special needs of transgender and transitioning students?:

Yes

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://college.lclark.edu/student_life/multicultural_affairs/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Affordability and Access

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 3.27 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has policies and programs in place to make it accessible and affordable to low-income students and/or to support non-traditional students. Such policies and programs may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Policies and programs to minimize the cost of attendance for low-income students
- Programs to equip the institution's faculty and staff to better serve students from low-income backgrounds
- Programs to guide and prepare students and families from low-income backgrounds for higher education (e.g. U.S. federal TRIO programs)
- Scholarships provided specifically for low-income students
- Targeted outreach to recruit students from low-income backgrounds
- Scholarships provided specifically for part-time students
- An on-site child care facility, a partnership with a local facility, and/or subsidies or financial support to help meet the child care needs of students

Part 2

Institution documents its accessibility and affordability to low-income students as demonstrated by one or more of the following indicators:

1. The percentage of entering students that are low-income (e.g., the percentage of students receiving Pell Grant funds as reported in the U.S. IPEDS Student Financial Aid component or the percentage of students receiving the Canada Student Grant for Students from Low-Income Families)
2. The graduation/success rate for low-income students
3. On average, the percentage of need met for students who were awarded any need-based aid (e.g. as reported to the U.S. Common Data Set initiative, item H2)
4. The percentage of students graduating without interest-bearing student loan debt or for whom no out-of-pocket tuition is required (i.e. the percentage of graduates who have not taken out interest-bearing loans)

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have policies and programs to make it accessible and affordable to low-income students?:

Yes

A brief description of any policies and programs to minimize the cost of attendance for low-income students:

Lewis & Clark College is exploring the possibility of increasing transfer student enrollment by 50 percent. This will include providing resources for a dedicated transfer counselor and studying policies that could make transfer enrollment more attractive to students. The goal will be, in part, to increase transfer enrollments from local community colleges.

As part of our ongoing recruitment efforts, we bring groups of low income students from underrepresented backgrounds and low income first-generation students to campus for special programs. Many of these students are flown in from out-of-state. All costs associated with attending these programs are covered by the College, and students who attend and are admitted to the College do not have any unmet need in their financial aid awards.

http://college.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/multicultural_recruitment/lead/

A brief description of any programs to equip the institution's faculty and staff to better serve students from low-income backgrounds:

Faculty are being asked to consider ways to make the first year core course more meaningful and engaging for students of diverse backgrounds.

A brief description of the institution's programs to guide and prepare students and families from low-income backgrounds for higher education:

As the second phase of our current Howard Hughes grant, L&C is embarking this year on a collaboration between our undergraduate program and our graduate teacher education program to provide after school inquiry-based programs in STEM fields for underrepresented students in five Portland high schools, along with the opportunity for some of these students to participate in summer research with undergraduate mentors on campus.

We are actively involved with Oregon College Application Week, a state-wide program designed to encourage and assist students as they apply for college/university. Our Director of Admissions is a member of the state-wide steering committee.

A brief description of the institution's scholarships for low-income students:

The institution offers substantial financial aid in order to make a Lewis & Clark education affordable to students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. This aid is offered in the form of scholarship, grant, work, and loan.

A list of some of our named scholarships for returning students can be found at:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/financial_aid/scholarships_continuing/

A brief description of the institution’s targeted outreach to recruit students from low-income backgrounds:

L&C has assigned admissions counselors to high schools and districts serving low income students, especially in Oregon, California, and Texas. This year we are expanding these outreach efforts.

The Office of Admissions works with Community Based Organizations (CBOs) like YES Prep, Bright Prospect, Black United Fund, etc. to identify appropriate under-served students to apply for admission and enroll at the College. This includes participating in programs to assist students with the college search and application process, inviting and funding low-income students to visit campus, and meeting need in financial aid awards. Among our newer partnerships are FutureConnect in Portland (two years) and Raise (new this year) on the national level.

A brief description of the institution’s other policies or programs to make the institution accessible and affordable to low-income students:

Emergency fund for high-need students who encounter unanticipated costs due to medical or family emergencies.

Does the institution have policies and programs to support non-traditional students?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution’s scholarships provided specifically for part-time students:

The institution's graduate and law program support non-traditional part-time students. Scholarships provided are listed here:

http://graduate.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/paying_for_graduate_school/scholarships/

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/financial_aid/law/scholarships/

A brief description of the institution’s on-site child care facility, partnership with a local facility, and/or subsidies or financial support to help meet the child care needs of students:

The institution is currently considering onsite child care facilities or partnerships to support child care.

A brief description of the institution’s other policies and programs to support non-traditional students:

https://law.lclark.edu/offices/career_services/specialty/evening/

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 2 of this credit (tracking accessibility and affordability)? (If data is not available, select 'No'):

Yes

The percentage of entering students that are low-income (0-100):

16.40

The graduation/success rate for low-income students (0-100):

74

On average, the percentage of need that was met for students who were awarded any need-based aid (e.g. as reported to the U.S. Common Data Set initiative, item H2) (0-100):

92

The percentage of students graduating with no interest-bearing student loan debt or for whom no out-of-pocket tuition is required (i.e. the percentage of graduates who have not taken out interest-bearing loans) (0-100):

45

Estimated percentage of students that participate in or directly benefit from the institution's policies and programs to support low-income and non-traditional students (0-100):

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/financial_aid/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Investment & Finance

Points Claimed 5.75

Points Available 7.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that make investment decisions that promote sustainability. Collectively, colleges and universities invest hundreds of billions of dollars. Like other decisions that institutions make, these investments have impacts that are both local and global in scope. Institutions with transparent and democratic investment processes promote accountability and engagement by the campus and community. By using the tools of sustainable investing, institutions can improve the long-term health of their endowments, encourage better corporate behavior, support innovation in sustainable products and services, support sustainability in their community, and help build a more just and sustainable financial system.

Throughout this subcategory, the term “sustainable investment” is inclusive of socially responsible, environmentally responsible, ethical, impact, and mission-related investment.

| Credit | Points |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Committee on Investor Responsibility | 2.00 / 2.00 |
| Sustainable Investment | 3.75 / 4.00 |
| Investment Disclosure | 0.00 / 1.00 |

Committee on Investor Responsibility

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 2.00 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has a formally established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) or equivalent body that makes recommendations to fund decision-makers on socially and environmentally responsible investment opportunities across asset classes, including proxy voting (if the institution engages in proxy voting). The body has multi-stakeholder representation, which means its membership includes faculty, staff, and/or students (and may also include alumni, trustees, and/or other parties).

Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system and/or a separate foundation of the institution should report on the investment policies and activities of those entities.

A general committee that oversees the institution's investments does not count for this credit unless social and environmental responsibility is an explicit part of its mission and/or a regular part of its agenda.

This credit recognizes committees that regularly make recommendations to fund decision-makers on the institution's external investments. Committees that only have within their purview green revolving loan funds or similar initiatives to fund campus infrastructure improvements and sustainability committees that occasionally make recommendations to fund decision-makers do not count. Student-managed sustainable investment funds, green fees and revolving funds, and sustainable microfinance initiatives are covered in the *Student Life* credit in Campus Engagement.

This credit applies to institutions with endowments of US \$1 million or larger. Institutions with endowments totaling less than US \$1 million may choose to omit this credit.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have a formally established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) that makes recommendations to fund decision-makers on socially and environmentally responsible investment opportunities across asset classes?:

Yes

The charter or mission statement of the CIR or other body which reflects social and environmental concerns or a brief description of how the CIR is tasked to address social and environmental concerns:

The Operations Committee of the Sustainability Council is charged with advising on proxy voting for investments, participates in ESG program developing/re-assessment, and several members also participate in the Divestment Sub-Committee.

The Divestment Sub-Committee includes faculty, staff and administrators from the above group as well as student and Board of Trustees members.

Does the CIR include staff representation?:

Yes

Does the CIR include faculty representation?:

Yes

Does the CIR include student representation?:

Yes

Members of the CIR, including affiliations and role (e.g. student, faculty, staff, alumni):

Purchasing Manager
Data analyst/researcher
Law Student
Grad Student
CAS student
Sustainability Director
Grounds Manager
Grad Faculty
Chief Investment Officer

Examples of CIR actions during the previous three years:

proxy voting, sustainable investing policy development, climate action plan update, divestment and ESG investment

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainable Investment

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 3.75 / 4.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

There are two possible approaches to this credit; institutions may pursue one or both. Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities.

Option 1: Positive Sustainability Investment

Institution invests in one or more of the following:

- Sustainable industries (e.g. renewable energy or sustainable forestry). This may include any investment directly in an entire industry sector as well as holdings of companies whose entire business is sustainable (e.g. a manufacturer of wind turbines).
- Businesses *selected for* exemplary sustainability performance (e.g. using criteria specified in a sustainable investment policy). This includes investments made, at least in part, because of a company's social or environmental performance. Existing stock in a company that happens to have socially or environmentally responsible practices should not be included unless the investment decision was based, at least in part, on the company's sustainability performance.
- Sustainability investment funds (e.g. a renewable energy or impact investment fund). This may include any fund with a mission of investing in a sustainable sector or industry (or multiple sectors), as well as any fund that is focused on purchasing bonds with sustainable goals.
- Community development financial institutions(CDFI) or the equivalent (including funds that invest primarily in CDFIs or the equivalent).
- Socially responsible mutual funds with positive screens (or the equivalent). Investment in a socially responsible fund with only negative screens (i.e. one that excludes egregious offenders or certain industries, such as tobacco or weapons manufacturing) does not count for Option 1.
- Green revolving loan funds that are funded from the endowment

Option 2: Investor Engagement

Institution has policies and/or practices that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Has a publicly available sustainable investment policy (e.g. to consider the social and/or environmental impacts of investment decisions in addition to financial considerations)
- Uses its sustainable investment policy to select and guide investment managers
- Has engaged in proxy voting to promote sustainability, either by its CIR or other committee or through the use of guidelines, during the previous three years
- Has filed or co-filed one or more shareholder resolutions that address sustainability or submitted one or more letters about social or environmental responsibility to a company in which it holds investments, during the previous three years

- Has a publicly available investment policy with negative screens, for example to prohibit investment in an industry (e.g. tobacco or weapons manufacturing) or participate in a divestment effort (e.g. targeting fossil fuel production or human rights violations)
- Engages in policy advocacy by participating in investor networks (e.g. Principles for Responsible Investment, Investor Network on Climate Risk, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility) and/or engages in inter-organizational collaborations to share best practices

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution wish to pursue Option 1 (positive sustainability investment)?:

Yes

Total value of the investment pool:

218,367,406 US/Canadian \$

Value of holdings in each of the following categories:

| | Value of Holdings |
|---|---------------------------|
| Sustainable industries (e.g. renewable energy or sustainable forestry) | --- |
| Businesses selected for exemplary sustainability performance (e.g. using criteria specified in a sustainable investment policy) | 79,216,969 US/Canadian \$ |
| Sustainability investment funds (e.g. a renewable energy or impact investment fund) | --- |
| Community development financial institutions (CDFIs) or the equivalent | --- |
| Socially responsible mutual funds with positive screens (or the equivalent) | --- |
| Green revolving loan funds that are funded from the endowment | 0 US/Canadian \$ |

A brief description of the companies, funds, and/or institutions referenced above:

Generation IM, City of London EM Global Fund, DFA, Mondrian Emerging Markets Fund, & PIMCO Developing Local Markets and Commodity Real Return, Common Fund, Dodge & Cox, SSGA, Vanguard, Generation Global Equities, Knighthead, Metropolitan Global Feeder Fund, W Capital Partner/W Capital Partners III, Scopia PX International Ltd, 57 Stars Global Opportunity III

Percentage of the institution's investment pool in positive sustainability investments:

36.28

Does the institution wish to pursue Option 2 (investor engagement)?:

Yes

Does the institution have a publicly available sustainable investment policy?:

Yes

A copy of the sustainable investment policy:

[updated-investment-policy-amended-with-esg.pdf](#)

The sustainable investment policy:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/files/18216-updated-investment-policy-amended-with-esg>

Does the institution use its sustainable investment policy to select and guide investment managers?:

Yes

A brief description of how the policy is applied, including recent examples:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/files/18216-updated-investment-policy-amended-with-esg>

Has the institution engaged in proxy voting, either by its CIR or other committee or through the use of guidelines, to promote sustainability during the previous three years?:

Yes

A copy of the proxy voting guidelines or proxy record:

A brief description of how managers are adhering to proxy voting guidelines:

A sub-committee of the institutional Sustainability Council jointly votes proxies which are submitted by the CFO/VP.

Has the institution filed or co-filed one or more shareholder resolutions that address sustainability or submitted one or more letters about social or environmental responsibility to a company in which it holds investments during the previous three years?:

No

Examples of how the institution has engaged with corporations in its portfolio about sustainability issues during the previous three years:

Does the institution have a publicly available investment policy with negative screens?:

No

A brief description of the negative screens and how they have been implemented:

Approximate percentage of the endowment that the negative screens apply to:

0

Does the institution engage in policy advocacy by participating in investor networks and/or engage in inter-organizational collaborations to share best practices?:

Yes

A brief description of the investor networks and/or collaborations:

Intentional Endowments Network founding member

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Investments_2016.pdf](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

1/31/2017 data pull

Investment Disclosure

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 0.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution makes a snapshot of its investment holdings available to the public, including the amount invested in each fund and/or company and proxy voting records. The snapshot of holdings is updated at least once per year.

Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution make a snapshot of its investment holdings available to the public?:

Yes

A copy of the investment holdings snapshot:

The website URL where the holdings snapshot is publicly available:

<http://www.lclark.edu/offices/business/investments/>

Percentage of the total investment pool included in the snapshot of investment holdings at each of the following levels of detail:

| | Percentage (0-100) |
|--|--------------------|
| Specific funds and/or companies | 0 |
| Investment managers and/or basic portfolio composition (i.e. asset classes), but not specific funds or companies | 100 |

Does the institution engage in proxy voting?:

Yes

Are proxy voting records included in the snapshot of investment holdings?:

No

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Investment snapshot is taken at the end of the academic year, each year. Proxy voting is available at the Business Office upon request.

Wellbeing & Work

Points Claimed 3.11

Points Available 7.00

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that have incorporated sustainability into their human resources programs and policies. An institution's people define its character and capacity to perform; and so, an institution's achievements can only be as strong as its community. An institution can bolster the strength of its community by offering benefits, wages, and other assistance that serve to respectfully and ethically compensate workers and by acting to protect and positively affect the health, safety and wellbeing of the campus community.

| Credit | Points |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Employee Compensation | 1.32 / 3.00 |
| Assessing Employee Satisfaction | 0.00 / 1.00 |
| Wellness Program | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Workplace Health and Safety | 0.79 / 2.00 |

Employee Compensation

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.32 / 3.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

More than 75 percent of the institution's employees receive a living wage (benefits excluded).

Include all regular full-time, regular part-time, and temporary (or non-regular) employees (staff and faculty). Institutions may choose to include or omit student workers.

Part 2

Institution is able to verify that more than 75 percent of the employees of contractors that work on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations receive a living wage (benefits excluded).

Part 2 is only applicable to institutions that have one or more significant on-site contractors, which may include (but are not limited to) regular providers of dining/catering, cleaning/janitorial, maintenance, groundskeeping, transportation, and retail services (e.g. book and supply stores).

Part 3

Total compensation provided to the institution's lowest paid regular (i.e. permanent) employee or pay grade meets or exceeds the local living wage.

Include regular part-time and full-time workers. Newly hired, entry-level employees may be excluded from Part 3 during the first six months of employment. Institutions may choose to include or omit student workers.

To determine the local living wage::

- U.S. institutions must use the [Living Wage Calculator](#) hosted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to look up the living wage for "2 [working] Adults, 2 Children" for the community in which the main campus is located.
- Canadian institutions must use [Living Wage Canada](#)'s standards (if a living wage has been calculated for the community in which the main campus is located) or else the appropriate after tax [Low Income Cut-Off \(LICO\)](#) for a family of four (expressed as an hourly wage),
- Institutions located outside the U.S. and Canada must use local equivalents of the above standards if available or else the local poverty indicator for a family of four (expressed as an hourly wage).

For further guidance, see *F. Measurement*.

The local living wage (based on a family of four and expressed as an hourly wage):

15.79 US/Canadian \$

Percentage of all employees (regular full-time, regular part-time, and temporary workers) that receive a living wage (benefits excluded) (0-100):

99

Does the institution have employees of contractors that work on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations?:

Yes

Percentage of employees of contractors that work on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations that the institution has verified as receiving a living wage (benefits excluded) (0-100; enter '0' if unknown):

0

The total compensation provided to the institution's lowest paid regular (i.e., permanent) employee or pay grade meets or exceeds what percentage of the living wage?:

125 percent

A brief description of the minimum total compensation provided to the institution's lowest paid employee or pay grade, including any in-kind benefits included as part of the total compensation figure :

The minimum total compensation is \$25,000 for a nine month employee plus benefits. Total benefit compensation depends on those which are selected and the length of employment.

Has the institution made a formal commitment to pay a living wage?:

A copy or brief description of the institution's written policy stating its commitment to a living wage:

Has the institution made a formal commitment to provide a living wage to its student employees and/or graduate teaching/research assistants (e.g. by adopting a student bill-of-rights)?:

A brief description of the institution's commitment to a student living wage:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/human_resources/employee_resources/unions/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Data source: U.S. institutions must use the Living Wage Calculator hosted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to look up the living wage for “2 [working] Adults, 2 Children” for the community in which the main campus is located.

Location: Multnomah County, OR

Assessing Employee Satisfaction

Score

0.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution conducts a survey or other evaluation that allows for anonymous feedback to measure employee satisfaction and engagement. The survey or equivalent may be conducted institution-wide or may be done by individual departments or divisions. The evaluation addresses (but is not limited to) the following areas:

- Job satisfaction
- Learning and advancement opportunities
- Work culture and work/life balance

The institution has a mechanism in place to address issues raised by the evaluation.

This credit was marked as **Not Pursuing** so Reporting Fields will not be displayed.

Wellness Program

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|--|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has a wellness and/or employee assistance program that makes available counseling, referral, and wellbeing services to all students, staff, and/or faculty members.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution have a wellness program that makes counseling, referral, and wellbeing services available to all students?:

Yes

Does the institution have a wellness and/or employee assistance program that makes counseling, referral, and wellbeing services available to all staff?:

Yes

Does the institution have a wellness and/or employee assistance program that makes counseling, referral, and wellbeing services available to all faculty?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's wellness and/or employee assistance program(s), including information to support each affirmative response above :

As a Lewis & Clark employee you have a number of wellness activities and education opportunities available to you.

Annual Wellness Fair
Professional Wellness Coaching
Health Risk Assessment
Organized Activities

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/human_resources/employee_resources/benefits/wellness/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

stars.aashe.org

Workplace Health and Safety

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Score | Responsible Party |
| 0.79 / 2.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Part 1

Institution has reduced its total number of recordable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per full-time equivalent (FTE) employee compared to a baseline.

Part 2

Institution has fewer than 6 recordable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases annually per 100 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.

This credit includes employees of contractors working on-site for whom the institution is liable for workplace safety, for example workers for whom the institution is mandated to report injuries and disease cases by a health and safety authority such as the U.S. Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) or the Canadian Center for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS). Injuries and disease cases include OSHA/CCOHS-recordable fatal and non-fatal injuries (or the equivalent) arising out of or in the course of work and cases of diseases arising from a work-related injury or the work situation or activity (e.g. exposure to harmful chemicals, stress, ergonomic issues). See *F. Measurement*, below, for further guidance on reporting injuries and disease cases.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Please enter data in the table below:

| | Performance Year | Baseline Year |
|--|------------------|---------------|
| Number of recordable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases | 9 | 7 |
| Full-time equivalent of employees | 709 | 612 |
| Number of injuries and cases per FTE employee | 0.01 | 0.01 |

Start and end dates of the performance year and baseline year (or three-year periods):

| | Start Date | End Date |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Performance Year | Jan. 1, 2016 | Dec. 31, 2016 |
| Baseline Year | Jan. 1, 2008 | Dec. 31, 2008 |

A brief description of when and why the workplace health and safety baseline was adopted (e.g. in sustainability plans and policies or in the context of other reporting obligations):

2008 is the earliest data available

Percentage reduction in workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per FTE employee from baseline (0-100):

0

Number of workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per 100 FTE employees, performance year:

1.27

A brief description of the institution's workplace health and safety initiatives, including how workers are engaged in monitoring and advising on health and safety programs:

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/risk_management/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[OSHA 300A for 2016.pdf](#)

Innovation & Leadership

Exemplary Practice

Points Claimed 1.00

Points Available 1.00

Exemplary practice credits recognize specific initiatives that demonstrate sustainability leadership. Exemplary practices include:

- Emerging best practices that are not otherwise recognized in STARS (e.g. seeking independent review of STARS data prior to submission).
- Initiatives and outcomes that are a step beyond what is recognized in a standard credit (e.g. achieving third party certification for a program or exceeding the highest criterion of an existing credit).
- Exemplary initiatives and outcomes that are only relevant to a minority of institution types or regions (e.g. participation in green hospital networks).
- Exemplary practice credits may be claimed in multiple submissions as long as the criteria are being met at the time of submission.

A catalog of currently available exemplary practice credits is [available on the STARS website](#).

| Credit | Points |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Grounds Certification | 0.50 / 0.50 |
| Pay Scale Equity | 0.50 / 0.50 |

Grounds Certification

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 0.50 / 0.50 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution owns and/or manages land that is currently certified under one or more of the following programs:

- Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program (ACSP) or ACSP for Golf
- Bee Campus USA
- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management standard
- National Wildlife Federation's Certified Wildlife Habitat Program
- An Organic standard or Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) endorsed by IFOAM
- SalmonSafe
- Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES)
- Tree Campus USA (Arbor Day Foundation)
- An equivalent program approved by AASHE (email stars@ashe.org to inquire about program equivalence)

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Does the institution own and/or manage land that is currently certified under the following programs? (at least one positive response required):

| | Yes or No |
|--|-----------|
| Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program (ACSP) or ACSP for Golf | --- |
| Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management standard | --- |
| National Wildlife Federation's Certified Wildlife Habitat Program | --- |
| An IFOAM-endorsed organic standard or Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) | --- |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Salmon-Safe | Yes |
| Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES) | --- |
| Tree Campus USA (Arbor Day Foundation) | No |
| Bee Campus USA | --- |
| An equivalent program approved by AASHE | --- |

A brief description of institution owned and/or managed land that is currently third party certified under one or more of the programs listed above, including the year each certification was achieved and/or renewed:

Salmon Safe: 2013, entire campus

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

<http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/grounds/initiatives/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Pay Scale Equity

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 0.50 / 0.50 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Institution has a maximum compensation scale ratio of 1:15, where 1 represents the compensation of the lowest-paid full-time employee and 15 represents the compensation of the highest paid senior administrator (e.g. president or chancellor).

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

The factor by which the total compensation of the highest compensated senior administrator exceeds that of the lowest compensated full-time employee (1:X):

13.20

Documentation supporting the institution's reported pay scale ratio:

[PayEquityScale.pdf](#)

Documentation supporting the institution's reported pay scale ratio:

\$330,000 Interim President (no benefits)

\$25,000 Lowest paid worker (no benefits)

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Human Resources, HRIS Analyst

Innovation

Points Claimed 4.00

Points Available 4.00

These credits recognize institutions that are seeking innovative solutions to sustainability challenges and demonstrating sustainability leadership in ways that are not otherwise captured by STARS.

| Credit | Points |
|---------------|---------------|
| Innovation A | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Innovation B | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Innovation C | 1.00 / 1.00 |
| Innovation D | 1.00 / 1.00 |

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Innovation credits are open-ended and reserved for new, extraordinary, unique, groundbreaking, or uncommon outcomes, policies, and practices that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit or exemplary practice option.

- 1) In general, innovation credits should have roughly similar impacts or be on the same scale as other STARS credits.
- 2) Outcomes, policies, and practices that are innovative for the institution's region or institution type are eligible for innovation credits.
- 3) The innovative practice, policy, program, or outcome must be ongoing or have occurred within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.
- 4) The innovative practice or program has to be something that the institution has already implemented; planned activities do not count.
- 5) The innovative practice or program should originate from an area within the defined institutional boundary.
- 6) Practices, policies, and programs that were once considered innovative but are now widely adopted (e.g. being the first institution to enact a policy 20 years ago that is now common) may not be claimed as innovation credits.
- 7) Multiple activities or practices whose sum is innovative can be considered for an innovation credit as long as those activities or practices are related. Listing a series of unrelated accomplishments or events under a single innovation credit is not accepted.
- 8) While the practices that led to receiving an award may be appropriate for an innovation credit, winning awards and/or high sustainability rankings in other assessments is not, in and of itself, grounds for an innovation credit. When the innovation is part of a partnership, the summary provided must clearly describe the institution's role in the innovation.

An institution can only claim a particular activity as an innovation credit once. When re-submitting for a STARS rating, an innovation credit that the institution submitted previously cannot be re-submitted. However, an institution that has made significant advancements to a project or program that was previously submitted as an innovation may resubmit based on those advancements if the project or program is still considered innovative.

To help verify that the policy, practice, program, or outcome that the institution is claiming for an innovation credit is truly innovative, the institution may submit a letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise in the associated content area or a press release or publication featuring the innovation.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Name or title of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome:

A brief description of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome that outlines how credit criteria are met and any positive measurable outcomes associated with the innovation:

Oregon's building code and administrative rules regulate the installation and use of composting toilets in residential areas. Currently, this code reference does not allow for commercial or multi-family installations. Following a lengthy yet successful code exception and installation process, Lewis & Clark installed its first composting toilet, and one of very few in our local area, on a commercial property. We will be working with Recode and other community partners to develop methods and standards for use of commercial composting toilets with the intent of promoting code change at the State level.

Which of the following impact areas does the innovation most closely relate to? (select up to three):

Buildings

Grounds

Water

A letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise or a press release or publication featuring the innovation :

The website URL where information about the innovation is available :

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Innovation B

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Innovation credits are open-ended and reserved for new, extraordinary, unique, groundbreaking, or uncommon outcomes, policies, and practices that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit or exemplary practice option.

- 1) In general, innovation credits should have roughly similar impacts or be on the same scale as other STARS credits.
- 2) Outcomes, policies, and practices that are innovative for the institution's region or institution type are eligible for innovation credits.
- 3) The innovative practice, policy, program, or outcome must be ongoing or have occurred within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.
- 4) The innovative practice or program has to be something that the institution has already implemented; planned activities do not count.
- 5) The innovative practice or program should originate from an area within the defined institutional boundary.
- 6) Practices, policies, and programs that were once considered innovative but are now widely adopted (e.g. being the first institution to enact a policy 20 years ago that is now common) may not be claimed as innovation credits.
- 7) Multiple activities or practices whose sum is innovative can be considered for an innovation credit as long as those activities or practices are related. Listing a series of unrelated accomplishments or events under a single innovation credit is not accepted.
- 8) While the practices that led to receiving an award may be appropriate for an innovation credit, winning awards and/or high sustainability rankings in other assessments is not, in and of itself, grounds for an innovation credit. When the innovation is part of a partnership, the summary provided must clearly describe the institution's role in the innovation.

An institution can only claim a particular activity as an innovation credit once. When re-submitting for a STARS rating, an innovation credit that the institution submitted previously cannot be re-submitted. However, an institution that has made significant advancements to a project or program that was previously submitted as an innovation may resubmit based on those advancements if the project or program is still considered innovative.

To help verify that the policy, practice, program, or outcome that the institution is claiming for an innovation credit is truly innovative, the institution may submit a letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise in the associated content area or a press release or publication featuring the innovation.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Name or title of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome:

Paper use reduction software and hardware, campus-wide
stars.aashe.org

A brief description of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome that outlines how credit criteria are met and any positive measurable outcomes associated with the innovation:

Lewis & Clark College recently converted its fleet of multi-function printers and copiers to managed print services contract intended to save energy and reduce paper use. This technology has an innovative software system that reduces 'orphan' prints by requiring users to release print jobs, cutting down on unnecessary printing and forgotten jobs. Additionally, this software provides real time reporting of paper usage allowing efforts to reduce paper to be targeted to the individual or departmental level. This effort is considered innovative, in our opinion, due to the extent of the program - it was a campus-wide initiative (massive scale) and it made transparent the true cost of printing each time an individual goes to the machine. In first six months, over 138,000 pages were saved from printing.

Which of the following impact areas does the innovation most closely relate to? (select up to three):

- Energy
- Purchasing
- Waste

A letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise or a press release or publication featuring the innovation :

[POA_STARSInnovLetter.docx.pdf](#)

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Innovation credits are open-ended and reserved for new, extraordinary, unique, groundbreaking, or uncommon outcomes, policies, and practices that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit or exemplary practice option.

- 1) In general, innovation credits should have roughly similar impacts or be on the same scale as other STARS credits.
- 2) Outcomes, policies, and practices that are innovative for the institution's region or institution type are eligible for innovation credits.
- 3) The innovative practice, policy, program, or outcome must be ongoing or have occurred within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.
- 4) The innovative practice or program has to be something that the institution has already implemented; planned activities do not count.
- 5) The innovative practice or program should originate from an area within the defined institutional boundary.
- 6) Practices, policies, and programs that were once considered innovative but are now widely adopted (e.g. being the first institution to enact a policy 20 years ago that is now common) may not be claimed as innovation credits.
- 7) Multiple activities or practices whose sum is innovative can be considered for an innovation credit as long as those activities or practices are related. Listing a series of unrelated accomplishments or events under a single innovation credit is not accepted.
- 8) While the practices that led to receiving an award may be appropriate for an innovation credit, winning awards and/or high sustainability rankings in other assessments is not, in and of itself, grounds for an innovation credit. When the innovation is part of a partnership, the summary provided must clearly describe the institution's role in the innovation.

An institution can only claim a particular activity as an innovation credit once. When re-submitting for a STARS rating, an innovation credit that the institution submitted previously cannot be re-submitted. However, an institution that has made significant advancements to a project or program that was previously submitted as an innovation may resubmit based on those advancements if the project or program is still considered innovative.

To help verify that the policy, practice, program, or outcome that the institution is claiming for an innovation credit is truly innovative, the institution may submit a letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise in the associated content area or a press release or publication featuring the innovation.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Name or title of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome:

A brief description of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome that outlines how credit criteria are met and any positive measurable outcomes associated with the innovation:

The institution moved to a paperless/permitless transportation management system that reduced thousands of dollars of paper use and several metric tons of carbon emissions. In addition to reducing paper use, this new system also streamlines enforcement through the use of LPR; camera-based, enforcement process. The enforcement vehicle is all electric, so vehicle miles as well as carbon emissions have been reduced.

Which of the following impact areas does the innovation most closely relate to? (select up to three):

Air & Climate

Transportation

Waste

A letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise or a press release or publication featuring the innovation :

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Innovation D

| Score | Responsible Party |
|-------------|---|
| 1.00 / 1.00 | Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities |

Criteria

Innovation credits are open-ended and reserved for new, extraordinary, unique, groundbreaking, or uncommon outcomes, policies, and practices that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit or exemplary practice option.

- 1) In general, innovation credits should have roughly similar impacts or be on the same scale as other STARS credits.
- 2) Outcomes, policies, and practices that are innovative for the institution's region or institution type are eligible for innovation credits.
- 3) The innovative practice, policy, program, or outcome must be ongoing or have occurred within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.
- 4) The innovative practice or program has to be something that the institution has already implemented; planned activities do not count.
- 5) The innovative practice or program should originate from an area within the defined institutional boundary.
- 6) Practices, policies, and programs that were once considered innovative but are now widely adopted (e.g. being the first institution to enact a policy 20 years ago that is now common) may not be claimed as innovation credits.
- 7) Multiple activities or practices whose sum is innovative can be considered for an innovation credit as long as those activities or practices are related. Listing a series of unrelated accomplishments or events under a single innovation credit is not accepted.
- 8) While the practices that led to receiving an award may be appropriate for an innovation credit, winning awards and/or high sustainability rankings in other assessments is not, in and of itself, grounds for an innovation credit. When the innovation is part of a partnership, the summary provided must clearly describe the institution's role in the innovation.

An institution can only claim a particular activity as an innovation credit once. When re-submitting for a STARS rating, an innovation credit that the institution submitted previously cannot be re-submitted. However, an institution that has made significant advancements to a project or program that was previously submitted as an innovation may resubmit based on those advancements if the project or program is still considered innovative.

To help verify that the policy, practice, program, or outcome that the institution is claiming for an innovation credit is truly innovative, the institution may submit a letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise in the associated content area or a press release or publication featuring the innovation.

"---" indicates that no data was submitted for this field

Name or title of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome:

Off-Site Solar Projects
stars.aashe.org

A brief description of the innovative policy, practice, program, or outcome that outlines how credit criteria are met and any positive measurable outcomes associated with the innovation:

In 2016, two students solar projects were initiated and completed off-site for which the institution gained no financial or environmental benefit. These projects were completed by students on a volunteer basis neither for credit nor for pay.

Powering a School, Empowering a Community in Port-au-Prince, Haiti

Applicants: Valcourt Honoré ('17) and Kayla Nachtsheim ('14)

Description: This project was motivated by the question: how can renewable energy can provide affordable, reliable, and sustainable power for Valcourt Honoré's home country of Haiti?. A team of two Lewis & Clark students realized their vision to use renewable solar energy to sustainably power le Village des Petits Princes School. They established 9 solar panels with 2.745 kilowatts capacity and the necessary equipment to power le Village des Petits Princes School and its computer lab. In collaboration with Enersa solar power Company, Valcourt and Kayla traveled to Port-au-Prince to install the system and train 5 young people from the community in solar energy system maintenance.

Solar Energy Justice in Portland

Applicant: Kori Groenveld ('18) and Frances Swanson ('17)

Description: This project was initiated by two LC students to develop the partnerships, funding and education to install a 110 kw system on an affordable housing unit. More information about the project is here:

<https://ds.lclark.edu/oregonsolarpolicy/>

Which of the following impact areas does the innovation most closely relate to? (select up to three):

Air & Climate

Buildings

Energy

A letter of affirmation from an individual with relevant expertise or a press release or publication featuring the innovation :

[TriPhase_STARSInnovLetter.pdf](#)

The website URL where information about the programs or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:
