



Lewis & Clark College

STARS REPORT

Date Submitted: March 6, 2020

Rating: Gold

Score: 70.42

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

STARS Version: 2.2

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](#).

Summary of Results

Score 70.42

Rating: Gold

Report Preface

Introduction	0.00 / 0.00
Institutional Characteristics	0.00 / 0.00

Academics

Curriculum	26.83 / 40.00
Research	9.93 / 18.00

Engagement

Campus Engagement	12.50 / 21.00
Public Engagement	16.03 / 20.00

Operations

Air & Climate	10.00 / 11.00
Buildings	0.10 / 5.00
Energy	6.24 / 10.00
Food & Dining	4.09 / 8.00
Grounds	2.00 / 3.00
Purchasing	4.48 / 6.00
Transportation	4.72 / 7.00
Waste	5.30 / 9.00
Water	5.00 / 6.00

Planning & Administration

Coordination & Planning	6.63 / 9.00
Diversity & Affordability	8.37 / 10.00
Investment & Finance	4.02 / 6.00
Wellbeing & Work	5.42 / 7.00

Innovation & Leadership

Innovation & Leadership	3.25 / 3.50
-------------------------	-------------

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.

Report Preface

Introduction

Points Claimed 0.00

Points Available 0.00

This section provides the opportunity for an institution to highlight points of distinction and upload an executive letter to accompany its STARS Report.

Credit	Points
	0.00 /
Executive Letter	Total adjusted for non-applicable credits
	Close
	0.00 /
Points of Distinction	Total adjusted for non-applicable credits
	Close

Executive Letter

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

Criteria

This section allows an institution to upload a letter from the institution's president, chancellor, or other high ranking executive. Typically written on official letterhead, the executive letter serves as an introduction or cover letter for the institution's STARS report. As such, the letter may include a description of the institution's commitment to sustainability, background about the institution, key achievements or highlights from the report, and/or goals for future submissions. The letter also serves as indicator of administrative support for sustainability and the STARS process. Institutions are expected to submit a new executive letter when there has been a change in leadership or the institution is submitting for a higher rating.

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

Executive cover letter:

[STARS_2020ExecLetter_Signed.pdf](#)

Points of Distinction

Score

0.00 /

Total adjusted for non-applicable credits

Close

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

This optional section provides an opportunity for an institution to highlight up to three programs, initiatives, or accomplishments that best reflect its leadership for sustainability. Completing this section will help inform how AASHE publicizes the institution's STARS rating.

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

Name of the institution's featured sustainability program, initiative, or accomplishment:

Fossil Fuel Divestment

A brief description of the institution's featured program, initiative, or accomplishment:

In February 2018, Lewis & Clark College's Board of Trustees voted unanimously to divest from fossil fuel holdings in the endowment, approving the recommended policy changes prepared by a subcommittee formed to study the matter. Passing the resolution after multi-year conversations and study, the trustees affirmed that Lewis & Clark could simultaneously meet the critical objectives of best-in-class endowment management as well as environmental leadership. To reiterate, Lewis & Clark's fossil fuel divestment policy states:

Lewis & Clark's endowment shall not directly own any securities publicly issued by companies in the fossil fuel industry, specifically the largest owners of coal, oil, and natural gas reserves ("fossil fuel companies").

Starting immediately, Lewis & Clark will make no investments in any new fund that has exposure to fossil fuel companies.

Over the next five years (before Dec. 31, 2022) Lewis & Clark will eliminate exposure to fossil fuel companies held indirectly through public commingled strategies. In addition, the college will exit all private limited partnership investments holding fossil fuel companies as they mature, which will take more than five years.

Consistent with the college's existing ESG [Environmental, Social, and Governance] policy, Lewis & Clark will actively engage with existing investment managers to encourage them to adopt fossil fuel free investment options.

Lewis & Clark will provide an annual update to the broader campus community on holdings of fossil fuel securities in the endowment portfolio.

Which of the following impact areas does the featured program, initiative, or accomplishment most closely relate to?:

Campus Engagement
Investment & Finance

Website URL where more information about the accomplishment may be found:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/42223-divesting-from-fossil-fuels-a-progress-report>

STARS credit in which the featured program, initiative, or accomplishment is reported (if applicable):

Investment

A photograph or document associated with the featured program, initiative, or accomplishment:

Name of a second highlighted sustainability program/initiative/accomplishment:

Single Use Plastics policy

A brief description of the second program/initiative/accomplishment:

Single-Use Plastic Elimination Policy

The Lewis & Clark Sustainability Council formally endorses efforts by the Lewis & Clark community to remove beverages in plastic bottles from campus vending and catering while promoting policies and practices to eliminate plastic bottles sales entirely. This effort aims to eliminate waste created by single-use items, to reduce our reliance on products containing fossil fuels, and support higher value recyclable or reusable items across our campuses. This policy has been extended to include cutlery and plastic cups.

Which impact areas does the second program/initiative/accomplishment most closely relate to?:

Waste

Website URL where more information about the second program/initiative/accomplishment may be found:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/38782-lewis-clark-adopts-single-use-plastic>

STARS credit in which the second program/initiative/accomplishment is reported (if applicable):

Innovation

A photograph or document associated with the second program/initiative/accomplishment:

Name of a third highlighted program/initiative/accomplishment:

Sustainability & Entrepreneurship

A brief description of the third program/initiative/accomplishment:

Working with Lewis & Clark's Sustainability Council, the Bates Center for Entrepreneurship and Leadership is offering a class in sustainability and entrepreneurship this fall. Taught by Lewis & Clark Law Professor Dan Rohlf, it is open to all majors and focuses on current trends to address environmental, economic, and social disparities of the 21st century.

Which impact areas does the third program/initiative/accomplishment most closely relate to?:

Curriculum

Website URL where more information about the third program/initiative/accomplishment may be found:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/39871-new-course-examines-intersection-of-sustainability>

STARS credit in which the third program/initiative/accomplishment is reported (if applicable):

curriculum

A photograph or document associated with the third program/initiative/accomplishment:

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 academic structure. This information provides valuable context for understanding and interpreting STARS data. The category also provides the opportunity for an institution to highlight points of distinction and upload an executive letter to accompany its STARS Report.

Some of the values reported in IC-2 and IC-3 are also required to pursue specific STARS credits. Such reporting fields may be populated from the data provided in the Institutional Characteristics section of the Reporting Tool.

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

Institutional Boundary

Score

0.00 /

Total adjusted for non-applicable credits

[Close](#)

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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.

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

Institution type:

Baccalaureate

Institutional control:

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 or clinics (e.g. dental, nursing, pharmacy, public health, veterinary)	No	No
Museum	No	---
Satellite campus	No	No
Farm larger than 2 hectares or 5 acres	No	No
Agricultural experiment station larger than 2 hectares or 5 acres	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	Nicole Godbout Student Assistant Undergraduate
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:

238,045,000 *US/Canadian \$*

Total campus area:

137.37 *Acres*

Locale:

Urban fringe of large city

IECC climate zone:

4 - Mixed

Gross floor area of building space:

1,314,488 *Gross Square Feet*

Floor area of laboratory space:

68,839 *Square Feet*

Floor area of healthcare space:

2,907 *Square Feet*

Floor area of other energy intensive space:

0 *Square Feet*

Additional documentation to support the submission :

Academics and Demographics

Score	Responsible Party
0.00 /	
Total adjusted for non-applicable credits	Nicole Godbout Student Assistant Undergraduate
Close	

Criteria

This section includes variables that provide information about the institution's academic programs, students, and employees. 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:

3

Number of academic departments (or the equivalent):

41

Number of students enrolled for credit:

3,396

Total number of employees:

902

Full-time equivalent student enrollment:

3,214

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

0

Full-time equivalent of employees:

729

Number of students resident on-site:

1,333

Number of employees resident on-site:

6

Number of other individuals resident on-site:

0

Weighted campus users, performance year:

3,292

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[web-enrollment-report-2018-fallpdf.pdf](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Enrollment report for Fall 2018, IR Data from 10/23/18, HR Data for current
1.9.20: Amy updated residential student and staff numbers

Academics

Curriculum

Points Claimed 26.83

Points Available 40.00

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	11.74 / 14.00
Learning Outcomes	2.59 / 8.00
Undergraduate Program	3.00 / 3.00
Graduate Program	1.50 / 3.00
Immersive Experience	2.00 / 2.00
Sustainability Literacy Assessment	2.00 / 4.00
Incentives for Developing Courses	0.00 / 2.00
Campus as a Living Laboratory	4.00 / 4.00

Academic Courses

Score	Responsible Party
11.74 / 14.00	Nicole Godbout Student Assistant Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Sustainability course offerings

Institution offers sustainability course content as measured by the percentage of academic courses offered that are sustainability-focused or sustainability-inclusive (see Standards and Terms).

Part 2. Sustainability course offerings by department

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

Required documentation

Institution must provide an inventory conducted during the previous three years to identify its sustainability course offerings and describe for current and prospective students how each course addresses sustainability. For each course, the inventory must include:

- The title, department (or equivalent), and level of the course (e.g., undergraduate or graduate).
- A brief course description or rationale explaining why the course is included that references sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a sustainability challenge.
- An indication of whether the course qualifies as sustainability-focused or sustainability-inclusive (or equivalent terminology).

A course may be sustainability-focused or sustainability-inclusive; 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.

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.

"---" 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-focused courses offered	40	40
Number of sustainability-inclusive courses offered	76	56

Percentage of courses that are sustainability course offerings:

14.35

Total number of academic departments that offer courses:

41

Number of academic departments with sustainability course offerings:

37

Percentage of academic departments with sustainability course offerings:

90.24

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

[LC_SustainabilityCourses2018Update.xlsx](#)

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

Three

A brief description of the methodology used to complete the course inventory :

General:

Total course numbers are obtained from registrars and varies by year/term when the data is selected (2018-19 base year)

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 inclusive or 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:

Website URL where information about the sustainability course offerings 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 base year being AY 2018-19 and the last year being 19-20, without duplication.

Learning Outcomes

Score

2.59 / 8.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Institutional sustainability learning outcomes

Institution has adopted one or more sustainability learning outcomes that apply to the entire student body (e.g., general education requirements covering all students) or, at minimum, to the institution's predominant student body (e.g., learning outcomes that cover all undergraduate students).

The learning outcome(s) may be explicitly focused on sustainability or supportive of sustainability (see Standards and Terms). Mission, vision, and values statements do not qualify.

Part 2. Program-level sustainability learning outcomes

Institution's students graduate from degree programs that require an understanding of the concept of sustainability, i.e., programs that:

- Have been identified as sustainability-focused programs in the Undergraduate Program or Graduate Program credit,
- Have adopted one or more sustainability-focused learning outcomes (i.e., student learning outcomes that explicitly focus on the concept of sustainability or the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems), OR
- Require successful completion of a sustainability-focused course as identified in the Academic Courses credit.

This credit includes graduate as well as undergraduate programs. 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 to the program.

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

Has the institution adopted one or more sustainability learning outcomes that apply to the entire student body or, at minimum, to the institution's predominant student body?:

No

Which of the following best describes the sustainability learning outcomes?:

A list of the institution level sustainability learning outcomes:

The Graduate School of Education and Counseling includes social justice and social sustainability issues at the college level. These ideas are incorporated throughout the curriculum. For this reason, all graduates of this college are counted.

Total number of graduates from degree programs:

928

Number of graduates from degree programs that require an understanding of the concept of sustainability:

300

A brief description of how the figure above was determined:

This figure was determined by using AY end graduation data for:

- sustainability-focused degree programs or certificates
- sustainability-focused courses required as part of a course of study or certificate

A list of degree programs that require an understanding of the concept of sustainability:

Ecopsychology
Mental Health Counseling
Teaching
Environmental Law
Animal Law
Business Law
Energy, Innovation, and Sustainability
Entrepreneurship
Environmental Studies
Biology
Economics
Chemistry
History
Philosophy
Sociology/Anthropology

Documentation supporting the figure reported above (upload):

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

One

Percentage of students who graduate from programs that require an understanding of the concept of sustainability:

32.33

Website URL where information about the sustainability learning outcomes is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2017-2018 CDS data

Undergraduate Program

Score

3.00 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution offers at least one:

- Sustainability-focused program (major, degree, or certificate program) 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, a major, degree/certificate program, minor, or concentration must have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability or the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems.

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, or certificate program for undergraduate students?:

Yes

Name of the sustainability-focused undergraduate degree program:

Environmental Studies

A brief description of the undergraduate degree program:

Environmental studies (ENVS) at Lewis & Clark is unique: you will learn the newest concepts in the field and cultivate cutting-edge technical and leadership skills to make a creative difference. We will challenge you to cross intellectual, geographic, and communication boundaries as you weave insights drawn from across the sciences and humanities, apply them in local, regional, and global contexts, and learn strategies to connect with the people and institutions you encounter. In so doing, you will draw a larger—potentially more hopeful—circle around environmental issues. You will graduate with a background in environmental science situated in a broader understanding of cultural, political, and other key dimensions of environmental issues, plus skills and experience you can apply to professional opportunities, graduate study, and effective environmental action.

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 ENVS events.

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):

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):

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 or concentrations for undergraduate students?:

No

Name of the sustainability-focused undergraduate minor or concentration:

A brief description of the undergraduate minor or concentration:

Website URL for the undergraduate minor or concentration:

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

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

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

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

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

Website URL for the undergraduate minor or concentration (3rd program):

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Graduate Program

Score

1.50 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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, a program, minor, concentration, or certificate must have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability or the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems.

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 graduate students?:

No

Name of the sustainability-focused graduate-level degree program:

A brief description of the graduate-level degree program:

Website URL for the graduate-level degree program:

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

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

Website URL for the graduate degree program (2nd program):

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

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

Website URL for the graduate degree program (3rd program):

The name and website URLs of all other sustainability-focused graduate-level degree programs:

Does the institution offer one or more graduate-level sustainability-focused minors, concentrations or certificates?:

Yes

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

Energy, Innovation, and Sustainability

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

The Certificate in Energy, Innovation, and Sustainability Law is designed for students interested in practicing in the energy law or related fields. The certificate provides an important blend of both environmental and business law courses to reflect the expected competencies of a future energy law practitioner. The certificate also allows students to develop a deep understanding of the energy law field, as well as important practical and professional skills, by including a practical skills component.

Website URL for the graduate minor, concentration or certificate:

https://law.lclark.edu/programs/environmental_and_natural_resources_law/degrees/jd-degree-and-certificate-in-energy-innovation-and-sustainability-law/

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

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

Website URL for the graduate minor, concentration or certificate (2nd program):

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

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

Website URL for the graduate minor, concentration or certificate (3rd program):

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Immersive Experience

Score

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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.

To qualify, a program must have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, and/or a major sustainability challenge.

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:

The Law Schools offers courses sustainability focused courses; Sustainability Law and Business; Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Law; Renewable Energy Finance and Development; Environmental Justice. The Graduate school offers a certificate in Ecopsychology. The undergraduate school offers multiple sustainability focused courses, most recently Sustainability and Entrepreneurship .

Website URL where information about the institution's immersive education programs is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainability Literacy Assessment

Score

2.00 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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 exclusively 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 and participation by U.S. and Canadian institutions in the Sustainability Education Consortium (NSSE) are recognized in the Assessing Sustainability Culture credit in Campus Engagement.

An institution may use a single instrument that addresses sustainability literacy, culture, and/or engagement to meet the criteria for this credit if a substantive portion of the assessment (e.g., 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?:

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):

[Short_Version_-_Lewis__Clark_sustainability_survey.pdf](#)

A list or 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):

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

Website URL where information about the sustainability literacy assessment is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Incentives for Developing Courses

Score

0.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution has an ongoing program or programs that offer incentives for academic staff (i.e., faculty members) in multiple disciplines or departments to develop new sustainability courses and/or incorporate sustainability into existing courses or departments. To qualify, the program must specifically aim to increase student learning of sustainability.

Incentives may include release time, funding for professional development, or trainings offered by the institution. Incentives for expanding sustainability offerings in academic, non-credit, and/or continuing education courses count for this credit.

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

Campus as a Living Laboratory

Score

4.00 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution is utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability. The applied learning for sustainability initiative includes living laboratory projects that contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in at least one of the following impact areas:

- Campus Engagement
- Public Engagement
- Air & Climate
- Buildings
- Energy
- Food & Dining
- Grounds
- Purchasing
- Transportation
- Waste
- Water
- Coordination & Planning
- Diversity & Affordability
- Investment & Finance
- Wellbeing & Work

This credit includes substantive work (e.g., class projects, thesis projects, term papers, published papers) that involves active and experiential student learning (see the Credit Example in the Technical Manual). Supervised student internships and non-credit work 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).

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 infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Campus Engagement?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Campus Engagement?:

A graduate student in a practicum role is leading our climate plan campus engagement efforts.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Public Engagement?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Public Engagement:

A volunteer student, as part of the institution-wide Sustainability Council, organized a panel discussion on campus for the community to learn about and debate carbon tax policies.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Air & Climate?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Air & Climate:

A paid undergraduate student worker is assisting the Sustainability Office in developing a tool to estimate airline travel emissions.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Buildings?:

No

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Buildings:

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Energy?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Energy:

A student working as the Renewable Energy intern, manages a fund that helps students implement projects, complete research, and intern around topics of renewable energy.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Food & Dining?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Food & Dining:

Two paid student interns are collecting and analyzing data related to our food purchasing.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Grounds?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Grounds:

An undergraduate student is developing a map of native edible plants across campus as part of her senior thesis. Another student is planning and leading an invasive plant removal and educational event.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Purchasing?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Purchasing:

Several undergraduate students, as part of a class assignment, reviewed and made recommendations around the institution's current sustainable purchasing policy.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Transportation?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Transportation:

A paid undergraduate student is working to develop a GIS-based heat map examining the home addresses of our community members and analyzing potential to take public transportation from those locations.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Waste?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Waste:

A paid undergraduate student reviewed and make recommendations around how our institution could better collect information regarding waste and recycling production.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Water?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Water:

A group of students, as part of a class project, analyzed our bottled water ban as well as currently alternatives to plastic bottled water.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Coordination & Planning?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Coordination & Planning:

A student in a paid internship role, is currently leading our sustainability reporting efforts as well as verifying previous data.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Diversity & Affordability?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Diversity & Affordability:

A student acting as a volunteer for the institution-wide Sustainability Council is reviewing and identifying models for equity, diversity and inclusion as a lens for climate action.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Investment & Finance?:

Yes

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Investment & Finance:

A student-led club focused on socially responsible investing is managing a portion of the institution's invested 'Green Fee Fund' under ESG criteria. Students research funds and vote on potential new investments.

Is the institution utilizing its infrastructure and operations as a living laboratory for applied student learning for sustainability in relation to Wellbeing & Work?:

No

A brief description of the projects and how they contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability in relation to Wellbeing & Work:

Website URL where information about the institution's living laboratory program is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Research

Points Claimed 9.93

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	8.93 / 12.00
Support for Sustainability Research	1.00 / 4.00
Open Access to Research	0.00 / 2.00

Research and Scholarship

Score	Responsible Party
8.93 / 12.00	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Sustainability research

Institution produces sustainability research as measured by the percentage of employees who conduct research that are engaged in sustainability research.

Part 2. Sustainability research by department

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

Required documentation

Institution must provide an inventory conducted during the previous three years to identify its sustainability research activities and initiatives. The research inventory must be based on the definition of sustainability research outlined in Standards and Terms and include for each individual conducting sustainability research:

- Name
- Departmental affiliation
- Research interests/topics or a brief description justifying the individual's inclusion

Research for which partial or incomplete information is provided may not be counted toward earning points for this credit.

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

Total number of employees that conduct research:

160

Number of employees engaged in sustainability research:

30

Percentage of employees that conduct research that are engaged in sustainability research:

18.75

Total number of academic departments that include at least one employee who conducts research:

41

Number of academic departments that include at least one employee who conducts sustainability research:

15

Percentage of departments that conduct research that are engaged in sustainability research:

36.59

A copy of the inventory of the institution's sustainability research (upload):

[STARS_18-19research.xlsx](#)

Inventory of the institution's sustainability research:

A brief description of the methodology the institution followed to complete the research inventory:

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. Tenure or tenured tracked, full time faculty are considered as part of the total research pool.

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainability research is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Support for Sustainability Research

Score

1.00 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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 sustainability research. To qualify, the program must provide incentives (e.g., fellowships, financial support, and/or mentorships) that are specifically intended to increase student sustainability research.
 - An ongoing program to encourage academic staff from multiple disciplines or academic programs to conduct sustainability research. To qualify, the program must provide incentives (e.g., fellowships, financial support, and/or faculty development workshops) that are specifically intended to increase sustainability research by academic staff.
 - Published promotion or tenure guidelines or policies that give explicit positive recognition to interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and/or multidisciplinary research.
 - 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 sustainability research?:

No

A brief description of the student sustainability research program:

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

No

A brief description of the faculty sustainability research program:

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 copy of the promotion or tenure guidelines or policies:

The promotion or tenure guidelines or policies:

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:

Website URL where information about the institution's support for sustainability research is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Open Access to Research

Score

0.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution facilitates open access publishing in at least one of the following ways. The institution:

A. Offers institutional repository hosting that makes versions of journal articles, book chapters, and other peer-reviewed scholarly works by its employees freely available on the public internet. The open access repository may be managed by the institution or the institution may participate in a consortial and/or outsourced open access repository.

B. Has a published policy that requires its employees to publish scholarly works open access or archive final post-peer reviewed (a.k.a. "author's accepted manuscript") versions of scholarly works in an open access repository.

While the policy may allow for publisher embargoes and/or provide a waiver option that allows authors to opt-out of the open access license/program for individual articles, policies and commitments that are strictly voluntary (i.e., opt-in) do not qualify. Likewise, open access policies published by external funding agencies do not qualify in the absence of a formal institutional policy.

C. Provides an open access article processing charge (APC) fund for employees that includes specified criteria and an application process. Discounts and ad hoc funding for APCs do not qualify in the absence of a formal ongoing program.

D. Provides open access journal hosting services (directly or through participation in a consortium) through which peer-reviewed open access journals are hosted on local servers with dedicated staff who provide publishing support at no (or minimal) cost.

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.

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 12.50

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 help integrate sustainability into the campus culture and set a positive tone for the institution.

In addition, this subcategory recognizes institutions that support employee engagement, training and development programs in sustainability. Employees' daily decisions impact an institution's sustainability performance and employees can model sustainable behavior for students and the rest of the campus community. Equipping employees 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	2.00 / 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 and Training	1.50 / 2.00

Student Educators Program

Score

0.00 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Percentage of students served by a peer-to-peer, sustainability educators program

Institution engages its students in sustainability outreach and education as measured by the percentage of students served (i.e., directly targeted) by a peer-to-peer educators program.

Part 2. Educator hours per student served by a peer-to-peer program

Institution engages its students in sustainability outreach and education as measured by the ratio of the number of hours worked by trained student educators to the number of students served by a peer-to-peer program.

To earn points for this credit, an institution must coordinate an ongoing, peer-to-peer sustainability outreach and education program for students that is explicitly focused on sustainability. 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.

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

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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., environmental, social, 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 students that are provided an opportunity to participate in orientation activities and programming that prominently include sustainability:

100

A brief description of how sustainability is included prominently in new student orientation :

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 the incoming student body.

Website URL where information about sustainability in student orientation is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Student Life

Score

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

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
- 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)
- 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 focused on sustainability
- Cultural arts events, installations or performances focused on sustainability
- Wilderness or outdoors programs (e.g., that organize hiking, backpacking, kayaking, or other outings for students) that follow Leave No Trace principles
- Sustainability-focused themes chosen for themed semesters, years, or first-year experiences (e.g., choosing a sustainability-focused 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

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 an active student group focused on sustainability?:

Yes

Name and a brief description of the active student groups focused on sustainability:

Law School Sustainability Group, sub-group of Natural Resources Committee.
Students Engaged in Eco-Defense is dedicated to creating a more sustainable and just world. Our focus is to bring green, sustainable practices to Lewis & Clark College and conduct outreach to the larger community.

Does the institution have a garden, farm, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery program, or an urban agriculture project 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 three student gardens that provide various opportunities to engage in alternative farming and gardening practices as well as therapy gardens.

Does the institution have a student-run enterprise that includes sustainability as part of its mission statement or stated purpose?:

No

A brief description of the student-run enterprises:

Does the institution have a sustainable investment fund, green revolving fund, or sustainable microfinance initiative 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 club

Has the institution hosted a conference, speaker series, symposium, or similar event focused on sustainability during the previous three years that had students as the intended audience?:

Yes

A brief description of the conferences, speaker series, symposia, or similar events focused on sustainability:

The institution has held an annual speaker series called 'Hot Topics' focused on sustainability related issues.

Has the institution hosted a cultural arts event, installation, or performance focused on sustainability with the previous three years that had students as the intended audience?:

Yes

A brief description of the cultural arts events, installations, or performances focused on sustainability:

For the climate march, the LC Graduate School of Education held a community art event where students, faculty and staff could co-contribute content to an installation.

Does the institution have a wilderness or outdoors program 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. Leave no trace principles are followed, see webpage for more info.

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/25530-policybrochure2018pdf>

Has the institution had a sustainability-focused theme chosen for a themed semester, year, or first-year experience during the previous three years?:

No

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

Does the institution have a program 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

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

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

No

A brief description of the graduation pledge(s):

A brief description of other co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives that do not fall into one of the above categories:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Outreach Materials and Publications

Score

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

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 newsletter or social media platform (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, or interactive blog) that focuses specifically on campus sustainability
- Signage that highlights sustainability features on campus
- A sustainability walking map or tour
- A guide for green living and/or incorporating sustainability into the residential experience

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 Campus Engagement.

"---" 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

Website URL for the central sustainability website:

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

Does the institution have a sustainability newsletter or social media platform that focuses specifically on campus sustainability?:

Yes

A brief description of the sustainability newsletter or social media platform:

The Sustainability Office produces a newsletter that goes out to an institution-wide listserv.

Does the institution have signage that highlights sustainability features on campus?:

Yes

A brief description of the signage that highlights sustainability features on campus:

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

Does the institution provide 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.

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/or incorporating sustainability into the residential experience:

Resident advisors provide information about sustainable living at hall meetings and within periodic communications to residents.

A brief description of other comprehensive sustainability outreach materials and publications not covered above:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Outreach Campaign

Score	Responsible Party
4.00 / 4.00	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Student outreach campaign

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. Employee outreach campaign

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 a 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 a 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:

Divestment from Fossil Fuels

A brief description of the campaign:

In 2018, the Lewis & Clark College Board of Trustees voted to divest from all fossil fuel holdings in the endowment by 2023. Lewis & Clark is one of about 30 colleges and universities nationwide to make this commitment, according to the international environmental group

[350.org](https://www.350.org)

. This campaign was run by Lewis & Clark's Students Engaged in Eco-Defense (SEED) club. Report here:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/38897-the-dividends-of-divestment>

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

Lewis & Clark divestment process is ongoing, with full divested from fossil fuels by 2030.

Name of the campaign (2nd campaign):

Transportation & Parking program improvements

A brief description of the campaign (2nd campaign):

Over the last two years, the institution has launched several T&P related projects to reduce our transportation related impacts. This has included increasing the subsidy for public transit, launching a WAZE carpool program and instituting a bike share.

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

Transit sales have increased by more than 10% and bike awareness and interest has increased among students and staff.

A brief description of other sustainability-related outreach campaigns:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Assessing Sustainability Culture

Score

0.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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. Likewise, assessments that exclusively address sustainability literacy (i.e., knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges) are excluded. Literacy assessments are recognized in the Sustainability Literacy Assessment credit in Curriculum.

Participation by U.S. and Canadian institutions in the Sustainability Education Consortium (NSSE) qualifies as a cultural assessment.

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

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Percentage of employees served by a peer-to-peer educators program

Institution engages its employees in sustainability outreach and education as measured by the percentage of employees served (i.e., directly targeted) by a peer-to-peer educators program.

Part 2. Educator hours per employee served by a peer-to-peer program

Institution engages its employees in sustainability outreach and education as measured by the ratio of the number of hours worked by trained employee educators to the number of employees served by a peer-to-peer program.

To earn points for this credit, an institution must administer or oversee an ongoing, peer-to-peer sustainability outreach and education program for employees. The institution:

- Selects or appoints employees to serve as peer educators and formally designates the employees as educators (paid and/or volunteer);
- Provides formal training to the employee 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.

To qualify, a program must be explicitly focused on sustainability. The peer educators must also 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 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 and Training 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

1.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

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

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

Percentage of new employees that are offered orientation and/or outreach and guidance materials that cover sustainability topics:

100

A brief description of how sustainability is included in new employee orientation:

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

Website URL where information about sustainability in employee orientation is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Staff Professional Development and Training

Score	Responsible Party
1.50 / 2.00	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Availability of professional development and training in sustainability

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

Part 2. Participation in professional development and training in sustainability

Institution's regular (full-time and part-time) non-academic 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 include:

- Training to integrate sustainability knowledge and skills into the workplace;
- Lifelong learning and continuing education in sustainability; and/or
- 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 or training opportunity to count, the institution must offer financial or other support (e.g., payment, reimbursement, or subsidy).

This credit applies to non-academic staff members only; it does not include academic staff, i.e., 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 non-academic staff at least once per year?:

Yes

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

Yes

Estimated percentage of regular, non-academic staff that participates annually in sustainability professional development and training:

25-49%

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

The institution holds several events that include training and education components. For example, a sustainability course is included in annual staff training which is open to all employees. Sustainability program elements are also included in the Benefits and Wellness Fair, through Sustainability Office program related to our climate action plan, and via tours/annual events.

A brief description of any external professional development and training opportunities in sustainability that are supported by the institution :

Classes offered are free of charge at the institution

Estimated percentage of regular non-academic staff for which sustainability is included in performance reviews:

0

A brief description of how sustainability is included in staff performance reviews :

Website URL where information about staff professional development and training in sustainability is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Public Engagement

Points Claimed 16.03

Points Available 20.00

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, nonprofit 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	3.00 / 5.00
Community Service	3.53 / 5.00
Participation in Public Policy	2.00 / 2.00
Trademark Licensing	2.00 / 2.00

Community Partnerships

Score

3.00 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution has one or more formal community partnership(s) with school districts, government agencies, private sector organizations, civil society organizations, and/or other external entities to work together to advance sustainability on a regional, municipal, community, or neighborhood scale.

This may be demonstrated by having an active community partnership that addresses sustainability challenges in the broader community and meets at least two of the following criteria. The partnership is:

- Financially or materially supported by the institution.
- Multi-year or ongoing (rather than a short-term project or event).
- Sustainability-focused, i.e., its primary and explicit focus is on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a major sustainability challenge.
- Inclusive and participatory, i.e., underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations are engaged as equal partners in strategic planning, decision-making, implementation, and review.

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

Community-based research and engaged scholarship around sustainability challenges 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 covered in the Community Service credit and should not be included in this credit.

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

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

GPSEN

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?:

Sustainability-focused

Are underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations engaged as equal partners? :

Yes

A brief description of the institution's formal community partnership to advance sustainability:

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. In 2019, Lewis & Clark, along with OMSI and GSPEN, hosted a Virtual Bridge to COP25 on our campus to help our community engage in valuable local discussions about climate change and connect with leaders in Madrid. Also in 2019, President Wim Wiewel, attended the COP25 as a delegation with the Climate Leadership Network, part of Second Nature's commitment to acceleration climate change through higher education.

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):

Sustainability-related

Are underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations engaged as equal partners? (2nd partnership):

Not Sure

A brief description of the institution's formal community partnership to advance sustainability (2nd partnership):

The institution is a founding member of the Intentional Endowments Network. Our Chief Investment Officer served as a steering committee member for the Intentional Endowments Network from 2016-2018, and was also 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. As of 2019 we use an outsourced CIO.

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

Second Nature

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? (3rd partnership):

Sustainability-focused

Are underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations engaged as equal partners? (3rd partnership):

Not Sure

A brief description of the institution's formal community partnership to advance sustainability (3rd partnership):

President Wim Wiewel is on the Board of Second Nature on the Climate Leadership Steering Committee. The Climate Leadership Network is comprised of colleges and universities in nearly every state and the District of Columbia who are taking action on climate change and preparing students through research and education to solve the challenges of the 21st century.

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

Website URL where information about the institution's community partnerships to advance sustainability is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Inter-Campus Collaboration

Score

2.50 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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 a member of a national or international higher education sustainability network.
 - Actively participates in a regional, state/provincial, or local higher education sustainability network.
 - Has presented at a higher education sustainability conference during the previous year.
 - Has submitted a case study or the equivalent during the previous year to an external higher education sustainability resource center (e.g., AASHE's Campus Sustainability Hub or EAUC's Sustainability Exchange) or awards program.
 - Has had employees or students serving on a board or committee of an external higher education 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 employees 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.
-

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

Is the institution currently a member of a national or international higher education sustainability network?:

Yes

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

GPSEN

Does the institution actively participate in a regional, state/provincial, or local higher education sustainability network?:

Yes

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

WOHESC, Oregon and Washington

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

Yes

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

GPSEN conference in January 2017; AASHE conference in October 2019.

Has the institution submitted a case study during the previous year to an external higher education sustainability resource center or awards program?:

No

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

Has the institution had employees or students 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):

GPSEN and Second Nature.

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?:

Yes

A brief description of the mentoring relationship and activities:

Lewis & Clark College participated in the AASHE mentorship program for the last three years (2016-19).

Has the institution had employees or students serving as peer reviewers of another institution's sustainability data and/or STARS submission during the previous three years?:

No

A brief description of the peer review activities:

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

Website URL where information about the institution's inter-campus collaborations is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Continuing Education

Score

3.00 / 5.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Continuing education courses in sustainability

Institution's offers continuing education courses that are sustainability-focused or sustainability-inclusive (see Standards and Terms).

Required documentation

Institution must provide an inventory conducted during the previous three years to identify its continuing education sustainability course offerings and describe for current and prospective students how each course addresses sustainability. For each course, the inventory must include:

- The title and department (or equivalent) of the course.
- A brief course description or rationale explaining why the course is included that references sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a sustainability challenge.

Courses for which partial or incomplete information is provided may not be counted toward earning points for this credit. 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 2. Sustainability-focused certificate program

Institution has at least one sustainability-focused certificate program through its continuing education or extension department (or the equivalent).

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

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

Total number of continuing education courses offered:

94

Number of continuing education courses that are sustainability course offerings:

17

Percentage of continuing education courses that are sustainability course offerings:

18.09

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

[LC_SustainabilityCourses2018Update_Fs1a4iz.xlsx](#)

Institution's inventory of its continuing education sustainability course offerings and descriptions:

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

Does the institution have at least one sustainability-focused certificate program through its continuing education or extension department?:

No

A brief description of the certificate program(s):

Lewis & Clark's Ecopsychology Certificate program provides an opportunity for practitioners and graduate students to enhance their training with an evidence-based, experiential, and socially progressive ecopsychology curriculum. Certificate coursework explores questions like:

How do green spaces support the healthy development of children—and of communities?

What happens when you bring nature into the counseling office? Or when you take therapy outdoors?

How can psychological insights invigorate conservation efforts and support advocacy for social justice and community wellbeing?

Website URL where information about the institution's continuing education courses and programs in sustainability is available:

https://graduate.lclark.edu/departments/counseling_psychology/ecopsychology/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Community Service

Score

3.53 / 5.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Percentage of students participating in community service

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

Part 2. Community service hours per student

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

Part 3. Employee community service program

Institution has a formal program to support employee volunteering during regular work hours, for example by offering paid time off for volunteering or by sponsoring an organized service event for which employees are compensated.

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

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 1 of this credit (student participation in community service)?:

Yes

Total number of students:

3,419

Number of students engaged in community service:

1,186

Percentage of students engaged in community service:

34.69

Does the institution wish to pursue Part 2 of this credit (community service hours)?:

Yes

Total number of student community service hours contributed annually:

209,417.91

Number of annual community service hours contributed per student :

61.25

Does the institution have a formal program to support employee volunteering during regular work hours?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's program to support employee volunteering:

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

Does the institution track the number of employee community service hours contributed through programs it sponsors?:

Total number of employee community service hours contributed annually through programs sponsored by the institution:

Website URL where information about the institution's community service programs is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Undergraduate: Harold McNaron, Director of Student Leadership and Service
Grad School: Barbara A. Shepperson Director of Research & Assessment
Law School: Carra Sahler, J.D., Director of Public Interest Law, Career Services

Participation in Public Policy

Score

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

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
- 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, or employees who are acting as representatives of the institution or its governance bodies may count. Advocacy by students or employees 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?:

No

A brief description of how the institution engages in public policy advocacy for sustainability at the municipal/local level:

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:

The institution provided support and advocacy for cap and trade legislation state-wide. Please see the email below, the actual submitted document included only a logo, which is attached.

Email from President:
Fwd: HB2020 in Oregon
Inbox
x
Wim Wiewel <

wim@lclark.edu

>

AttachmentsMar 7, 2019, 2:38 PM

to David, Timothy, smuzzy, ehoward, Katharina, me, Janice
Dave,

Any comments on this? I'd be happy to sign on.

Wim

Wim Wiewel
President
Lewis and Clark College
0615 SW Palatine Hill Road
Portland, OR 97219-7899
(503) 768-7680

www.lclark.edu

wim@lclark.edu

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

Yes

A brief description of how the institution engages in public policy advocacy for sustainability at the national level:

We Are Still In

<https://www.wearestillin.com/signatories>

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:

Signatory to Investor Agenda's Global Investor Statement To Governments on Climate Change. This effort was approved by our Sustainability Council, Board of Trustees, CFO and President. See our

name listed here:

<https://theinvestoragenda.org/focus-areas/policy-advocacy/>

Email from President:
Wim Wiewel <

wim@lclark.edu

>

Tue, Nov 5, 2019, 3:09 PM

to Janice, Katharina, me, Andrea, jouni, David
Colleagues,

Per the discussion at the Board's Investment Committee, and at the suggestion of Cambridge Associates, I have signed Lewis & Clark on to the Investor Agenda's Global Investor Statement To Governments on Climate Change.

Their website is The Investor Agenda, and the statement is under their Policy Agenda. It appears they last updated their list of signatories on September 17, so I don't know how soon our name will appear.

Wim

Wim Wiewel
President
Lewis and Clark College
0615 SW Palatine Hill Road
Portland, OR 97219-7899
(503) 768-7680

www.lclark.edu

wim@lclark.edu

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

Also, signed the SDG Accord:

<https://www.sdgaccord.org/climateletter>

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

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainability advocacy efforts is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:
[OR_HB2020_Cap_and_Invest_Support_Letter.pdf](#)

Trademark Licensing

Score

2.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution ensures that apparel bearing its name/logo is produced under fair working conditions by:

- Maintaining current membership in the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC), the Fair Labor Association (FLA), or (for institutions outside the U.S., Canada, and the U.K.), an equivalent independent monitoring and verification organization that has been approved by AASHE; OR
- Adopting a labor rights code of conduct in its licensing agreements with licensees who produce its logo apparel without maintaining institutional membership in an independent monitoring and verification organization.

To qualify, a labor rights code of conduct must be consistent in all respects with the [WRC Model Code of Conduct](#), the [FLA Workplace Code of Conduct](#), or the [International Labour Organisation \(ILO\) fundamental Conventions](#).

The companies, suppliers, and licensees that an institution works with may also participate in monitoring and verification organizations, thereby helping to ensure fair labor practices are applied throughout the supply chain, however these activities are not sufficient to earn points in this credit.

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

Is the institution a member of the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC)?:

Yes

Is the institution currently a member of the Fair Labor Association (FLA)? :

Yes

Is the institution currently a member of an equivalent independent monitoring and verification organization approved by AASHE?:

No

A brief description of the independent monitoring and verification organization:

Has the institution adopted a labor rights code of conduct in its licensing agreements with the licensees who produce its logo apparel?:

No

A copy of the labor rights code of conduct for licensees:

The labor rights code of conduct for licensees:

Website URL where information about the institution's trademark licensing initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Operations

Air & Climate

Points Claimed 10.00

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
Emissions Inventory and Disclosure	2.00 / 3.00
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	8.00 / 8.00

Emissions Inventory and Disclosure

Score

2.00 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Greenhouse gas emissions inventory

Institution has completed an inventory to quantify its Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The inventory may also:

- Include Scope 3 GHG emissions from one or more of the following sources:
 - Business travel (the transportation of employees and students for institution-related activities in vehicles owned or operated by third parties)
 - Commuting (regular commuting to and from the institution by students and employees)
 - Purchased goods and services (e.g., food and paper)
 - Capital goods (e.g., equipment, machinery, buildings, facilities, and vehicles)
 - Fuel- and energy-related activities not included in Scope 1 or 2
 - Waste generated in operations (solid waste and/or wastewater disposal/treatment in facilities owned or operated by third parties)
 - Other sources not included in Scope 1 or 2 (e.g., student travel to/from home)
- Have been verified by an independent, external third party or validated internally by personnel who are independent of the GHG accounting and reporting process.

Part 2. Air pollutant emissions inventory

Institution has completed an inventory to quantify its air pollutant emissions. The inventory includes at least nitrogen oxides (NOx) and sulfur oxides (SOx). It may also include other standard categories of toxic air emissions - e.g., carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), and so on - from one or more of the following:

- Major stationary sources (e.g., combustion-based energy plants, boilers, furnaces, and generators)
- Area sources (minor stationary sources such as paint booths, book preservation operations, and wastewater treatment plants)
- Mobile sources (e.g., campus fleet, other motorized vehicles, and lawn care equipment)
- Commuting
- Off-site electricity production

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

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

Yes

A copy of the most recent GHG emissions inventory:

[Copy_of_GHG_2018_Autosaved.xlsm](#)

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

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 GHG inventory verification process:

Documentation to support the GHG inventory verification process:

Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions, performance year:

	Weight in MTCO ₂ e
Stationary combustion	2,937 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent
Other sources (mobile combustion, process emissions, fugitive emissions)	247.80 Metric Tons of CO ₂ Equivalent

Total gross Scope 1 GHG emissions, performance year:

3,184.80 *Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent*

Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions, performance year (market-based):

	Weight in MTCO2e
Imported electricity	3,194 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Imported thermal energy	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>

Total gross Scope 2 GHG emissions, performance year:

3,194 *Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent*

Gross GHG emissions from biogenic sources, performance year:

0 *Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent*

Does the GHG emissions inventory include Scope 3 emissions from the following sources?:

	Yes or No	Weight in MTCO2e
Business travel	Yes	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Commuting	Yes	1,461.20 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Purchased goods and services	---	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Capital goods	---	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Fuel- and energy-related activities not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2	---	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Waste generated in operations	Yes	10.30 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Other sources	Yes	212.40 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>

Total Scope 3 GHG emissions, performance year:

1,683.90 *Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent*

A brief description of how the institution accounted for its Scope 3 emissions:

clean air calculator

Has the institution completed an inventory within the previous three years to quantify its air pollutant emissions?:

Yes

Annual weight of emissions for::

	Weight of Emissions
Nitrogen oxides (NOx)	2.76 <i>Tons</i>
Sulfur oxides (SOx)	0.11 <i>Tons</i>

	Weight of Emissions
Carbon monoxide (CO)	2.32 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	0.40 Tons

Do the air pollutant emissions figures provided include the following sources?:

	Yes or No
Major stationary sources	Yes
Area sources	---
Mobile sources	Yes
Commuting	No
Off-site electricity production	No

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.

Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from purchased electricity (location-based):

Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from imported thermal energy (location-based) :

Website URL where information about the institution’s emissions inventories is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Score	Responsible Party
8.00 / 8.00	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. GHG emissions per person

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

Part 2. GHG emissions per unit of floor area

Institution's annual adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions are less than the minimum performance threshold of 0.215 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) per gross square metre (0.02 MTCO₂e per gross square foot) of floor area.

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 Standards and Terms).

Carbon sinks

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

- Third-party verified, purchased carbon offsets
- Institution-catalyzed carbon offsets (popularly known as “local offsets”)
- Carbon storage from on-site composting. The compost may be produced off-site, but must originate from on-site materials and be returned to the campus for use as a soil amendment.

Purchased carbon offsets that have not been third-party verified do not count. Consistent with the Sustainability Indicator Management & Analysis Platform (SIMAP) and relevant protocols from The Offset Network, non-additional sequestration does not count, but may be reported in the optional reporting field provided.

Scope 2 GHG emissions totals should include accounting for any contractual procurement and sales/transfer of renewable energy, e.g., Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), and International RECs (I-RECs). Such products may not be counted as carbon offsets.

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

Gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions:

	Performance year	Baseline year
Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from stationary combustion	2,937 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	3,818 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from other sources	247.80 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	82 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from imported electricity	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	8,342 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from imported thermal energy	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Total	3,184.80 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	12,242 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>

Figures needed to determine net carbon sinks:

	Performance year	Baseline year
Third-party verified carbon offsets purchased	3,185 <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 storage from on-site composting	10 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>
Carbon storage from non-additional sequestration	0 <i>Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent</i>	---

	Performance year	Baseline year
Carbon sold or transferred	0 Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent	0 Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent
Net carbon sinks	3,195 Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent	700 Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent

A brief description of the carbon sinks, including vendor, project source, verification program and contract timeframes (as applicable):

The institution annually purchases market-based RECs to offset the entirety of our electricity use (scope 2 emissions) each year. Additionally, the institution purchases market-based carbon offsets to offset our scope 1 and scope 3 carbon emissions - including commuting, airline travel and some purchased goods, to the extent we are able to quantify those emissions.

Offsets:

Bear Creek Watershed Forest Carbon Project - vendor: terrapass, contract: 154688 Time: April 2019

On-site composting: carbon storage resulting from on-site composting includes all landscape material removed from campus which is composted on a campus. Material is 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.

Adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions:

	Performance year	Baseline year
Adjusted net GHG emissions	0 Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent	11,542 Metric Tons of CO2 Equivalent

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

	Performance year	Baseline year
Start date	Jan. 1, 2018	Jan. 1, 2005
End date	Dec. 31, 2018	Dec. 31, 2005

A brief description of when and why the GHG emissions baseline was adopted:

Earliest, consistently-measured baseline

Figures needed to determine “Weighted Campus Users”:

	Performance year	Baseline year
Number of students resident on-site	1,333	1,199
Number of employees resident on-site	6	0
Number of other individuals resident on-site	0	0
Total full-time equivalent student enrollment	3,214	3,153

	Performance year	Baseline year
Full-time equivalent of employees	729	695
Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education	0	0
Weighted Campus Users	3,292	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:

100

Gross floor area of building space, performance year:

1,314,488 *Gross Square Feet*

Floor area of energy intensive building space, performance year:

	Floor area
Laboratory space	68,839 <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:

1,457,980 *Gross Square Feet*

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

0 *MtCO2e / GSF*

A brief description of the institution's GHG emissions reduction initiatives:

Website URL where information about the institution's GHG emissions is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2018 GHG profile

Buildings

Points Claimed 0.10

Points Available 5.00

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 Design and Construction	Not Applicable
Building Operations and Maintenance	0.10 / 5.00

Building Design and Construction

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution-owned buildings that were constructed or underwent major renovations in the previous five years were designed and built in accordance with a published green building code, policy/guideline, and/or rating system.

Green building codes, policies/guidelines, and rating systems may be:

- Multi-attribute: addressing location and transportation, sustainable sites, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, material and resources, and indoor environmental quality (e.g., BREEAM, LEED BD+C, and similar programs); OR
- Single-attribute: focusing predominantly on one aspect of sustainability such as energy/water efficiency, human health and wellbeing, or sustainable sites.

Building space that is third party certified under a multi-attribute green building rating system developed/ administered by a WorldGBC member Green Building Council (GBC) is weighted more heavily for scoring purposes than space designed and built under other standards and policies/programs. For more information, see [Examples of Multi-attribute and Single-attribute Building Frameworks](#).

Floor area designed and built in accordance with multiple green building codes, policies/guidelines, and/or rating systems should not be double-counted.

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

No new construction or major renovation projects were completed within the previous five years.

Building Operations and Maintenance

Score

0.10 / 5.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution's buildings are operated and maintained in accordance with a sustainable management policy/ program and/or a green building rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings, e.g. LEED®: Building Operations + Maintenance (O+M).

Sustainable operations and maintenance policies/programs and rating systems may be:

- Multi-attribute: addressing water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, material and resources, and indoor environmental quality (e.g., BREEAM-In Use, LEED O+M, and similar programs); OR
- Single-attribute: less comprehensive; focusing predominantly on either resource use (i.e., energy and/or water efficiency) or indoor environmental quality (e.g., green cleaning, indoor air quality, and integrated pest management).

Building space that is third party certified under a multi-attribute green building rating system developed/ administered by a WorldGBC member Green Building Council (GBC) is weighted more heavily for scoring purposes than space operated and maintained under other standards and policies/programs. For more information, see [Examples of Multi-attribute and Single-attribute Building Frameworks](#).

Floor area operated and maintained under multiple O+M policies/programs and/or rating systems should not be double-counted.

Building space that is certified only under a green building rating system for new construction and major renovation does not count 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 existing building space:

1,303,887 Square Feet

Floor area of existing building space operated and maintained in accordance with a sustainable management policy/program and/or a green building rating system:

	Existing floor area
Certified at the highest achievable level under a multi-attribute, Green Building Council (GBC) rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings (e.g., LEED O+M Platinum)	0 Square Feet
Certified at the 2nd highest level under a 4- or 5-tier, multi-attribute, GBC rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings (e.g., LEED O+M Gold)	0 Square Feet
Certified at mid-level under a 3- or 5-tier, multi-attribute, GBC rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings (e.g., BREEAM-In Use Very Good)	0 Square Feet

	Existing floor area
Certified at a step above minimum level under a 4 -or 5-tier, multi-attribute, GBC rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings (e.g., LEED O+M Silver)	0 <i>Square Feet</i>
Certified at minimum level under a multi-attribute, GBC rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings (e.g., BREEAM In-Use Pass or LEED O+M Certified)	0 <i>Square Feet</i>
Certified at any level under a non-GBC rating system or single-attribute rating system focused on the operations and maintenance of existing buildings	52,000 <i>Square Feet</i>
Operated and maintained in accordance with a multi-attribute, sustainable management policy/program, but not certified under an O+M rating system	0 <i>Square Feet</i>
Operated and maintained in accordance with a single-attribute, sustainable management policy/program, but not certified under an O+M rating system	0 <i>Square Feet</i>
Total	52,000 <i>Square Feet</i>

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

3.99

A brief description of the sustainable operations and maintenance policy/program and/or O+M rating system(s) used:

Green Globes - Existing Building; Holmes Hall

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainable operations and maintenance program is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Energy

Points Claimed 6.24

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 Efficiency	4.67 / 6.00
Clean and Renewable Energy	1.57 / 4.00

Building Energy Efficiency

Score

4.67 / 6.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Reduction in source energy use per unit of floor area

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

Part 2. Site energy use per unit of floor area

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

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

Electricity use, performance year (report kilowatt-hours):

	kWh	MMBtu
Imported electricity	10,447,640 <i>Kilowatt-hours</i>	35,647.35 <i>MMBtu</i>
Electricity from on-site, non-combustion facilities/devices (e.g., renewable energy systems)	16,910 <i>Kilowatt-hours</i>	57.70 <i>MMBtu</i>

Stationary fuels and thermal energy, performance year (report MMBtu):

	MMBtu
Stationary fuels used on-site to generate electricity and/or thermal energy	55,088 <i>MMBtu</i>
Imported steam, hot water, and/or chilled water	0 <i>MMBtu</i>

Total site energy consumption, performance year:

90,793.04 *MMBtu*

Gross floor area of building space, performance year:

1,314,488 *Gross Square Feet*

Floor area of energy intensive space, performance year:

	Floor area
Laboratory space	68,839 <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:

1,457,980 *Gross Square Feet*

Degree days, performance year:

	Degree days
Heating degree days	3,881 <i>Degree-Days (°F)</i>
Cooling degree days	542 <i>Degree-Days (°F)</i>

Total degree days, performance year:

4,423 *Degree-Days (°F)*

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

	Start date	End date
Performance period	Jan. 1, 2018	Dec. 31, 2018

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

14.08 Btu / GSF / Degree-Day (°F)

Electricity use, baseline year (report kWh):

	kWh	MMBtu
Imported electricity	15,800,989 <i>Kilowatt-hours</i>	53,912.97 <i>MMBtu</i>
Electricity from on-site, non-combustion facilities/devices (e.g., renewable energy systems)	0 <i>Kilowatt-hours</i>	0 <i>MMBtu</i>

Stationary fuels and thermal energy, baseline year (report MMBtu):

	MMBtu
Stationary fuels used on-site to generate electricity and/or thermal energy	71,794 <i>MMBtu</i>
Imported steam, hot water, and/or chilled water	0 <i>MMBtu</i>

Total site energy consumption, baseline year:

125,706.97 *MMBtu*

Gross floor area of building space, baseline year:

1,245,427 *Gross Square Feet*

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

	Start date	End date
Baseline period	Jan. 1, 2005	Dec. 31, 2005

A brief description of when and why the energy consumption baseline was adopted:

2005 baseline used as standard where data is available

Source-site ratio for imported electricity:

3.14

Total energy consumption per unit of floor area:

	Site energy	Source energy
Performance year	0.07 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i>	0.13 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i>
Baseline year	0.10 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i>	0.19 <i>MMBtu / GSF</i>

Percentage reduction in total source energy consumption per unit of floor area from baseline:

34.34

Documentation to support the performance year energy consumption figures reported above:

[Copy_of_GHG_2018_Autosaved.xlsm](#)

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to shift individual attitudes and practices in regard to energy efficiency:

Employee fairs, student events/activities, new student orientation, new employee orientation, employee development offerings

A brief description of energy use standards and controls employed by the institution:

Building control management via building monitoring, energy star reporting and tracking controls were use in the past

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:

Passive heating and cooling is used in two buildings on campus, daylighting strategies are used in numerous locations

A brief description of co-generation employed by the institution:

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to replace energy-consuming appliances, equipment, and systems with high efficiency alternatives:

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

Website URL where information about the institution's energy conservation and efficiency program is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

<https://portfoliomanager.energystar.gov/pm/degreeDaysCalculator>

Clean and Renewable Energy

Score	Responsible Party
1.57 / 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:

Clean and renewable electricity

1. Purchasing or otherwise importing electricity from certified/verified clean and renewable sources. This includes utility-provided green power purchasing options, power purchase agreements (PPAs) for electricity generated off-site, and equivalent products that bundle physical electricity with the right to claim its renewable energy attributes.
2. Generating electricity from clean and renewable sources on-site and retaining or retiring the rights to its renewable energy attributes. In other words, if the institution has sold Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) or the equivalent for the clean and renewable energy 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.

Clean and renewable thermal energy

1. Using clean and renewable stationary fuels on-site to generate thermal energy, e.g., using certain types of biomass for heating (see Standards and Terms).
2. Purchasing or otherwise importing steam, hot water, and/or chilled water from certified/verified clean and renewable sources (e.g., a municipal geothermal facility).

Unbundled renewable energy products

1. Purchasing RECs, Guarantees of Origin (GOs), International RECs (I-RECs), or equivalent unbundled renewable energy products certified by a third party (e.g., Green-e or EKOenergy).

Energy on the grid is indistinguishable by source. Therefore, 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 in the absence of RECs, GOs, I-RECs, or equivalent products that document the renewable electricity delivered or consumed and give the institution to right to claim it as renewable.

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, performance year:

90,793.04 MMBtu

Clean and renewable electricity (report kilowatt-hours):

	kWh	MMBtu
Imported electricity from certified/verified clean and renewable sources (i.e., bundled green power purchases)	0 Kilowatt-hours	0 MMBtu
Electricity from on-site, clean and renewable sources (rights retained/retired)	16,910 Kilowatt-hours	57.70 MMBtu

A brief description of the certified/verified sources of clean and renewable electricity:

A brief description of the on-site renewable electricity generating facilities/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 a 5 kw net zero composting toilet.

Clean and renewable thermal energy (report MMBtu):

Clean and renewable stationary fuels used on-site to generate thermal energy	0 MMBtu
Imported steam, hot water, and/or chilled water from certified/verified clean and renewable sources	0 MMBtu

A brief description of the clean and renewable stationary fuels:

A brief description of the certified/verified sources of clean and renewable thermal energy:

Unbundled renewable energy products (report kWh):

	kWh	MMBtu
Purchased RECs, GOs, I-RECs or equivalent unbundled renewable energy products certified by a third party	10,447,640 <i>Kilowatt-hours</i>	35,647.35 <i>MMBtu</i>

A brief description of the unbundled renewable energy products:

L&C undergraduate students purchase RECs to cover 100% of our energy usage each year. 2018 year purchase:

RECs:

National Renewable Energy Certificates vendor: 3 Phase Renewables Time: 5/21/2019

Total clean and renewable energy generated or purchased:

35,705.04 *MMBtu*

Percentage of total energy consumption from clean and renewable sources:

39.33

Website URL where information about the institution's support for clean and renewable energy is available:

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

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

	Percentage of total electricity use (0-100)
Biomass	---
Coal	14
Geothermal	---
Hydro	14
Natural gas	33
Nuclear	---
Solar photovoltaic	5
Wind	9
Other (please specify and explain below)	30

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:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

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 4.09

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	2.09 / 6.00
Sustainable Dining	2.00 / 2.00

Food and Beverage Purchasing

Score

2.09 / 6.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution's dining services purchase food and beverage products that meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Sustainably or ethically produced as determined by one or more of the standards listed in Standards and Terms.
- Plant-based.

An institution with [Real Food Calculator](#) results that have been validated by the Real Food Challenge (U.S.) or [Good Food Calculator](#) results that have been validated by Meal Exchange (Canada) may simply report its Real/Good Food percentage as the percentage of expenditures on sustainably or ethically produced products. The percentage of expenditures on plant-based foods is reported separately.

Required documentation

For transparency and to help ensure comparability, a completed [STARS Food and Beverage Purchasing Inventory template](#) or equivalent inventory must be provided to document purchases that qualify as sustainably or ethically produced. The inventory must justify each product's inclusion and include, at minimum, the following information:

- Product name, label, or brand
- Product description/type
- Recognized sustainability standard met (e.g., third party certification or ecolabel)

It is not required that products that qualify solely as plant-based be documented at the same level of detail (i.e., they may or may not be included in the inventory).

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

Percentage of total annual food and beverage expenditures on products that are sustainably or ethically produced:

2.71

Percentage of total annual food and beverage expenditures on plant-based foods:

64.19

An inventory of food and beverage purchases that qualify as sustainably/ethically produced:

[Copy_of_STARS_2.2_Food_and_Beverage_Purchasing_Inventory_BA_v2.2.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.

Website URL where the institution's validated Real/Good Food Calculator results are publicly posted:

Which of the following food service providers are present on campus and included in the inventory/assessment?:

	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., regional or global brands)	No	No
Convenience stores	No	No
Vending services	Yes	No
Concessions	Yes	Yes

Total annual dining services budget for food and beverage products:

\$1 million - \$4.9 million

A brief description of the institution's sustainable food and beverage purchasing program:

Sustainability is at the heart of the food and beverage program managed by Bon Appetit @ Lewis & Clark. We have a goal to source at least 20% of ingredients, by dollar, from small, local, owner operated farmers and artisans; prioritize plant-based proteins in the café and offer vegetarian options at every meal; cook from scratch, including stocks, sauces, and soups; prevent and minimize waste in a number of ways; purchase only cage-free and third party certified eggs, pork raised without the use of gestation crates, and ground beef from Certified Humane operations or small, local farmers. Our seafood is never airfreighted, and is purchased in accordance with the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Guidelines for Sustainability, and we've been at the forefront of the right for farmworkers rights - including hosting an annual National Farmworker Awareness Week on campus. Last but not least, we communicate with guests through menus in the café's and through our guest facing website (

www.cafebonappetit.com

) in order to share our sustainability related policies, the local farms we source from and their distance from the campus, and menu items with sustainability and wellness related icons that relay information related to each of these standards.

Website URL where information about the food and beverage purchasing program is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2016_BonApetitPurchasingUpdates.xlsx](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

[Lewisandclark.cafebonappetit.com](http://lewisandclark.cafebonappetit.com)

Sustainable Dining

Score	Responsible Party
2.00 / 2.00	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Sustainable dining initiatives

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

- Hosts a farmers market, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery program, or urban agriculture project, or supports such a program in the local community.
- Hosts a sustainability-themed food outlet on-site, either independently or in partnership with a contractor or retailer.
- Supports disadvantaged businesses, social enterprises, and/or local small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) through its food and beverage purchasing.
- Hosts low impact dining events (e.g., Meatless Mondays) or promotes plant-forward (vegetables-as-center-of-the-plate, with smaller portions of meat) options.
- Has a vegan dining program that makes diverse, complete-protein vegan options available to every member of the campus community at every meal (e.g., a vegan entrée, an all-vegan station, or an all-vegan dining facility).
- Informs customers about low impact food choices and sustainability practices through labeling and signage in dining halls.

Part 2. Food waste minimization and recovery

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 a 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.

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 host a farmers market, community supported agriculture (CSA) or fishery program, 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 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 support disadvantaged businesses, social enterprises, and/or local small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) through its food and beverage purchasing?:

Yes

A brief description of the support for disadvantaged businesses, social enterprises, and/or local SMEs:

Locally we purchase from a number of small providers, including Bui Tofu, Tao of Tea, Garcia Family Farms, and Ace High Orchards

Estimated percentage of total food and beverage expenditures on products from disadvantaged businesses, social enterprises, and/or local SMEs:

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor host low impact dining events or promote plant-forward options?:

Yes

A brief description of the low impact dining events and/or plant-forward options:

Yes, we host a number of low impact dining events, including an annual Eat Local Challenge, Earth Week, and an annual National Farmworker Awareness Week. Through educational materials on each table, and in signage throughout the café, we share information about the benefits of prioritizing plant-based proteins for one's health and the environment, and offer plant-forward meals multiple times per week in each café.

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:

Yes, we prioritize plant-based proteins in the cafes and a complete protein vegan option is available to the campus communities at every meal served in our cafés. We communicate vegan options to our guests using the Vegan Circle of Responsibility icon, on both online menus and menus in the café. Our main café has a station designated vegan only for every service period.

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

Yes

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

We inform guests about low impact food choices and sustainability practices in many ways. On guest tables and in signs around the cafe, we share information about pressing sustainability issues and relevant policies, including antibiotics use on animal farms, animal welfare issues such as gestation crate use, sustainable seafood, and farmworkers rights. Using our Circle of Responsibility (COR) program, we communicate sustainability attributes of ingredients through our online and in-café menus. Menus are labeled with COR icons that denote the following (and more):

 if the dish includes local ingredients, and which farm they are from

 if the dish includes animal products from a farm with a third party animal welfare certification

 if the dish includes seafood rated as Green or Yellow by the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch program

 if the dish is vegetarian and/or vegan

Table tents, daily menus, and informational boards all demonstrate sustainable food information throughout the dining facilities.

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:

Yes, we are trayless in our all-you-care-to-eat café on campus, and train all servers in portion control to help minimize post-consumer food waste.

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:

Yes, we donate food to Urban Gleaners, and are currently Food Recovery Verified.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor divert food materials from the landfill, incinerator or sewer for animal feed or industrial uses?:

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 our system.

Does the institution or its primary dining services contractor offer discounts or other incentives to customers who use reusable containers 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.

A brief description of other sustainability-related initiatives not covered above:

Yes, wellness and nutrition information is made available via the website.

Website URL where information about the sustainable dining programs is available:

<http://Lewisandclark.cafebonappetit.com>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[STARS_2.2._Responses_Food.docx](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2018/2019 data

Grounds

Points Claimed 2.00

Points Available 3.00

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	1.00 / 2.00
	1.00 / 1.00
	This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions that own or manage land that includes or is adjacent to any of the following:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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)
Biodiversity	
	2 points are available for this credit if the institution owns or manages land that includes or is adjacent to any of the above. 1 point is available for this credit for all other institutions.
	Close

Landscape Management

Score

1.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution's grounds include areas that are managed:

- Organically, without the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides and herbicides (i.e., only ecologically preferable materials may be used);

OR

- In accordance with an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program.

An area of grounds may be managed organically or in accordance with an IPM program that uses selected chemicals, but not both.

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

Total campus area:

137 Acres

Figures required to calculate the total area of managed grounds:

	Area (double-counting is not allowed)
Area managed organically, without the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides and herbicides	0 Acres
Area managed in accordance with an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program that uses selected chemicals only when needed	100 Acres
Area managed using conventional, chemical-based landscape management practices	0 Acres
Total area of managed grounds	100 Acres

A brief description of any land excluded from the area of managed grounds:

Impervious surfaces, buildings, natural areas where most activities/management are not permitted

Percentage of grounds managed organically:

0

A brief description of the organic landscape management program:

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.

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.

Percentage of grounds managed in accordance with an IPM program:

100

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.

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 landscape materials management and waste minimization:

Some 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:

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainable landscape management program is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Biodiversity

Score

1.00 / 1.00

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

2 points are available for this credit if the institution owns or manages land that includes or is adjacent to any of the above. 1 point is available for this credit for all other institutions.

[Close](#)

Criteria

Institution has conducted an assessment to identify:

- Endangered and vulnerable species (including migratory species) with habitats on land owned or managed by the institution;

AND/OR

- Areas of biodiversity importance on land owned or managed by the institution.

The institution has plans or programs in place to protect or positively affect the species, habitats, and/or ecosystems identified.

Assessments conducted and programs adopted by other entities (e.g., government, university system, or 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, or regions of conservation importance?:

No

A brief description of the legally protected areas, internationally recognized areas, priority sites for biodiversity, and/or regions of conservation importance:

The institution does not own or manage land that is legally protected, internationally recognized, or a priority site according to a IPac report. However, the institution is adjacent to a state and local park.

Has the institution conducted an assessment to identify endangered and vulnerable species (including migratory species) with habitats on land owned or managed by the institution?:

Yes

A list of endangered and vulnerable species with habitats on land owned or managed by the institution, by level of extinction risk:

The IPaC report indicated that the institution is not located in a critical habitat area for endangered species while migratory bird information for our location was not available.

Has the institution conducted an assessment to identify areas of biodiversity importance on land owned or managed by the institution?:

Yes

A brief description of areas of biodiversity importance on land owned or managed by the institution:

The IPaC report identified riverine wetland habitat on the institution's property.

The methodologies used to identify endangered and vulnerable species and/or areas of biodiversity importance and any ongoing assessment and monitoring mechanisms:

IPaC report

A brief description of the scope of the assessment(s):

IPaC report

A brief description of the plans or programs in place to protect or positively affect identified species, habitats, and/or ecosystems:

Strategies to protect habitat include: reduction in the use of pesticides/herbicides, increasing the percentage of pervious surface, use of organic land care practices, construction and building practices to protect stormwater, increasing/improving native habitat, Salmon Safe certification.

Estimated percentage of areas of biodiversity importance that are also protected areas :

0

Website URL where information about the institution's biodiversity initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[IPaC_Resources.pdf](#)

Purchasing

Points Claimed 4.48

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	2.00 / 3.00
Electronics Purchasing	1.00 / 1.00
Cleaning and Janitorial Purchasing	0.80 / 1.00
Office Paper Purchasing	0.68 / 1.00

Sustainable Procurement

Score

2.00 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Institution-wide sustainable procurement policies

Institution has written policies, guidelines, or directives that seek to support sustainable purchasing across multiple commodity categories, institution-wide. For example:

- A stated preference for post-consumer recycled or bio-based content, for carbon neutral products, 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 standards for the social and environmental responsibility of the institution's business partners that exceed basic legal compliance.

Part 2. Life Cycle Cost Analysis

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 requests for proposals (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 1 and Part 3 of this credit, Part 2 specifically recognizes institutions that employ LCCA.

Part 3. Product-specific sustainability criteria

Institution has published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating products and/or services in one or more of the following categories. The criteria may be included in broader policies such as those recognized in Part 1, however they must address the specific sustainability challenges and impacts associated with products and/or 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
A. Chemically intensive products and services 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.• Including sustainability objectives in contracts with service providers.
B. Consumable office products Batteries, lamps, paper, toner cartridges	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A stated preference for post-consumer recycled, agricultural residue, or third party certified (e.g., FSC) content.• A stated preference for extended use, rechargeable, or remanufactured products.• A stated preference for low mercury lamps.
C. Furniture and furnishings Furniture, flooring, ceilings, walls, composite wood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A stated preference for third party certified materials and products (e.g., FSC or LEVEL certified)• A stated preference for furnishings that are low-VOC or free of flame retardants
D. Information technology (IT) and equipment Computers, imaging equipment, mobile phones, data centers, cloud services, scientific and medical equipment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Published measures to reduce the demand for equipment.• A stated preference for ENERGY STAR, TCO Certified, Blue Angel, or EPEAT registered products.• A stated preference for ACT-labeled laboratory products
E. Food service providers Contractors, franchises, vending and catering services. (Food and beverage purchasing is covered in Food & Dining.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Including sustainability objectives in contracts with on-site food service providers.• Requiring that dining service contractors pay a living wage to employees.

F. Garments and linens

Clothing, bedding, laundry services.

- Published labor and human rights standards that clothing suppliers must meet.
- A stated preference for organic, bio-based, or recycled content textiles.

G. Professional service providers

Architectural, engineering, public relations, and financial services.

- A stated preference for disadvantaged businesses, social enterprises, or B Corporations.

H. Transportation and fuels

Travel, vehicles, delivery services, long haul transport, generator fuels, steam plants.

- 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.

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 multiple commodity categories institution-wide?:

Yes

A copy of the policies, guidelines or directives:

[sustainable-procurement-policy.pdf](#)

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. Please see this link for more information:

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/sustainability/green_building/

Looking at the life cycle of products, policies and operations is also included in various forms in the following links/areas:

- our capital projects process, which includes an evaluation section on sustainability:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/20346-captialrequest-draft-version>

- 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://www.lclark.edu/live/files/28399-2019-facilities-master-plan>

- Salmon Safe certification requirements:

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

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating chemically intensive products and services?:

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 consumable office products?:

Yes

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for consumable office 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 furniture and furnishings?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for furniture and furnishings:

The institution's construction contract outlines LEED certification requirements for renovations and new construction. The certification outlines product criteria.

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating Information technology (IT) and equipment?:

Yes

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for Information Technology (IT) and equipment:

Purchase of EPEAT Gold rated computers and monitors, whenever practical.
Copiers/Printers – increase number of networked multi-function machines to reduce the number of individual copiers, printers, scanners and fax machines.
Purchase electronic products that meet U.S. EPA Energy Star certifications.

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/16648-sustainable-procurement-policy>

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating food service providers?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for food service providers:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating garments and linens?:

No

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 service providers?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for professional service providers:

Does the institution have published sustainability criteria to be applied when evaluating transportation and fuels?:

No

A brief description of the published sustainability criteria for transportation and fuels:

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainable procurement program or initiatives is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Electronics Purchasing

Score

1.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party**Amy Dvorak**
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution purchases electronic products that are:

- EPEAT registered,
- Third party certified under a multi-attribute sustainability standard or ISO Type 1 ecolabel developed/administered by a [Global Ecolabelling Network](#) or [ISEAL Alliance](#) member organization (e.g., Blue Angel, TCO Certified, UL Ecologo), AND/OR
- Labeled under a single-attribute standard for electrical equipment (e.g., ENERGY STAR, EU Energy A or higher, or local equivalent).

Included are desktop and notebook/laptop computers, displays, thin clients, tablets/slates, televisions, mobile phones, and imaging equipment (copiers, digital duplicators, facsimile machines, mailing machines, multifunction devices, and printers and scanners). Specialized equipment that EPEAT does not register may be excluded.

A product that meets multiple criteria (e.g., a product that is both EPEAT registered and ENERGY STAR labeled) should not be double-counted.

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

Total annual expenditures on electronics:

251,710 US/Canadian \$

Expenditures on environmentally or socially preferable electronics:

	Expenditure Per Level
EPEAT Gold registered and/or third party certified at the highest achievable level under a multi-attribute sustainability standard	251,710 US/Canadian \$
EPEAT Silver registered and/or third party certified at mid-level under a multi-attribute sustainability standard	0 US/Canadian \$
EPEAT Bronze registered and/or third party certified at minimum level under a multi-attribute sustainability standard	0 US/Canadian \$
Labeled under a single-attribute standard	0 US/Canadian \$

Do the figures reported above include leased equipment?:

No

A brief description of the time period from which the figures reported above are drawn:

AY 2018-2019

Website URL where information about the institution's electronics purchasing is available:

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/files/16648-sustainable-procurement-policy>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2018_Electronics_Purchasing.pdf](#)

Cleaning and Janitorial Purchasing

Score

0.80 / 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:

- Blue Angel labeled (German Federal Environment Agency)
- Cradle to Cradle Certified
- ECOLOGO certified (UL Environment)
- EU Ecolabel
- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified
- Good Environmental Choice Australia (GECA) certified
- Green Seal certified
- Nordic Swan labeled (Nordic Ecolabelling Board)
- U.S. EPA Safer Choice labeled
- Other multi-criteria sustainability standards and ISO Type 1 ecolabels developed/administered by [Global Ecolabelling Network](#) and/or [ISEAL Alliance](#) member organizations

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 cleaning and 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 annual expenditures on cleaning products:

13,539 US/Canadian \$

Annual expenditures on certified green cleaning products:

11,998 US/Canadian \$

Total annual expenditures on janitorial paper products:

63,874 US/Canadian \$

Annual expenditures on certified green janitorial paper products:

49,936 US/Canadian \$

A brief description of the time period on which the figures reported above are based :

2019

Percentage of expenditures on cleaning and janitorial products that are third party certified to meet recognized sustainability standards:

80.00

Website URL where information about the institution's cleaning and janitorial purchasing is available:

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/sustainability/built_environment/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Copy_of_2019_Sustainable_Cleaning_Product_Spend_Calculator.xlsx](#)

Office Paper Purchasing

Score

0.68 / 1.00

Responsible Party

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 annual expenditures on office paper:

67,929.72 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	9,013.22 US/Canadian \$
30-49 percent	17,723.51 US/Canadian \$
50-69 percent	241.79 US/Canadian \$
70-89 percent (or FSC Mix label)	0 US/Canadian \$
90-100 percent (or FSC Recycled/100% label)	37,156.40 US/Canadian \$

A brief description of the time period from which the figures reported above are drawn:

Calendar year 2018

Website URL where information about the institution's paper purchasing is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[LEWIS_CLARKPaperUse_70109398LA_01.01.2018_-_12.31.2019.xlsb](#)

Transportation

Points Claimed 4.72

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	0.21 / 1.00
Commute Modal Split	3.51 / 5.00
Support for Sustainable Transportation	1.00 / 1.00

Campus Fleet

Score

0.21 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution supports alternative fuel and power technology by including vehicles in its motorized fleet that are:

1. Gasoline-electric hybrid,
2. Diesel-electric hybrid,
3. Plug-in hybrid,
4. 100 percent electric (including electric assist utility bicycles and tricycles),
5. Fueled with Compressed Natural Gas (CNG),
6. Hydrogen fueled,
7. Fueled with B20 or higher biofuel for more than 4 months of the year, OR
8. 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)

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 in the institution's fleet:

42

Number of vehicles in the institution's fleet that are:

	Number of Vehicles
Gasoline-only	33
Diesel-only	0
Gasoline-electric hybrid	2
Diesel-electric hybrid	0
Plug-in hybrid	0
100 percent electric	7
Fueled with Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)	0
Hydrogen fueled	0
Fueled with B20 or higher biofuel	0

Number of Vehicles

Fueled with locally produced, low-level biofuel 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 area for electric fleet vehicles.

Website URL where information about the institution's motorized fleet is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Commute Modal Split

Score

3.51 / 5.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Student commute modal split

Institution's students commute to and from campus using more sustainable commuting options such as walking, cycling, vanpooling or carpooling, taking public transportation or a campus shuttle, riding motorcycles or scooters, using a zero-emissions vehicle, availing of distance education, 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.

Part 2. Employee commute modal split

Institution's employees commute to and from campus using more sustainable commuting options such as walking, cycling, vanpooling or carpooling, taking public transportation or a campus shuttle, riding motorcycles or scooters, using a zero-emissions vehicle, 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 worksites.

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

Total full-time equivalent student enrollment:

3,214

Full-time equivalent of employees:

729

Has the institution gathered data about student commuting behavior?:

Yes

Total percentage of students that use more sustainable commuting options as their primary mode of transportation:

83

A brief description of the method(s) used to gather data about student commuting:

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 were 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. This data is supported by recent survey regarding commute behavior.

Has the institution gathered data about employee commuting behavior?:

Yes

Total percentage of employees that use more sustainable commuting options as their primary mode of transportation:

14

A brief description of the method(s) used to gather data about employee commuting:

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. Annual survey data is used as well to support this calculation. For this survey, we were able to get over 80% of all employees to participate.

Percentage of students and employees that use the following as their primary mode of transportation:

	Percentage of students (0-100)	Percentage of employees (0-100)
Single-occupancy vehicle	---	---
Zero-emissions vehicle	---	---
Walk, cycle, or other non-motorized mode	---	---
Vanpool or carpool	---	---
Public transport or campus shuttle	---	---
Motorcycle, motorized scooter/bike, or moped	---	---
Distance education / telecommute	---	---

Website URL where information about student or employee commuting is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2018-2019 data

Support for Sustainable Transportation

Score

1.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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:

- Has a bicycle-sharing program or participates in a local bicycle-sharing program.
 - 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.
 - Offers preferential parking or other incentives for fuel efficient vehicles.
 - Has one or more Level 2 or Level 3 electric vehicle charging stations that are accessible to student and employee commuters.
 - Has incentives or programs to encourage employees to live close to campus.
 - Has other programs or initiatives to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation and/or reduce the impact of student and employee commuting.
-

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

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 participate in a car sharing program?:

Yes

A brief description of the car sharing program:

ZipCar

Does the institution offer preferential parking or other incentives for fuel efficient vehicles?:

Yes

A brief description of the incentives for fuel efficient vehicles:

There are multiple EV charging stations around the institution which are generally located in the closest spots to the building.

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:

There are four EV charging stations:

- Law Campus, underneath solar installation in student parking area
- Grad Campus, near Sequoia Hall
- Undergrad campus near Holmes Hall
- Undergrad campus near Evans music building

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 have other programs or initiatives to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation and/or reduce the impact of student and employee commuting?:

Yes

A brief description of other programs or initiatives to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation and/or reduce the impact of student and employee commuting:

Bike Commute Challenge, Sustainability Incentives Program

Website URL where information about the institution's support for sustainable transportation is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Waste

Points Claimed 5.30

Points Available 9.00

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	4.30 / 8.00
Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion	Not Applicable
Hazardous Waste Management	1.00 / 1.00

Waste Minimization and Diversion

Score

4.30 / 8.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Reduction in total waste per person

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. Total waste per person

Institution's total annual waste generation (materials diverted and disposed) is less than the minimum performance threshold of 0.45 tonnes (0.50 short tons) per weighted campus user.

Part 3. Waste diverted from the landfill or incinerator

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, 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	151 Tons	368 Tons
Materials composted	109 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	625.23 Tons	883 Tons

A brief description of the residual conversion facility:

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

	Start Date	End Date
Performance Period	Jan. 1, 2017	Dec. 31, 2017
Baseline Period	Jan. 1, 2012	Dec. 31, 2012

A brief description of when and why the waste generation baseline was adopted:

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	1,333	1,318
Number of employees resident on-site	6	5
Number of other individuals resident on-site	0	0
Total full-time equivalent student enrollment	3,214	3,428
Full-time equivalent of employees	729	730
Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education	0	0
Weighted campus users	3,292	3,449.25

Total waste generated per weighted campus user:

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Total waste generated per weighted campus user	0.19 <i>Tons</i>	0.26 <i>Tons</i>

Percentage reduction in total waste generated per weighted campus user from baseline:

25.81

Percentage of materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator by recycling, composting, donating or re-selling, performance year:

42.74

Percentage of materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator (including up to 10 percent attributable to post-recycling residual conversion):

42.74

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	Yes
White goods (i.e. appliances)	Yes
Electronics	Yes
Laboratory equipment	Yes
Furniture	Yes
Residence hall move-in/move-out waste	Yes

	Yes or No
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, used blankets are donated to a local animal shelter

Materials intended for disposal but subsequently recovered and reused on campus, performance year:

150 Tons

Does the institution use single stream recycling to collect standard recyclables in common areas?:

No

Does the institution use dual stream recycling to collect standard recyclables in common areas?:

Yes

Does the institution use multi-stream recycling to collect standard recyclables in common areas?:

Yes

Average contamination rate for the institution's recycling program:

A brief description of any recycling quality control mechanisms employed:

Waste hauler currently monitors contamination rates. In the past year, student workers have also assisted with this process.

A brief description of the institution's waste-related behavior change initiatives:

- student-oriented videos created to address waste/recycling issues
- student workers assigned to monitor bins and engage with education with residents

A brief description of the institution's waste audits and other initiatives to assess its materials management efforts and identify areas for improvement:

- student workers assigned to monitor bins and engage with education with residents on areas for improvement
- student club informational boards around recycling and trash

A brief description of the institution's procurement policies designed to prevent waste:

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:

In previous years, we have had active peer to peer exchange boards, which have since gone dormant. Currently, this happens over email or FB.

A brief description of the institution's limits on paper and ink consumption:

Printing is limited for most students. Faculty and staff have to pay for prints.

A brief description of the institution's initiatives to make materials available online by default rather than printing them:

Much of our campus is now using 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:

Reuse and recycling bins are available for students to donate used and/or unwanted goods as well as an appliance take back program run by student volunteers, paid students and paid staff. We also run a free swap location most years.

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, plastics reduction.

Website URL where information about the institution's waste minimization and diversion efforts is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2017_Lewis__Clark_Waste_Composition.xlsx](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

2017 waste data was used in instead of 2018, as during the 2018 year we switched waste haulers and that data is both incomplete and suspect.

Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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.

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

Institution has not conducted a major construction, renovation and/or demolition project in the previous three years.

Hazardous Waste Management

Score

1.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Hazardous waste minimization and disposal

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. Electronic waste diversion

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 Free Geek

Is the institution's electronic waste recycler certified under the e-Stewards and/or Responsible Recycling (R2) standards?:

Yes

Website URL where information about the institution's hazardous waste program is available:

http://www.lclark.edu/offices/facilities/policies/chemical_safety/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Water

Points Claimed 5.00

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		
4.00 / 4.00	<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 each part of this credit are determined by the level of "Physical Risk Quantity" for the institution's main campus, as indicated by the World Resources Institute Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. The number of points available is automatically calculated in the online Reporting Tool as detailed in the following table:</p>		
	Physical Risk QUANTITY	Points available for each part	Total available points for this credit
Water Use	Low and Low to Medium Risk	1 $\frac{1}{3}$	4
	Medium to High Risk	1 $\frac{2}{3}$	5
	High and Extremely High Risk	2	6
Rainwater Management	Close	1.00 / 2.00	

Water Use

Score

4.00 / 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 each part of this credit are determined by the level of "Physical Risk Quantity" for the institution's main campus, as indicated by the World Resources Institute [Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas](#). The number of points available is automatically calculated in the online Reporting Tool as detailed in the following table:

Physical Risk QUANTITY	Points available for each part	Total available points for this credit	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities
Low and Low to Medium Risk	1 $\frac{1}{3}$	4	
Medium to High Risk	1 $\frac{2}{3}$	5	
High and Extremely High Risk	2	6	

[Close](#)

Criteria

Part 1. Reduction in potable water use per person

Institution has reduced its annual potable water use per weighted campus user compared to a baseline.

Part 2. Reduction in potable water use per unit of floor area

Institution has reduced its annual potable water use per gross square metre or foot of floor area compared to a baseline.

Part 3. Reduction in total water withdrawal per unit of vegetated grounds

Institution has reduced its total annual water use (potable + non-potable) per hectare or acre 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 Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas:

Low to Medium

Total water withdrawal (potable and non-potable combined):

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Total water withdrawal	22,270,255 Gallons	33,811,844 Gallons

Potable water use:

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Potable water use	22,270,255 Gallons	33,811,844 Gallons

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

	Start Date	End Date
Performance Period	Jan. 1, 2019	Dec. 31, 2019
Baseline Period	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	1,333	1,199
Number of employees resident on-site	6	0
Number of other individuals resident on-site	0	0
Total full-time equivalent student enrollment	3,214	3,153
Full-time equivalent of employees	729	695
Full-time equivalent of students enrolled exclusively in distance education	0	0
Weighted campus users	3,292	3,185.75

Potable water use per weighted campus user:

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Potable water use per weighted campus user	6,764.96 <i>Gallons</i>	10,613.46 <i>Gallons</i>

Percentage reduction in potable water use per weighted campus user from baseline:
36.26

Gross floor area of building space:

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Gross floor area	1,314,488 <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	16.94 <i>Gallons / GSF</i>	27.15 <i>Gallons / GSF</i>

Percentage reduction in potable water use per unit of floor area from baseline:
37.60

Area of vegetated grounds:

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Vegetated grounds	137 <i>Acres</i>	137 <i>Acres</i>

Total water withdrawal per unit of vegetated grounds:

	Performance Year	Baseline Year
Total water withdrawal per unit of vegetated grounds	162,556.61 <i>Gallons / Acre</i>	246,801.78 <i>Gallons / Acre</i>

Percentage reduction in total water withdrawal per unit of vegetated grounds from baseline:
34.13

A brief description of the institution's water-related behavior change initiatives:

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:

High efficiency aerators, showerheads

Website URL where information about the institution's water conservation and efficiency efforts is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2013_CityWaterUsage.xls](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Amy update with 2019 data (that's what I was already using) - everything updated except for on campus residential staff

Rainwater Management

Score

1.00 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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., government or 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, and/or guidelines 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.

Website URL where information about the institution's green infrastructure and LID practices is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2019-facilities-master-plan.pdf](#)

Planning & Administration

Coordination & Planning

Points Claimed 6.63

Points Available 9.00

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	4.00 / 4.00
Inclusive and Participatory Governance	1.63 / 3.00
Reporting Assurance	0.00 / 1.00

Sustainability Coordination

Score

1.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/13044-lewis-amp-clark-sustainability-council-reconstituted-as-task-force-wraps-up-work>

Members of each committee, including affiliations and role:

Katharina Altpeter-Jones, Associate Professor of German, CAS
Janice Weis, Associate Dean Environmental Law, Law School
Dan Rohlf, Professor of Law and Of Counsel, Earthrise Law Center, Law School
Esme Miller, Assistant Director, Research and Assessment, Graduate School
Amy Dvorak, Sustainability Director
Michel George, Associate Vice President of Facilities Services
Andrea Dooley, Controller, Interim Vice President for Business and Finance/Treasurer
Roy Kaufmann, Director of Public Relations
Audrey Leonard, Law student

Does the institution have at least one sustainability office that includes more than 1 full-time equivalent 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 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?:

Yes

A brief description of the activities and substantive accomplishments of the institution-wide coordinating body or officer during the previous three years:

Developed several new courses focused on sustainability
Plastics Reduction Initiative
Annual Speaker Series
Funded a part-time faculty to support sustainability initiatives in the curriculum
Developed a Board of Advisors for sustainability

Job title of the sustainability officer position:

Job description for the sustainability officer position:

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):

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainability coordination is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainability Planning

Score

4.00 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Measurable sustainability objectives

Institution has a published plan or plans that include measurable sustainability objectives that address one or more of the following:

- Academics - sustainability in curriculum and/or research
- Engagement - student, employee, or community engagement for sustainability
- Operations (e.g., sustainable resource use, emissions, groundskeeping, procurement)
- Administration (e.g., diversity, equity, and inclusion; sustainable investment/finance; wellbeing)

The criteria for Part 1 may be met by any combination of published plans, for example:

- Sustainability plan
- Campus master plan or physical campus plan
- Climate action plan
- Diversity and inclusion plan
- Human resources strategic plan
- Strategic plan or equivalent guiding document

Part 2. Sustainability in institution's highest guiding document

Institution includes the integrated concept of sustainability (as opposed to one or more aspects of sustainability) in its highest guiding document, e.g., a published, institution-wide strategic plan or the equivalent.

Sustainability may be included in the highest guiding document as a major theme (e.g., in a section on sustainability, as a major institutional goal, or through multiple sustainability-focused objectives) or as a minor theme (e.g., in passing, as part of a vision or values statement, or in objectives that are related to rather than focused on sustainability). A strategic plan that addresses aspects of sustainability, sustainability issues/concepts, and/or sustainability challenges, but not the integrated concept of sustainability does not qualify.

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 plan or plans that include measurable sustainability objectives that address sustainability in curriculum and/or research?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives related to academics and the plan(s) in which they are published:

Goal: The institutional Sustainability Council will work with the three deans as well as faculty from each school in developing new programming and enhancing existing coursework to advance sustainability-related curriculum between and across the three schools.

- Strategic Plan 2019: Exploring for the Global Good

Does the institution have a published plan or plans that include measurable sustainability objectives that address student, employee, or community engagement for sustainability?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives related to engagement and the plan(s) in which they are published:

Work with the Sustainability Council and relevant deans across the campus to engender greater cooperation among student governments around sustainability initiatives.

- Strategic Plan 2019: Exploring for the Global Good

Does the institution have a published plan or plans that include measurable sustainability objectives that address sustainability in operations?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives related to operations and the plan(s) in which they are published:

Creating a pedestrian-oriented campus core by eliminating through-traffic in the Templeton district, creating a bicycle dismount zone, and improving pedestrian infrastructure

Designing buildings and campus spaces for inclusivity, with deliberate strategies to welcome students from diverse backgrounds

The plan preserves and protects existing natural features, and promotes the sustainable management of the campus landscape. Strategies include the adoption of permaculture principles, which are defined as “thinking tools that ... allow us to creatively re-design our environment and our behavior in a world of less energy and resources

- Greenhouse gas emissions reductions of 45% by 2030, decarbonized systems and operations by 2050

- Facilities Master plan:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/28399-2019->

facilities-master-plan

- Climate Action Plan 2019-2020 update

Does the institution have a published plan or plans that include measurable sustainability objectives that address diversity, equity, and inclusion; sustainable investment/finance; or wellbeing?:

Yes

A list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives related to administration and the plan(s) in which they are published:

We will increase structures of support for those from underrepresented groups. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion is assessing what structures of support currently exist and what additions are needed. We will also implement a biannual campus climate assessment concerned with issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion by 2023.

CAS has grown from 16 percent students of color in the fall of 2011 to 31 percent students of color in the fall of 2018. The total percentage of students of color for all of Lewis & Clark is 25. We will also seek to increase the retention of students from underrepresented backgrounds by a certain percentage each year.

Provide opportunities for all members of our community to engage in reflective inquiry and to grow in the areas of inclusivity, respect, cultural curiosity, and cultural humility.

We strive to create a community that facilitates the active participation and reflective inquiry of all members. We will increase the number of professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. We will offer an increasing number of community conversations and events for students, faculty, and staff centering on diversity and working with and learning from cultures different from one's own.

We also seek to increase the diversity of the faculty and staff at all 3 schools each year, with a goal of having the faculty better reflect the demographics of our students. Currently 16 percent of our faculty and 14 percent of our staff are persons of color. We will review and implement diversity hiring best practices and report annually regarding our progress toward this goal. We will continue our current excellent retention rate for faculty from underrepresented groups and seek to improve retention of staff from underrepresented groups.

- Strategic Plan: Exploring for the Global Good

Does the institution have a published strategic plan or equivalent guiding document that includes sustainability at a high level? :

Yes

The institution's highest guiding document (upload):

Website URL where the institution's highest guiding document is publicly available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/27567-strategic-plan-bookfeb2019>

Which of the following best describes the inclusion of sustainability in the highest guiding document?:

Major theme

The institution's sustainability plan (upload):

Website URL where the institution's sustainability plan is publicly available:

Does the institution have a formal statement in support of sustainability endorsed by its governing body?:

The formal statement in support of sustainability:

The institution's definition of sustainability:

Is the institution an endorser or signatory of the following? :

	Yes or No
The Earth Charter	No
The Higher Education Sustainability Initiative (HESI)	No
ISCN-GULF Sustainable Campus Charter	No
Pan-Canadian Protocol for Sustainability	No
SDG Accord	Yes
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	No
Other multi-dimensional sustainability commitments (please specify below)	Yes

A brief description of the institution's formal sustainability commitments, including the specific initiatives selected above:

Cap & Trade declarations
We are Still In

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainability planning efforts is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Inclusive and Participatory Governance

Score

1.63 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Part 1. Shared governance bodies

Institution has formal participatory or shared governance bodies through which the following campus stakeholders can regularly participate in the governance of the institution (e.g., decision-making processes, plan/policy formulation and review):

- Students
- Academic staff (i.e., faculty members)
- Non-academic staff

The bodies 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).

Part 2. Campus stakeholder representation in governance

Institution's highest governing body includes individuals representing the following stakeholder groups as official (voting or non-voting) members:

- Students
- Academic staff (i.e., faculty members)
- Non-academic staff

Part 3. Gender equity in governance

Women (and/or individuals who do not self-identify as men) comprise at least 20 percent of the official members of the institution's highest governing body.

Part 4. Community engagement bodies

Institution hosts or supports one or more formal bodies through which external stakeholders (i.e., local community members) have a regular voice in institutional decisions that affect them. Examples include campus-community councils, "town and gown" committees, community advisory panels, and regular multi-stakeholder forums that are convened at least once a year.

Part 4 of this credit recognizes institutions that are proactive in creating opportunities for community members to contribute to and participate in the institution's decision-making processes. The institution's contributions to and participation in community decision-making processes do not count.

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

Does the institution have formal participatory or shared governance bodies through which the following stakeholders can regularly participate in the governance of the institution?:

	Yes or No
Students	Yes
Academic staff	Yes
Non-academic staff	Yes

A brief description of the institution's formal participatory or shared governance bodies:

A broad list of ongoing, formal committees that address institution-wide governance, policy, and operations is here:

<https://www.lclark.edu/administration/committees/>

Staff unions participate in negotiating wages, institution-wide policies, among other issues:

https://www.lclark.edu/offices/human_resources/employee_resources/unions/

College of Arts and Sciences student representatives serve as voting members on most administrative searches and routinely sit on search committees for faculty positions. Two student members are voting members of the Committee on the Curriculum and others serve with the Curriculum subcommittees on Course Proposals and International Studies. One student participates on the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid and one on the Committee on the Library and Educational Technology. Nomination and/or appointment of student representatives to committees is overseen by the Associated Students of Lewis & Clark College (ASLC) and forwarded to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for final approval.

Graduate School of Education and Counseling Students in the Graduate School of Education and Counseling routinely serve on faculty search committees. Nomination of the representatives to search committees is overseen by the respective departments. All nominations are forwarded to the associate dean of the Graduate School of Education and Counseling for final approval.

Law School: Two student representatives participate in and vote at meetings of the faculty except as provided in Article II, Sec. 4 of the Law School by laws pertaining to executive sessions of meetings of the law faculty and except for promotion and tenure decisions as set forth in Article II, Sec. 7 of the bylaws and other Law School documents. Except for the Sabbatical and Leave

Committee, two students serve as student representatives on the standing committees of the Law School.

Faculty Senates:

The undergrad College has several governance committees that include both faculty and staff, and some that also include students - for example the committee on enrollment.

<https://college.lclark.edu/faculty/governance/>

Graduate School of Education and Counseling: Educational Consortium

The Educational Consortium serves as an advisory board to the education and education-related programs in the Graduate School of Education and Counseling. The consortium is made up of eight voting members representing Graduate School department chairs, students, school administrators, and teachers.

Total number of individuals on the institution's highest governing body:

30

Number of students representing their peers as official members of the institution's highest governing body:

6

Number of academic staff representing their peers as official members of the institution's highest governing body:

4

Number of non-academic staff representing their peers as official members of the institution's highest governing body:

0

Number of women serving as official members of the institution's highest governing body:

10

Percentage of official members of the highest governing body that are women:

33.33

Website URL where information about the institution's highest governing body may be found:

https://www.lclark.edu/about/leadership/board_of_trustees/

Does the institution host or support one or more formal bodies through which external stakeholders have a regular voice in institutional decisions that affect them?:

No

A brief description of the campus-community council or equivalent body that gives external stakeholders a regular voice in institutional decisions that affect them:

The institution has a member on the local community council. This representative works with the local residents to address issues related to campus activities, events, policies, programs, etc.

Number of people from underrepresented groups serving as official members of the institution's highest governing body.:

Website URL where information about the institution's governance structure is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[2019-20_Committee_Membership_Roster_Students.Faculty.pdf](#)

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

A list of faculty and students who are official members of the Board of Trustees, is attached.

Reporting Assurance

Score

0.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Criteria

Institution has completed an assurance process that provides independent affirmation that the information in its current STARS report is reported in accordance with credit criteria.

To qualify, the process must successfully identify and resolve inconsistencies and errors in the institution's finalized STARS report prior to submitting it to AASHE. The assurance process may include:

1. Internal review by one or more individuals affiliated with the institution, but who are not directly involved in the data collection process for the credits they review.

AND/OR

1. An external audit by one or more individuals affiliated with other organizations (e.g., a peer institution, third-party contractor, or AASHE).

An institution is eligible to earn bonus points in the External Reporting Assurance credit in Innovation & Leadership if its assurance process includes an external audit.

Minimum requirements

The review and/or audit must be guided by and documented in the [STARS Review Template](#) and include the following steps:

1. Independent reviewer(s) review all credits that the institution is pursuing and document in the template the issues that are identified. Reviewer(s) must check that:
 - All required reporting fields, attachments, inventories, and URLs are included;
 - Reported information meets credit criteria and is consistent with required timeframes; AND
 - Reported figures are consistent across credits (e.g., between the Institutional Characteristics section and specific credits that require similar figures) and that any inconsistencies are explained.
4. The STARS Liaison (or another primary contact for the institution) addresses the inconsistencies or errors identified during the review by updating information in the Reporting Tool and documenting in the template that the issues have been addressed.
5. Reviewer(s) provide affirmation that the submission has been reviewed in full and that all identified inconsistencies and errors have been successfully addressed.
6. The Liaison or other primary contact uploads:
 - A statement of affirmation from each reviewer, AND
 - The completed [STARS Review Template](#).

Please note that assured reports are still subject to review by AASHE staff prior to publication, which may require additional revisions. AASHE reserves the right to withhold points for this credit if it is determined that the assurance process was clearly unsuccessful in identifying and resolving inconsistencies or errors (e.g., when AASHE staff identify a significant number of issues not captured in the completed review template). Published reports are also subject to public data inquiries and periodic audits by AASHE staff.

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

Diversity & Affordability

Points Claimed 8.37

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	0.75 / 1.00
Support for Underrepresented Groups	3.00 / 3.00
Affordability and Access	2.84 / 4.00

Diversity and Equity Coordination

Score

1.78 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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, anti-oppression, anti-racism, and/or social inclusion trainings and activities available to students, academic staff (i.e., faculty members), and/or non-academic staff.

The trainings and activities help participants build the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to redress inequalities and social disparities, and work effectively in cross-cultural situations.

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

Does the institution have a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies, programs, and trainings related to diversity, equity, inclusion and human rights?:

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, 2018-2019

Joe Becker, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs and Communications

Eduardo Beltran, CAS Student Representative

Janet Bixby, Associate Dean/Associate Professor GSEC

Naiomi Cameron, Associate Dean for Faculty Development CAS

Mark Duntley, Dean of Spiritual Life

Mark Figueroa, Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning

Martin Garland, CAS Student Representative

Elizabeth Gillingham, CAS Student Representative

Angela Gintz, Director of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement

Stella Kerl-McClain, Associate Professor of Counseling Psychology

J.B. Kim, Assistant Dean for Diversity & Academic Resources

Stacey Kim BA '94, Director of Marketing and Communications

Heyke Kirkendall-Baker, Associate Vice President & Director of Human Resources

Andrea Lewis, CAS Student Representative

Joel Martinez, Associate Professor of Philosophy CAS

Kayleigh McCauley, Associate Dean of Students, Director of Student Support & Title IX Case Manager

Raj Reddy, Animal Law LL.M. Degree Program Director

Sam Scott, IT Support Specialist/Media Technician

Janet Steverson, Dean for Diversity and Inclusion

Bruce Suttmeier, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Maiyo Taylor-Jackson, CAS Student Representative

Amanda Wilson, Groundskeeper

Yueping Zhang, Associate Professor of Psychology and Program Director of Neuroscience CAS

Law Campus Diversity Committee, 2019-2020

Professor Tom Buchele, Committee Chair

Associate Dean Libby Davis

Assistant Dean J.B. Kim

Professor Susan Mandiberg

Professor Ozan Varol

Professor Meg Garvin

Professor Raj Reddy

Julieanna Elegant

Reggie Raiford

Lydia Ruiz-Hom
Caitlin Skurky, Student Representative
Amanda Pham Haines, Student Representative
Kuranda Kasatka, Student Representative

Estimated proportion of students that has participated in that has participated in cultural competence, anti-oppression, anti-racism, and/or social inclusion trainings and activities:

All

Estimated proportion of academic staff that has participated in cultural competence, anti-oppression, anti-racism, and/or social inclusion trainings and activities:

Most

Estimated proportion of non-academic staff that has participated in cultural competence, anti-oppression, anti-racism, and/or social inclusion trainings and activities:

Most

A brief description of the institution's cultural competence, anti-oppression, anti-racism, and/or social inclusion 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.

Website URL where information about the institution's diversity and equity office or trainings is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/equity-and-inclusion/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Assessing Diversity and Equity

Score

0.75 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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:

- Campus climate by engaging stakeholders to assess the attitudes perceptions and behaviors of employees and students, including the experiences of underrepresented groups;
- Student outcomes related to diversity, equity, and success (e.g., graduation/success and retention rates for underrepresented groups); AND/OR
- 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:

CECE Project at Indiana University - Bloomington:

<http://cece.indiana.edu/model.html>

As part of our strategic plan and institutional commitment to advancing diversity, Lewis & Clark regularly collects data about our campus community. Our offices synthesize qualitative and quantitative findings to gain a clearer picture of our campus culture, so that we may identify and fill gaps in campus services.

These findings are available to Lewis & Clark community members (sign-in required). If you are not a current community member be are interested in reviewing our findings, please contact the Office of Equity and Inclusion at

diversityinclusion@lclark.edu

Access Reports

Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) reports included (as of May 3, 2019):

CECE Survey Results Presentation, CAS — Spring 2018
Community Forum Feedback, CAS — Spring 2018
CECE Survey Results Presentation, GSEC — Spring 2018
Community Forum Feedback, GSEC — Spring 2018
CECE Survey Results Presentation, Law — Fall 2018
Faculty Retreat CECE Presentation, Law — Fall 2018

Does the assessment process address campus climate by engaging stakeholders to assess the attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of employees and students, including the experiences of underrepresented groups?:

Yes

Does the assessment process address student outcomes related to diversity, equity and success?:

Yes

Does the assessment process address employee outcomes related to diversity and equity?:

No

A brief description of the most recent assessment findings and how the results are used in shaping policy, programs, and initiatives:

The Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) hosted a community feedback forum open to all CAS students. Along with our conversations with student affinity groups throughout the Spring 2018 semester, ODI considers this forum as a useful starting place to: determine key campus climate issues for some students, and as an opportunity to learn how to make these conversations more accessible to a wider student audience. This report contains a summary of the themes students raised, along with potential directions for future work.

Community Feedback Forum at the Graduate School of Education and Counseling, open to all students and primarily attended by GSEC students.

Overview of campus-wide survey answers were provided to all 3 campuses.

Are the results of the most recent structured diversity and equity assessment shared with the campus community?:

Yes

A brief description of how the assessment results are shared with the campus community:

They are located on the Equity and Inclusion webpage under Vision, Stats & Figures.

Are the results (or a summary of the results) of the most recent structured diversity and equity assessment publicly posted?:

Yes

The diversity and equity assessment report or summary (upload):

Website URL where the diversity and equity assessment report or summary is publicly posted:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/equity-and-inclusion/mission/data/>

Website URL where information about the institution's diversity and equity assessment efforts is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/diversity/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Support for Underrepresented Groups

Score

3.00 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

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, academic staff (i.e., faculty members), and/or non-academic staff from underrepresented groups.
4. Mentoring, counseling, peer support, academic support, or other programs designed specifically to support students, academic staff, and/or non-academic staff from underrepresented groups.
5. Programs that specifically aim to support and prepare students from underrepresented groups for academic 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 academics.
 - Financial and/or other support programs for doctoral and postdoctoral 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.

https://law.lclark.edu/offices/career_services/non-discrimination/

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3660-discrimination-harassment-and-hate-or>

Does the institution have a discrimination response protocol or committee (sometimes called a bias response team)?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's discrimination response protocol or team:

Bias Assessment Response Team (BART), more information here:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3660-hate-and-bias-motivated-conduct-policy>

The Bias Assessment Response Team receives reports submitted by students, faculty, and staff, regarding discrimination, harassment, and hate or bias-motivated conduct. Once a report is received, the BART administrator responds to acknowledge receipt and let the reporting person know that the information will be reviewed and assessed. After assessment by the BART, outreach is assigned to a member of BART, or follow-up is assigned to an appropriate campus resource, such as WIN (the Welfare Intervention Network). Campus Safety will be involved in assessment if criminal conduct is involved. When a member of BART reaches out to the reporting person, they will gather information from the reporting person to identify more about the incident(s) and context, what the reporting person would prefer to have happen, and ways in which the school can support them. If a violation of school policy (Discrimination, Harassment, and Hate- or Bias-Motivated Conduct Policy) is identified, the matter can be routed to the appropriate conduct body (Student Rights and Responsibilities or Human Resources). If no violation of policy is alleged by the reporting person, but the conduct still had a harmful impact, a BART member will coordinate resolution options, including working with an academic dean, faculty, or student organization involved. The goal of the BART response includes identifying a potential remedy for the harm, preventing recurrence, and respecting the wishes of the reporting person.

Does the institution have programs specifically designed to recruit students from underrepresented groups?:

Yes

Does the institution have programs specifically designed to recruit academic staff from underrepresented groups?:

Yes

Does the institution have programs designed specifically to recruit non-academic staff from underrepresented groups?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's programs to recruit students, academic staff, and/or non-academic staff 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, they conducted workshops on best practices in diversity hiring for this year's faculty and staff search committees, including the presidential search

committee. They 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.

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 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 designed specifically to support students from underrepresented groups on campus?:

Yes

Does the institution have mentoring, counseling, peer support or other programs designed specifically to support academic staff from underrepresented groups on campus?:

Yes

Does the institution have mentoring, counseling, peer support or other programs to support non-academic staff from underrepresented groups on campus?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's programs designed specifically to support students, academic staff, and/or non-academic staff from underrepresented groups:

The Living List (PDF), maintained by the Office of the Dean of the College, compiles information about many local multicultural resources. This guide is especially useful for traditionally underrepresented members of the Lewis & Clark community.

The Department of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement leads the college's efforts toward building and sustaining a diverse and culturally vibrant 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 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

GE Mentors are trained to assist you in your transition to LC and will help get you connected to our campus community and resources! Mentors are exceptional student leaders who can be a resource for you regarding information about academics, study and time management skills, student organizations, campus life, and other co-curricular activities.

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.

<https://college.lclark.edu/live/profiles/9345-american-psychological-minority-fellowship-program>

Scholarships for doctorate level students from underrepresented groups:

https://graduate.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/paying_for_graduate_school/scholarships/counseling_psychology/

https://graduate.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/paying_for_graduate_school/scholarships/educational_leadership/

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

Website URL where information about the institution's support for underrepresented groups is available:

http://college.lclark.edu/student_life/multicultural_affairs/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Affordability and Access

Score

2.84 / 4.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution is affordable and accessible to low-income students as demonstrated by one or more of the following indicators:

- A. Percentage of need met, on average, for students who were awarded any need-based aid
- B. Percentage of students graduating without student loan debt
- C. Percentage of entering students that are low-income
- D. Graduation/success rate for low-income students

These indicators are scored together to form a multi-dimensional index of affordability and accessibility that is relevant to institutions in diverse contexts. It is not expected that every institution will necessarily have the data required to report on all four indicators or achieve 100 percent on each indicator that it reports on. See Measurement for specific guidance on completing each indicator.

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

Percentage of need met, on average, for students who were awarded any need-based aid :

85

Percentage of students graduating without student loan debt:

41

Percentage of entering students that are low-income:

20

Graduation/success rate for low-income students:

67.50

A brief description of notable policies or programs to make the institution accessible and affordable to low-income students:

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.

<https://college.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/compass/fall/>

A brief description of notable policies or programs to support non-traditional students:

https://law.lclark.edu/offices/career_services/specialty/evening/

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

Website URL where information about the institution's accessibility and affordability initiatives is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Data source(s) and notes about the submission:

Percentage of need meet 85% 2018-19

Percent grad without debt 41% 2018-19

Low-income 20% from the three year average 2017, 18, 19

Grad success is 67.5% based off the average of a 4 and 6 year grad rate.

Investment & Finance

Points Claimed 4.02

Points Available 6.00

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											
	2.02 / 3.00											
<p>This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions with large investment pools and less heavily for institutions with smaller investment pools. The number of points available is automatically calculated in the online Reporting Tool as detailed in the following table:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total value of the investment pool (US/ Canadian dollars)</th> <th>Total points available for the credit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Sustainable Investment</td> <td>\$1 billion or more</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$500 - 999 million</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than \$500 million</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Total value of the investment pool (US/ Canadian dollars)	Total points available for the credit	Sustainable Investment	\$1 billion or more	5	\$500 - 999 million	4	Less than \$500 million	3
	Total value of the investment pool (US/ Canadian dollars)	Total points available for the credit										
Sustainable Investment	\$1 billion or more	5										
	\$500 - 999 million	4										
	Less than \$500 million	3										
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 academic staff, non-academic staff, and/or students (and may also include alumni, trustees, and/or other parties).

An institution 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.

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

Does the institution have a formally established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) or equivalent body?:

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 academic staff representation?:

Yes

Does the CIR include non-academic staff representation?:

Yes

Does the CIR include student representation?:

Yes

Members of the CIR, including affiliations and role:

Purchasing Manager
Data analyst/researcher
Law Student
Grad Student
CAS student
Sustainability Director
Grounds Manager
Grad Faculty
Chief Investment Officer - outsourced

Examples of CIR actions during the previous three years:

proxy voting, sustainable investing policy development, climate action plan update, divestment and ESG investment

Website URL where information about the institution's committee on investor responsibility is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainable Investment

Score

2.02 / 3.00

**Responsible
Party**

This credit is weighted more heavily for institutions with large investment pools and less heavily for institutions with smaller investment pools. The number of points available is automatically calculated in the online Reporting Tool as detailed in the following table:

**Total value of the investment pool (US/
Canadian dollars)**

**Total points available for the
credit**

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability
Manager
Facilities

\$1 billion or more

5

\$500 - 999 million

4

Less than \$500 million

3

[Close](#)

Criteria

Part 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 (CDFIs) 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 in Part 1.
- Green revolving loan funds that are funded from the endowment.

Part 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 during the previous three years, either by its committee on investor responsibility (CIR), by another committee, or through the use of guidelines.
- 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.
- Participates in a public divestment effort (e.g., targeting fossil fuel production or human rights violations) and/or has a publicly available investment policy with negative screens, for example to prohibit investment in an industry (e.g., tobacco or weapons manufacturing).
- 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

Total value of the investment pool:

255,900,000 US/Canadian \$

Value of holdings in each of the following categories:

	Value of holdings
Sustainable industries (e.g., renewable energy or sustainable forestry)	0 US/Canadian \$
Businesses selected for exemplary sustainability performance (e.g., using criteria specified in a sustainable investment policy)	0 US/Canadian \$
Sustainability investment funds (e.g., a renewable energy or impact investment fund)	8,500,000 US/ Canadian \$
Community development financial institutions (CDFIs) or the equivalent	0 US/Canadian \$
Socially responsible mutual funds with positive screens (or the equivalent)	43,400,000 US/ Canadian \$
Green revolving funds funded from the endowment	0 US/Canadian \$

A brief description of the companies, funds, and/or institutions referenced above:

Global equity strategy deeply integrating ESG/sustainability
Asia equity strategy deeply integrating ESG/sustainability
High quality fixed income strategy deeply integrating ESG/sustainability
Global equity strategy focused on water

Percentage of the institution's investment pool in positive sustainability investments:
20.28

Does the institution have a publicly available sustainable investment policy?:
Yes

A copy of the sustainable investment policy:
[resolution-no-16-enhanced-esg-inv-policy-may.pdf](#)

The sustainable investment policy:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/24172-resolution-no-16--enhanced-esg-inv-policy-may>

Does the institution use its sustainable investment policy to select and guide investment managers?:
Yes

A brief description of how the sustainable investment policy is applied:

The College's ESG and Divestment policy help guide every investment decision made in the portfolio. The college will not hire a manager that violates its stated divestment policy. Recent decisions include a full redemption from a natural resource equity strategy with fossil fuel reserve owners amongst its holdings. Commitments to various private investment funds focused on renewable energy also are examples of investments made with sustainability policy in mind.

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?:
No

A copy of the proxy voting guidelines or proxy record:

A brief description of how managers are adhering to proxy voting guidelines:

No; the College is invested almost exclusively through commingled vehicles, and as such proxy voting is determined by those managers.

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 participate in a public divestment effort and/or have a publicly available investment policy with negative screens?:

Yes

A brief description of the divestment effort or negative screens and how they have been implemented:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/news/38900-l-amp-c-divestment-policy-highlights>

Approximate percentage of endowment that the divestment effort and/or negative screens apply to:

100

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
Was one of a handful of colleges and universities to sign on to the Global Investor Statement to Governments on Climate Change

<https://www.iigcc.org/media/2019/12/191201-GISGCC-FINAL-for-COP25-007.pdf>

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainable investment efforts is available:

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[Investments_2016.pdf](#)

Investment Disclosure

Score

0.00 / 1.00

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution makes a snapshot of its investment holdings available to the public on at least an annual basis. Investment holdings must include the amount invested in each fund and/or company, and may also include proxy voting records (if applicable).

"---" 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:

Website URL where the investment 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

Website URL where information about the institution's investment pool 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 5.42

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	1.63 / 3.00
Assessing Employee Satisfaction	1.00 / 1.00
Wellness Program	1.00 / 1.00
Workplace Health and Safety	1.79 / 2.00

Employee Compensation

Score

1.63 / 3.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Living wage for employees

More than 75 percent of the institution's employees receive a living wage (benefits excluded).

Include all employees (full-time, part-time, and temporary/adjunct) in Part 1. An institution may choose to include or omit student workers, who are covered in the Student Living Wage credit in Exemplary Practice.

Part 2. Living wage for employees of contractors

Institution is able to verify that more than 75 percent of the employees of any significant contractors that are present on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations receive a living wage (benefits excluded).

Include all regular (i.e., permanent), part-time and full-time workers employed by significant contractors in Part 2. Examples include, but are not limited to, employees of regular providers of dining/catering, cleaning/janitorial, maintenance, groundskeeping, professional, transportation, and retail services. Construction workers and other employees of contractors that work on-site on a temporary or irregular basis may be excluded, as may student workers employed by contractors.

An institution without wage data for its contractors may report the percentage of employees of contractors covered by collective bargaining agreements (i.e., union contracts) in lieu of the above.

Part 3. Minimum total compensation for employees

Total compensation provided to the institution's lowest paid regular (i.e., permanent), part-time or full-time employee or pay grade meets or exceeds the local living wage.

Provisional compensation for newly hired, entry-level employees (e.g., compensation provided during the first six months of employment) may be excluded from Part 3. An institution may choose to include or omit student workers.

Determining the local living wage

To determine the local living wage:

- A U.S. institution must use the [Living Wage Calculator](#) hosted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to look up the living wage for “2 Adults, 2 Children” (which assumes both adults are working) for the community in which the main campus is located.
- A Canadian institution 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),
- An institution located outside the U.S. and Canada must use a local equivalent of the above standards if available or else the local poverty indicator for a family of four (expressed as an hourly wage).

Please note that a family of four is used to help harmonize the living wage standards and poverty indicators used in different countries and is not assumed to be the most common or representative family size in any particular context. For further guidance in determining the local living wage, see Measurement.

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

The local living wage (based on a family of four and expressed as an hourly wage):

18.15 US/Canadian \$

Percentage of employees that receive a living wage (benefits excluded):

95.90

Does the institution have significant contractors with employees that work on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations?:

Yes

A list or brief description of significant on-site contractors:

Dining
Janitorial
Transportation
Bookstore/retail

Percentage of employees of on-site contractors known to receive a living wage or be covered by collective bargaining agreements (i.e., union contracts):

0

Total compensation provided to the institution’s lowest paid regular, part-time or full-time 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:

Total compensation provided to lowest compensated regular FT or PT employee (and explanation): \$24,240. They are at 5% below the living wage figure as represented as an hourly wage. This is for a part-time assistant coach, and they only receive base pay without benefits

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:

Website URL where information about employee compensation 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

1.00 / 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.

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

Has the institution conducted a survey or other evaluation that allows for anonymous feedback to measure employee satisfaction and engagement during the previous three years?:

Yes

Percentage of employees assessed, directly or by representative sample:

100

A brief description of the institution's methodology for evaluating employee satisfaction and engagement:

Gallup survey

A brief description of the mechanism(s) by which the institution addresses issues raised by the evaluation:

Gallup survey

Website URL where information about the employee satisfaction and engagement evaluation is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/files/25928-q12-employee-engagement-report-detail>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Wellness Program

Score	Responsible Party
1.00 / 1.00	Amy Dvorak Sustainability Manager Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Wellness program

Institution has a wellness and/or employee assistance program that makes available counseling, referral, and wellbeing services to students and/or employees.

Part 2. Smoke-free environments

Institution prohibits smoking (as defined by the institution) within all occupied buildings that it owns or leases, and either:

1. Restricts outdoor smoking (e.g., by designating smoking areas or smoke-free spaces), OR
2. Prohibits smoking and tobacco use across the entire campus.

Policies 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.

"---" 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 academic staff?:

Yes

Does the institution have a wellness and/or employee assistance program that makes counseling, referral, and wellbeing services available to all non-academic staff?:

Yes

A brief description of the institution's wellness and/or employee assistance program(s):

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

Does the institution prohibit smoking within all occupied buildings owned or leased by the institution?:

Yes

Does the institution restrict outdoor smoking?:

Yes

Does the institution prohibit smoking and tobacco use across the entire campus?:

Yes

A copy of the institution's smoke-free policy:

The institution's smoke-free policy:

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3672-smoke-and-tobacco-free-community-policy>

Website URL where information about the institution's wellness programs is available:
http://www.lclark.edu/offices/human_resources/employee_resources/benefits/wellness/

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Workplace Health and Safety

Score

1.79 / 2.00

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Part 1. Health and safety management system

Institution has an occupational health and safety management system (OHSMS).

The system may use a nationally or internationally recognized standard or guideline (see Standards and Terms for a list of examples) or it may be a custom management system.

Part 2. Incidents per FTE employee

Institution has less than four annual recordable incidents of work-related injury or ill health per 100 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.

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

Does the institution have an occupational health and safety management system (OHSMS)?:

Yes

Does the system use a nationally or internationally recognized standard or guideline?:

Yes

The nationally or internationally recognized OHSMS standard or guideline used:

OHSA

A brief description of the key components of the custom OHSMS:

lan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle

Health and safety committees, ongoing training, Wellness Fair

Annual number of recordable incidents of work-related injury or ill health:

4

Full-time equivalent of employees:

729

Full-time equivalent of workers who are not employees, but whose work and/or workplace is controlled by the institution:

A brief description of the methodology used to track and calculate the number of recordable incidents of work-related injury or ill health :

Workplace injuries and health are tracked through our HR and the related software systems.

Annual number of recordable incidents of work-related injury or ill health per 100 FTE employees:

0.55

Website URL where information about the occupational health and safety program is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

[OSHA_Form_300A_-_signed_20200124.pdf](#)

Innovation & Leadership

Innovation & Leadership

Points Claimed 3.25

Points Available 3.50

The credits in this category recognize institutions that are seeking innovative solutions to sustainability challenges and demonstrating sustainability leadership in ways that are not otherwise captured in STARS.

Innovation & Leadership credits recognize:

- Emerging best practices (e.g., seeking independent assurance 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).
- Innovative programs and initiatives that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit.

A catalog of currently available Innovation & Leadership credits is available in the STARS Reporting Tool and on the [STARS website](#). These credits may be claimed in multiple submissions as long as the criteria are being met at the time of submission.

Scoring

Each Innovation & Leadership credit is worth a maximum of 0.5 bonus points. An institution's overall, percentage-based STARS score is increased by the number of these points it earns. For example, if an institution earned 30 percent of available points in the four main STARS categories, earning 2 Innovation & Leadership points would raise its final overall score to 32.

An institution may claim any combination of Innovation & Leadership credits and may include as many of these credits in its report as desired, however the maximum number of bonus points applied toward scoring is capped at 4.

Credit	Points
Dining Services Certification	0.50 / 0.50
Food Bank	0.50 / 0.50
Grounds Certification	0.50 / 0.50
Single-Use Plastic Ban	0.50 / 0.50
Sustainability Projects Fund	0.50 / 0.50
Textbook Affordability	0.25 / 0.50
Innovation A	0.50 / 0.50

Dining Services Certification

Score

0.50 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution and/or its primary dining services contractor has at least one on-site dining hall or food service outlet (e.g., café, coffee shop, dining hall, franchise, or restaurant) certified by one or more of the following:

- Food for Life (Food for Life Served Here award)
- The Food Recovery Network (Food Recovery Verified)
- The Green Restaurant Association (GRA) (Two Star or higher)
- Green Seal (GS-55 Standard for Restaurants and Food Services)
- Leaders for Environmentally Accountable Foodservice (LEAF)
- Nordic Swan
- Responsible Epicurean and Agricultural Leadership (REAL)
- Sustainable Restaurant Association (Food Made Good, Two Stars or higher)
- An equivalent third party certification approved by AASHE

Please note that this credit recognizes dining halls and food service outlets that have been third party certified. Expenditures on third party certified sustainable food and beverage products are recognized in the Food and Beverage Purchasing credit.

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

Is at least one on-campus dining hall or food service outlet certified by one or more of the following organizations?:

	Yes or No
Food for Life (Food for Life Served Here award)	---
The Food Recovery Network (Food Recovery Verified)	Yes
The Green Restaurant Association (GRA) (Two Star or higher)	---
Green Seal (GS-55 Standard for Restaurants and Food Services)	No
Leaders for Environmentally Accountable Foodservice (LEAF)	---
Nordic Swan	---
Responsible Epicurean and Agricultural Leadership (REAL)	---
Sustainable Restaurant Association (Food Made Good, Two Stars or higher)	---
An equivalent third party certification approved by AASHE	---

Approximately what proportion of on-site food service outlets (by location or sales) are third party certified?:

50 percent or more

A list or brief description of each certified dining hall or food service outlet, including the certification earned:

Food Recovery Certified:

<https://www.foodrecoverynetwork.org/verified-accounts>

Fields, Maggies, Dovecote

Website URL where information about the institution's sustainable dining certification program is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Food Bank

Score

0.50 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution hosts a food bank, pantry, or equivalent resource focused on alleviating food insecurity, hunger and poverty among students. The food bank, pantry, or equivalent may serve employees or local community members in addition to students.

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

Does the institution host a food bank, pantry, or equivalent resource focused on alleviating food insecurity, hunger and poverty among students?:

Yes

A brief description of the food bank, pantry, or equivalent resource:

Lewis & Clark's student-run and supported Food Pantry provides underprivileged students with access to food. The food pantry is open throughout the term, the link provided was one of the regularly scheduled events. Many of these events are also posted on social media for students.

Website URL where information about the food bank is available:

<https://college.lclark.edu/live/events/295916-food-pantry-open-hours>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Grounds Certification

Score

0.50 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution owns and/or manages land that is currently certified under one or more of the following programs:

- ArbNet Arboretum Accreditation
- Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program (ACSP)
- Bee Campus USA
- Demeter Biodynamic
- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management standard
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Green List Standard
- National Wildlife Federation's Certified Wildlife Habitat Program
- An [Organic standard](#) or [Participatory Guarantee System](#) (PGS) endorsed by IFOAM
- Salmon-Safe
- Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES)
- Tree Campus USA (Arbor Day Foundation)
- An equivalent third party certification program for the protection and promotion of biodiversity approved by AASHE.

"---" 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
ArbNet Arboretum Accreditation	---
Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program (ACSP)	---
Bee Campus USA	---
Demeter Biodynamic	---
Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management standard	---
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Green List Standard	---
National Wildlife Federation's Certified Wildlife Habitat Program	---

	Yes or No
An Organic standard or Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) endorsed by IFOAM	---
Salmon-Safe	Yes
Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES)	---
Tree Campus USA (Arbor Day Foundation)	No
An equivalent program approved by AASHE	---

A brief description of the institution’s third party certified land holdings:

Salmon Safe since 2013, entire campus.

Documentation affirming the certification(s):

Website URL where information affirming the certification(s) is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Single-Use Plastic Ban

Score

0.50 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution has banned or eliminated the on-site sales and distribution of at least one type of single-use disposable plastic, for example:

- Straws
- Beverage bottles
- Shopping bags
- Food serviceware, containers, or utensils
- Polystyrene (Styrofoam™) products
- Individually packaged items (e.g., napkins, condiments, and baked goods)

To qualify, a single-use disposable plastic must have been banned or eliminated across the entire institution. Biodegradable plastic options may be used if they are both certified compostable and used in conjunction with a campus composting program.

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

Has the institution banned or eliminated the on-site sales and distribution of at least one type of single-use disposable plastic?:

Yes

A brief description of the single-use disposable plastics that have been banned or eliminated:

Plastic bottled beverages (of all types) have been entirely banned and removed from campus in addition to plastic straws, plastic bags and plastic utensils.

Single-Use Plastic Elimination Policy

The Lewis & Clark Sustainability Council formally endorses efforts by the Lewis & Clark community to remove beverages in plastic bottles from campus vending and catering while promoting policies and practices to eliminate plastic bottles sales entirely. This effort aims to eliminate waste created by single-use items, to reduce our reliance on products containing fossil fuels, and support higher value recyclable or reusable items across our campuses.

Website URL where information about the single-use disposable plastic ban(s) is available:

<https://www.lclark.edu/about/sustainability/campus/>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Sustainability Projects Fund

Score

0.50 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution has a dedicated fund (e.g., a green fund) to support campus sustainability projects.

The fund is ongoing (i.e., not a one-time award or grant) and includes a multi-stakeholder decision-making process to determine which projects receive funding.

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

Name of the institution's sustainability projects fund:

Renewable Energy Fee Fund

Which of the following best describes the primary source of funding for the sustainability projects fund?:

Student fees

Year the institution's sustainability projects fund was established:

2,001

A brief description of the institution's sustainability projects fund:

As the costs associated with purchasing renewable energy certificates (REC) have come down over the years, surplus funds from the Renewable Energy Fee have become available to students via the Renewable Energy Fee Fund. A Renewable Energy Fee Fund Committee (REFF) is charged with overseeing the status of the surplus fund and approves any expenditure including the awarding of grants as described below.

Reasons for a Renewable Energy Fee Surplus

The surplus resulted from several factors including 1) establishing a competitive bid process among renewable energy certificate providers 2) lower than projected prices in the REC market, and 3) high enrollment and participation by CAS students in the program—particularly in 2011-2012 and 4) reductions in electricity use. There is no guarantee that there will continue to be a surplus in future academic years; however the Renewable Energy Fee committee (as governed by the ASLC Senate Resolution FA13 SR002) and sustainability managers must maintain an 8% reserve, in order to manage any fluctuations or unanticipated increases in the REC costs.

A brief description of the multi-stakeholder decision-making process used to determine which projects receive funding through the sustainability projects fund:

Renewable Energy Fee Committee

The Renewable Energy Fee Committee is comprised of two ASLC representatives, two at-large student members, a paid student position (Renewable Energy Intern), and a representative from the following staff departments; Business Office, Student Life, and the Sustainability Manager.

Interested in serving on the Committee? Please submit this interest form.

NOTE: Committee members may not apply for funding during their term of service.

General Application Guidelines

Applicants may apply for funding once per year, for a total of three times during their time as students at Lewis & Clark.

Applicants requesting funding for an internship will be paid minimum wage. This will vary based on the state of employment, but will not be less than the Oregon minimum wage.

Applicants in their senior year are encouraged to apply prior to their last semester to ensure their educational giveback is completed prior to graduation.

Applicants must contact the Renewable Energy Fee Fund Intern at least 2 weeks before the submission of their application.

Applicants must submit a short letter of interest to the committee two weeks before the final submission deadline if:

They are requesting \$5000 or more.

They are collaborating with organizations outside of Lewis and Clark as a significant component to the project.

This letter of interest should briefly describe the project, name all the participants/collaborators and describe their level of engagement with the project. It should also roughly outline the project's expected costs.

Grant proposals may not exceed five pages in length (excluding the budget forms).

Applications must be submitted electronically.

Applicants may be asked to make a presentation to the Committee.

Application Process

Contact the Renewable Energy Intern and discuss your preliminary ideas.

Work on your first application draft (fill out the two forms provided below).

Meet with Renewable Energy Intern and revise the application.

Submit your application by one of the two dates listed below.

The application has two parts. The first is the Renewable Energy Fee Fund Written Application and the second is the Renewable Energy Fee Fund Application Budget and Timeline Form Application. Both of these documents must be completed, and shared with the Renewable Energy Fee Fund intern, Satya Austin-Opper at

satyaaustin-opper@lclark.edu

The Renewable Energy Fee Fund Committee will assess each application according to the application assessment rubric. However, the primary driver of the application will be the presence or absence of a renewable energy component (please see definition below). Additionally, the degree to which the project supports renewable energy must be described in detail. The extent of the relationship will impact the amount of funding the applicant is eligible for. The remaining scores will assess the viability and significance of the project/initiative as a whole.

Renewable energy includes resources that rely on fuel sources that restore themselves over short periods of time and do not diminish. Such fuel sources include the sun, wind, moving water, organic plant and waste material (eligible biomass), and the earth's heat (geothermal).

Green power is a subset of renewable energy and represents those renewable energy resources and technologies that provide the highest environmental benefit. EPA defines green power as electricity produced from solar, wind, geothermal, biogas, eligible biomass, and low-impact small hydroelectric sources.

Website URL where information about the sustainability projects fund is available:

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

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Textbook Affordability

Score

0.25 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Nicole Godbout
Student Assistant
Undergraduate

Criteria

Institution supports textbook affordability by:

- Hosting a peer-to-peer textbook exchange program, textbook lending library, or an alternate textbook project covering multiple divisions or departments; AND/OR
 - Providing incentives for academic staff that explicitly encourage the authorship, peer review, and/or adoption of open access textbooks (or alternate textbooks composed of open educational resources). The incentives may include honors, fellowships, titles, monetary rewards, and/or release time.
-

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

Does the institution host a peer-to-peer textbook exchange program, textbook lending library, or alternate textbook project?:

Yes

A brief description of the textbook exchange program, textbook lending library, or alternate textbook project:

The Associated Students of Lewis and Clark Textbook Subsidy program provides textbooks at reduced costs for qualifying students.

Does the institution provide incentives for academic staff that explicitly encourage the authorship, peer review, and/or adoption of open access textbooks?:

No

A brief description of the incentives to encourage the authorship, peer review, and/or adoption of open access textbooks:

Website URL where information about the textbook affordability incentives is available:

<https://college.lclark.edu/live/news/42403-aslc-textbook-subsidy>

Additional documentation to support the submission:

Innovation A

Score

0.50 / 0.50

Responsible Party

Amy Dvorak
Sustainability Manager
Facilities

Criteria

Institution has a new, extraordinary, unique, ground-breaking, or uncommon outcome, policy, or practice that addresses a sustainability challenge and is not covered by an existing credit.

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.

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:

TransActive Gender Project

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 TransActive Gender Project at Lewis & Clark provides a holistic range of services and expertise to empower transgender and gender expansive children, youth, and their families in living healthy lives that are free of discrimination.

TransActive delivers:

Professional development and community centered training and education;
Facilitated support groups for adult family/allies and youth age 4-18;
Advocacy related to gender diverse social justice;

Policy development/implementation consultation and guidance, and
Screened referrals to mental health & medical providers experienced in trans youth care

Which of the following impact areas does the innovation most closely relate to? (select up to three):

Curriculum
Public Engagement
Diversity & Affordability

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 :

https://graduate.lclark.edu/programs/continuing_education/transactive/

Additional documentation to support the submission:
