



## **CUECS COLLEGE ENVIRONMENTAL LEAGUE TABLE 2007/08**

### **SUMMARY**

The Cambridge University Environmental Consulting Society (CUECS) has produced a League Table that ranks individual colleges by their environmental performance. This was achieved using methods adapted from the previous league table, published in 2007. The rankings reflect college practice in nine key areas: (1) kitchens, (2) college bar, (3) computers, printers & photocopiers, (4) gardens, (5) insulation, (6) lighting, (7) waste, (8) housekeeping and (9) college commitment. This report includes an examination of the methods used, a discussion of the final results and suggestion for how Colleges can make progress in order to perform better environmentally.

### **CONTENTS**

1. Introduction	2
2. Methodology	3
3. Results	5
4. Discussion	6
5. Recommendations and Top Ten Ideas	8
6. Appendix	
A. Full Table	11
B. League Tables from previous years	12
C. Questionnaire 2007/08	15

*Contact address:* [cuecs@cusu.cam.ac.uk](mailto:cuecs@cusu.cam.ac.uk)

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This environmental League Table has been produced by CUECS and ranks the colleges of Cambridge University based on their environmental performance. This report follows four previous League Tables, the first produced 2002 in which 25 colleges participated and Jesus College ranked top<sup>1</sup>, the second in 2005 where 23 colleges participated and Churchill College ranked top,<sup>2</sup> and the third in 2006, where 27 colleges participated and Darwin ranked top<sup>3</sup>, and last year's where Churchill held the top ranking again<sup>4</sup>.

The environmental performance of Cambridge colleges is an increasingly important issue in the light of growing concerns regarding environmental problems such as climate change and the exploitation of non-renewable resources. Cambridge University is a large and prominent institution with global influence. It is therefore very important that environmental practice and policy within the university sets a high environmental standard that can be widely recognised for its efforts to achieve. The aims of this project are twofold:

1. To gain a quantitative measure of the support and commitment of college administrations toward environmental initiatives.
2. To increase awareness of environmental issues throughout the university, its colleges and members; our ultimate aim is to improve environmental performance through implementation of realistic and accessible policies.

We hope that this project will be continued annually to ensure that environmental issues remain high on the university agenda and to encourage continual improvement throughout the university and individual colleges.

If you want to find out more about how your college scored, then please feel free to contact any member of the CUECS team who will be happy to talk through the results with you.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cam.ac.uk/societies/cuecs/upto2003/leaguetable/index.html>

<sup>2</sup> CUECS Environmental League Table 2004/5

<sup>3</sup> CUECS Environmental League Table 2005/6

<sup>4</sup> CUECS Environmental League Table 2006/7

## 2. METHODOLOGY

In November 2007, a comprehensive questionnaire was developed from the survey and weightings used to generate the CUECS League Table in 2006. The new questionnaire was distributed to the Bursars and student Green Officers of each Cambridge College, and returned throughout December. The quantitative data provided were entered into a spreadsheet from which the tables were generated. The qualitative information was collated for use in the analysis of the tables and in making suggestions for further improvements.

The questionnaire was adapted from the one used last year. A number of questions were added, rephrased or removed in response to feedback sought from Bursars, Green Officers and last year's CUECS team, in order to make the questionnaire as appropriate and straightforward as possible. The main section headings remained the same although some of the weightings were altered to make different sections more comparable, and the garden sections were worded differently based on feedback from last year. The qualitative questions were also altered to reduce repetition and provide for a more rounded form of feedback.

To generate the table from the quantitative data, points awarded for each question were weighted, summed and scaled to give each college a final score as a percentage, by which they were ranked. It should be noted that due to several alterations in questionnaire design and methodology percentage scores for each college are not directly comparable with those from previous years, however in most cases an increased percentage does reflect an improvement in a college's environmental behaviour.

The ranking method used was one developed by CUECS members in previous years to appropriately consider the particular context of Cambridge colleges and the initiatives they have in place. This was based on the 1994 CUSU publication 'Another 700 years'<sup>4</sup>, from which the questionnaire categories were derived as follows: *kitchens and college bar, computers, printers and photocopiers, gardens, insulation, lighting, waste, housekeeping and college commitment*. Each category was examined with respect to, among other things, the resources used, the extent of recycling and waste reduction and any policies that encouraged better practice. Weightings given for individual questions were based on their impact on the environment; in brief, each weighting was calculated by working out a sustainability factor and an impact factor for that practice and multiplying the two together<sup>5</sup>. The environmental footprint system was employed to make policies with different environmental impacts - low energy consumption versus low emission of pollutants for example - more comparable<sup>6</sup>.

The League Table project had a very good response this year, with 27 colleges supplying fully completed questionnaires and 1 college's questionnaire unfortunately

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www-green.cusu.cam.ac.uk/archive/a700y/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.cam.ac.uk/societies/cuecs/upto2003/leaguetable/index.html> for more information

<sup>6</sup> [www.bestfootforward.com](http://www.bestfootforward.com) for more information

being lost in the post. A few questions were unanswered for various reasons including the inapplicability of the question to the college, the responsible party being unavailable, or reluctance on the part of the college to respond to particular questions. Furthermore, four colleges did not participate at all in this exercise despite repeated attempts on our part to gather information from them and this has also been indicated in the table.

For some individual colleges the submitted answers may not fully reflect their environmental performance; that we are only able to present the results as submitted by the official representatives of the colleges is a limitation of which to be aware.

### 3. RESULTS

Position	College	Total Percentage
1	Robinson	78.6
2	Darwin	78.5
3	Churchill	75.6
4	Downing	75.3
5	Clare	74.9
6	Homerton	74.8
7	St Catherine's	72.3
8	Magdalene	70.1
9	Pembroke	69.3
10	St Edmund's	69.2
11	Selwyn	68.1
12	Sidney Sussex	68.0
13	St John's	65.6
14	Emmanuel	64.0
15	Newnham	61.4
16	Lucy Cavendish	60.2
17	New Hall	60.1
18	Gonville & Caius	59.4
19	Girton	58.0
20	Trinity Hall	57.1
21	Wolfson	57.0
22	Fitzwilliam	56.3
23	Queens'	55.6
24	Jesus	51.9
25	King's	51.4
26	Clare Hall	48.8
27	Christ's	41.6
28	Trinity	**
28	Corpus Christi	*
28	Hughes Hall	*
28	Peterhouse	*

\* Questionnaire not returned

\*\* Questionnaire lost in the post

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

The results of this year's League Table were remarkably positive. In categories that could be directly compared to last year's results, the colleges as a whole showed significant improvement. In particular, the average score in the 'lighting' category rose by over 20%, the average score in the 'college bar' category rose by over 12%, and the average score in the 'kitchens' category rose by over 10%. In most cases, any movement within the League Table was a result of a more significant improvement by one college than other colleges which resulted in the subsequent overtaking of the other colleges. These results are very promising and show that as a whole the colleges of the University are embracing environmental issues and making changes accordingly.

Robinson topped our table this year, edging out Darwin by 0.1% with an overall score of 78.6% in their quantitative questionnaire. The college's strong 'college commitment' score was evident as the college scored well above average in almost every category. Of particular mention are high marks in the 'kitchens,' 'college bar,' and 'waste' categories, where Robinson ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, joint 1<sup>st</sup>, and 2<sup>nd</sup>, respectively. The college can be specifically commended for using the results of last year's League Table questionnaire to develop a plan for changes to improve college practices. Robinson emphasizes the education of students, fellows, and staff as the key to making environmental initiatives work. Despite topping this year's table, like every college Robinson still has some room for improvement, in particular in the 'lighting' category where the college's score fell below average.

Darwin also deserves mention for its impressive ranking, falling just below Robinson with an overall score of 78.5%. In addition to environmentally friendly policies in the 'college bar' and 'kitchens,' Darwin used a strong 'college commitment' and impressive scores in the 'gardens' and 'lighting' categories to find itself towards the top of the table. The college focuses on practical green activities, such as the Green Room system in which a student takes on responsibility for overseeing recycling in each residence. Darwin's ranking would benefit from improvement in the college's policies on 'computing, printers, and photocopiers' and 'housekeeping,' two categories in which it scored below average.

While several colleges improved their standing in this year's League Table, of particular mention are Homerton and St. John's, who improved from 17<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup>, respectively. Homerton's improvement was evident in its perfect 'college commitment' score of 100%, up from 14.3% a year ago. Significant improvements in the 'college bar' and 'computing, printers, and photocopiers' categories greatly aided their climb up the table, a result which shows that the implementation of a college environmental policy can bring about great changes within a college. St. John's improvement was led by definitive increases in scores in the 'computing, printers, and photocopiers,' 'lighting,' and 'waste' categories. The college instituted many changes in the last year, including the addition of recycling facilities to the college buttry and an initiative to reduce plastic bag use.

This year's results once again highlight the importance of having a college environmental policy, as 16 of the 27 colleges who returned the survey do. It is no surprise that the colleges who scored less than 50% in the 'college commitment' section of the questionnaire found themselves in the bottom third of this year's rankings. These results show how the implementation of an environmental policy including the designation of responsibility for environmental issues to members of staff or students can significantly improve a college's environmental impact.

While some colleges were more consistent than others, every college showed some variations in their scoring, *i.e.* they scored well in some categories but poorly in others. While the League Table questionnaire is not an entirely comprehensive analysis of environmental impact, it does provide a fairly well-rounded view of college environmental issues. The fact that every college still struggles in at least one category simply highlights the fact there is always room for improvement when it comes to environmental issues. It is promising to see that the colleges on a whole have improved their performance in a variety of areas, and it is our hope that this table will continue to highlight the improvements each college makes as an increasing number environmentally friendly initiatives are embraced.

With that said, two categories in which the colleges as a whole continue to struggle are 'waste' and 'housekeeping.' The implementation of successful recycling initiatives still tends to be a difficulty for many of the colleges. Successful schemes tend to include the provision of readily accessible recycling bins, preferably in student rooms, and a system for managing them, such as the appointment of a staircase or residence green officer. A number of housekeeping issues can be improved quite easily, such as the use of environmentally friendly cleaning products and toilet roll made from recycled paper. Laundry facilities can be grounds for significant improvement through the use of signs to encourage students to hang-dry their clothes and the installation of washing machines with water-save settings. Each of these areas provides relatively straight-forward grounds for making significant improvements.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to mention each of the many good ideas colleges have devised to improve their environmental impact. A number of ideas such as Pembroke's decision to measure resource use (*i.e.* energy consumption) and the set targets for reduction, Churchill's incorporation of a 'good-living' shop into the college bar, and Downing and Clare incorporating environmental improvements such as ground source and solar heating or heat exchange pumps on new buildings stuck out. It is very encouraging to see college students and staff working together to develop innovative methods of improving the interaction between colleges and the environment.

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that the League Table Questionnaire will undergo a revamp before next year, hopefully taking into account the many concerns raised in the feedback sections of this year's results. CUECS are continually working to improve this investigation to make it as fair and comprehensive as possible. It is our hope that in future years this report will continue to raise awareness of environmental issues and be grounds for each college to engage in a healthy discussion of its individual impact on the environment.

## **5. RECCOMENDATIONS**

We asked Green Officers how they thought their college could reduce its environmental impact. There was a general agreement that the availability, accessibility and awareness of different types of recycling in college could be improved, in particular with regards to materials such as cardboard and plastic. Many colleges stated that the council did not provide plastic recycling, however we hope facilities will be available soon<sup>7</sup>. In many colleges responsibility for emptying existing recycling bins lay with student volunteers while some Green Officers expressed a desire for college staff, particularly housekeeping and maintenance, to be more involved in the emptying of recycle bins. Housekeeping provide a very important service and a balance must be struck between asking them to be involved and not asking them to increase their workload. St Catherine's college have succeeded on both counts by asking that on one day a week the housekeepers empty the recycling bins instead of normal bins, meaning hardly any change to their daily routine.

Many colleges find that the individuals' attitudes are one of the biggest challenges they face, but several colleges have had success by linking environmental behaviour to financial savings. CUECS strongly recommend that colleges install electricity meters so that students can be billed for their individual energy use, thereby encouraging them to cut down. Downing, for example, uses a reward system to reduce usage by offering a free formal hall to the house with the lowest energy bill. By installing motion-sensitive lights<sup>8</sup> and enabling automatic power down settings on printers and computers, colleges need not rely on individuals' attitudes.

Educating both students and staff is vital to achieving the smooth running of environmental policies, and colleges have demonstrated various ways of communicating the importance of environmental issues. These included websites, freshers guides, college magazines, regular emails and posters.

The incorporation of organic and free range food is often tricky because of the increased costs. However Kings have introduced a traffic light system where more environmentally friendly foods are marked with a green label, environmentally unfriendly foods with a red label and yellow for everything in between, allowing students to make a more informed choice.

It was encouraging to see many colleges looking towards long term plans to reduce their impact, with many expressing a desire to buy electricity from a green provider. Downing have shown real commitment by recently launching new carbon reduction scheme that will measure and monitor the energy use of all its accommodation and office buildings and create actual reduction targets. But with 11 out of 27 participating colleges still lacking a college environmental policy, this remains one of our most important recommendations.

---

<sup>7</sup> For more details on how to achieve plastic recycling please refer to your GoGreener handbook.

<sup>8</sup> For information about where to find suppliers please refer to your GoGreener handbook.



## TOP TEN IDEAS

1. Each college should have its own **environmental policy**. This will provide a framework for long-term commitment to environmentally friendly practice throughout the college, *e.g.* when replacing appliances. It should include guidelines for an established Environmental Committee comprising of both staff and student members and ideally should set actual targets for reduction in energy use that can be reviewed annually.
2. **“Power down”** notices and **“switch off”** stickers are proven cheap and effective ways to reduce college electricity bills, but it’s even better if you can enable **automatic “power down” settings** on computers, printers and photocopiers.
3. **Recycling bins for metal, glass and paper** should be accessible to all students, ideally at the *individual room/staircase level* depending on college restrictions, as well as appropriate areas such as computer rooms for paper and near can machines for cans.
4. **Low energy light bulbs, motion sensors** and **timers** on corridor lights are three ways to further reduce energy costs. Low energy light bulbs in particular have been shown to reduce electricity bills, can be easily recycled and often do not require any fitting replacements.
5. **Kitchens** should have a policy for sourcing more organic, local, free range and vegetarian options. Students should be able to choose their food based on its environmental impact, for instance using a traffic light labeling system (as shown by King’s college).
6. **Educating** new members will make sure that they know from the outset what environmental facilities are available within college. Introducing college recycling in **Fresher’s guides** and a **green website** can be particularly effective as well as the production of readily accessible **“green maps”** of college recycling points to encourage environmental awareness and action among all members of college.
7. **College Ball/ Events** committees can significantly reduce their ecological impact in a number of ways. The College Ball Sustainability Guide, published by CUECS, offers a range of cost-effective ideas and details on how this can be done.
8. Appointing **student representatives** to take responsibility for recycling and energy/water saving initiatives within accommodation units has proven successful in several colleges so far, especially where financial incentive is offered.
9. Printers should be set so that **duplex printing is standard** and single-sided printed is through opting out.
10. There should be a large emphasis on housekeeping using **environmentally friendly cleaning products** and on improvements in student **laundry facilities**.

Thank you for taking the time to read this report. We welcome your comments, which can be sent to [cuecs@cusu.cam.ac.uk](mailto:cuecs@cusu.cam.ac.uk)

**Regards, the CUECS Environmental League Table Team 2007/8**

Lotte Blair  
Steve Bland  
Jennifer Hoyal Cuthill  
Sara Lyon  
Patrick Marti  
Alex Richart



**Appendix A: Full Table 2007/2008**

<b>COLLEGE</b>	<b>KITCHENS</b>	<b>BAR</b>	<b>PRINTERS</b>	<b>GARDENS</b>	<b>INSULAT.</b>	<b>LIGHT</b>	<b>WASTE</b>	<b>H-EEPING</b>	<b>COMMITMENT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>POSITION</b>
<b>ROBINSON</b>	98	100	87.6	78	70.5	62.5	66	75	91.6	<b>78.6</b>	1
<b>DARWIN</b>	95.7	100	71.4	100	84.9	87.5	63	25	91.7	<b>78.5</b>	2
<b>CHURCHILL</b>	69	96	82.3	90.6	74	90.6	57.8	51.9	91.67	<b>75.6</b>	3
<b>DOWNING</b>	87.5	100	81.1	87.5	75.3	75	43.6	75	100	<b>75.3</b>	4
<b>CLARE</b>	85.7	100	85.4	65.6	84.9	63.6	36.4	84.6	91.7	<b>74.85</b>	5
<b>HOMERTON</b>	32.6	100	77.3	90.6	95.9	75	36.7	65.4	100	<b>74.8</b>	6
<b>ST CATS</b>	91.8	100	83.7	50	76.7	41.2	55.3	82.7	91.7	<b>72.9</b>	7
<b>MAGD</b>	51	70	89.4	78.1	90.4	62.5	37.1	0	91.7	<b>70.1</b>	8
<b>PEMBROKE</b>	61.2	70	90.2	15.6	58.9	75	62.9	80.8	91.7	<b>69.3</b>	9
<b>ST EDS</b>	42.9	100	62.6	75	91.8	75	30.3	84.6	100	<b>69.2</b>	10
<b>SELWYN</b>	69.4	100	83.7	65.6	65.8	62.5	41	50	91.7	<b>68.04</b>	11
<b>SIDNEY</b>	55.1	100	78.9	65.6	90.4	87.9	32	70	50	<b>68.03</b>	12
<b>ST JOHNS</b>	82.2	70	81.5	78.1	53.4	87.5	46.7	32.7	91.7	<b>65.6</b>	13
<b>EMMA</b>	36.7	100	72.3	100	57.5	62.5	55.4	9.6	91.7	<b>64</b>	14
<b>NEWNHAM</b>	62.2	100	69.1	96.9	65.7	75	17.3	28.8	91.7	<b>61.4</b>	15
<b>LUCY CAV</b>	51	100	92.3	90.6	61.6	62.5	29.7	84.6	16.7	<b>60.2</b>	16
<b>NEW HALL</b>	57.1	100	7.3*	65.6	72.6	62.5	72.6	69.2	91.7	<b>60.18</b>	17
<b>G&amp;C</b>	81.6	100	77.2	65.6	52.1	75	36.9	30.8	50	<b>59.4</b>	18
<b>GIRTON</b>	73.5	70	67.5	65.6	39.7	71.9	49.7	51.9	58.3	<b>58</b>	19
<b>TRINITY HALL</b>	34.6	70	74	71.9	46.6	87.9	44.2	84.6	50	<b>57.1</b>	20
<b>WOLFSON</b>	83.7	70	75.6	40.6	71.2	50	32.6	25	33.3	<b>57</b>	21
<b>FITZ</b>	53.1	100	58.5	87.5	72.5	12.5	28.1	75	50	<b>56.3</b>	22
<b>QUEENS</b>	95.6	70	71.8	65.6	58.8	39.4	39.8	25	33.3	<b>55.6</b>	23
<b>JESUS</b>	83.7	100	26	65.6	46.6	25	80.1	30.8	33.3	<b>51.9</b>	24
<b>KINGS</b>	87.8	70	70.7	65.6	41.1	75.8	28	69.2	16.7	<b>51.4</b>	25
<b>CLARE HALL</b>	55.1	100	65.9	90.6	45.2	62.5	13.9	75	33.3	<b>48.8</b>	26
<b>CHRISTS</b>	38.8	70	23.6	65.6	57.5	37.5	31.9	15.4	50	<b>41.6</b>	27
<b>AVERAGES</b>	<b>67.281481</b>	<b>87.26</b>	<b>73.061538</b>	<b>73.244444</b>	<b>66.72593</b>	<b>64.659</b>	<b>43.2963</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>69.45074074</b>	<b>63.84074</b>	

## Appendix B: League Tables from Previous Years

League Table: 2006/2007

Position	College	Total Percentage
1	Churchill	71.3
2	Robinson	70.6
3	Downing	70.5
4	Lucy Cavendish	68.7
5	St Catharine's	68.3
6	Corpus Christi	65.0
7	Selwyn	61.0
8	Magdalene	63.6
9	Trinity Hall	60.0
10	Pembroke	58.1
11	Peterhouse	57.3
12	Jesus	59.0
13	Darwin	54.7
14	Christ's	53.4
15	Girton*	52.8
16	Newnham	52.6
17	Homerton	49.8
18	Fitzwilliam*	49.2
19	St John's	43.7
20	King's*	43.4
21	Queen's	41.8
22	Clare*	30.5
23	Clare Hall	-
23	Emmanuel	-
23	Gonville & Ciaus	-
23	Hughes Hall	-
23	New Hall	-
23	St. Edmund's	-
23	Sidney Sussex	-
23	Trinity	-
23	Wolfson	-

Full Table: 2006/2007

<b>COLLEGE</b>	<b>KITCHENS</b>	<b>BAR</b>	<b>PRINTERS</b>	<b>GARDENS</b>	<b>INSULAT.</b>	<b>LIGHT</b>	<b>WASTE</b>	<b>H-EERING</b>	<b>COMMITMENT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>POSITION</b>
<b>Churchill</b>	44.9%	70.0%	85.4%	84.8%	67.1%	66.7%	51.8%	88.2%	92.9%	<b>71.3%</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Robinson</b>	65.3%	70.0%	91.1%	100.0%	56.2%	25.0%	54.9%	92.6%	92.9%	<b>70.6%</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Downing</b>	79.6%	100.0%	72.6%	54.5%	78.1%	63.6%	33.8%	82.9%	100.0%	<b>70.5%</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Lucy Cav</b>	53.1%	100.0%	80.5%	100.0%	67.1%	62.5%	41.2%	53.9%	92.9%	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>St Cat's</b>	89.8%	70.0%	81.9%	100.0%	54.8%	62.5%	43.7%	75.0%	85.7%	<b>68.3%</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Corpus C.</b>	75.5%	70.0%	84.3%	39.4%	37.0%	43.8%	78.4%	71.1%	78.6%	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Selwyn</b>	34.7%	70.0%	71.5%	27.3%	57.5%	75.0%	63.0%	47.4%	78.6%	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Magdalene</b>	83.7%	70.0%	58.5%	100.0%	69.9%	0.0%	48.0%	55.3%	85.7%	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Trinity Hall</b>	71.4%	85.0%	62.6%	69.7%	56.2%	50.0%	41.5%	71.1%	71.4%	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Pembroke</b>	67.3%	70.0%	80.2%	27.3%	64.4%	50.0%	34.0%	53.9%	57.1%	<b>58.1%</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Peterhouse</b>	63.3%	70.0%	76.1%	84.8%	68.5%	37.5%	19.0%	78.9%	42.9%	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Jesus</b>	24.5%	100.0%	62.6%	84.8%	54.8%	25.0%	38.6%	88.2%	92.9%	<b>59.0%</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Darwin</b>	22.4%	60.0%	72.2%	100.0%	83.6%	12.5%	26.6%	69.7%	35.7%	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Christ's</b>	34.7%	100.0%	61.1%	27.3%	53.4%	25.0%	38.1%	71.1%	78.6%	<b>53.4%</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Girton</b>	79.3%	60.0%	74.7%	-	27.4%	50.0%	45.8%	47.4%	100.0%	<b>52.8%</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Newnham</b>	61.2%	40.0%	46.9%	48.3%	66.9%	12.5%	54.4%	47.4%	54.2%	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Homerton</b>	44.9%	70.0%	33.3%	84.8%	69.9%	62.5%	35.3%	88.2%	14.3%	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Fitzwilliam</b>	32.7%	-	35.3%	87.9%	53.4%	37.5%	24.7%	82.9%	78.6%	<b>49.2%</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>St John's</b>	73.5%	70.0%	61.0%	69.7%	11.0%	62.5%	4.1%	36.8%	100.0%	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>King's</b>	71.4%	70.0%	45.5%	-	57.5%	37.5%	16.5%	43.4%	28.6%	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Queen's</b>	44.8%	100.0%	38.7%	27.3%	63.0%	25.0%	26.8%	52.6%	14.3%	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Clare</b>	7.7%	50.0%	48.9%	-	100.0%	37.5%	12.9%	55.2%	-	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>AVERAGES</b>	<b>55.7%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>69.4%</b>	<b>59.9%</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>70.3%</b>	<b>56.6%</b>	

League Table: 2005/2006

<b>Position</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
1	Darwin	77.6
2	Robinson	71.1
3	Jesus	68.9
4	Gonville and Caius	68.6
5	Churchill	67.0
6	Magdalene	65.4
7	Downing	63.8
8	Wolfson	63.0
9	Corpus Christi	62.4
10	Girton	62.1
11	Trinity	61.2
12	Lucy Cavendish	61.0
13	St Catharine's	58.8
14	Peterhouse	58.5
15	Clare Hall	56.8
16	Selwyn	55.2
17	Pembroke	54.2
18	Homerton	52.5
19	Sidney Sussex	51.8
20	Fitzwilliam	49.7
21	King's	49.5
22	Trinity Hall	48.4
23	St John's	47.4
24	Queens'	44.2
25	Newnham	44.1
26	Christ's	36.3
27	Clare	33.3
28	Emmanuel	-
28	Hughes Hall	-
28	New Hall	-
28	St Edmund's	-
28	Darwin	-

League Table: 2004/2005

<b>Rank</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
1	Churchill	60.2%
2	Trinity Hall	59.1%
3	Jesus	58.0%
4	Downing	56.6%
5	Trinity	56.0%
6	Clare	53.2%
7	Wolfson	51.1%
8	Robinson	51.1%
9	St John's	49.5%
10	Selwyn	47.8%
11	Gonville and Caius	47.5%
12	Fitzwilliam	47.3%
13	Lucy Cavendish	46.0%
14	Corpus Christi	45.3%
15	Clare Hall	44.1%
16	Homerton	43.7%
17	Girton	40.5%
18	St Edmund's	40.3%
19	St Catharine's	38.1%
20	Sidney Sussex	37.7%
21	Queen's	35.0%
22	Darwin	34.3%
23	Peterhouse*	22.3%
24	Christ's	-
24	Emmanuel	-
24	Hughes Hall	-
24	King's	-
24	Magdalene	-
24	New Hall	-
24	Newnham	-
24	Pembroke	-

**Appendix C: CUECS Environmental League Table**  
**Questionnaire 2007-8**

**Instructions:**

1. Please answer all the questions and indicate where a question is not applicable to your college by writing "n/a" in the box. You are welcome to add any extra comments next to the relevant question.
2. The questionnaire has been divided into sections. Some of these questions you will be able to answer yourself, but most will require liaising with departmental managers. Meeting these managers may involve setting up appointments, but in general each interview should only take a few minutes, so you may find that a telephone interview is simpler. We ask that you begin by getting in touch with your college Bursar or Domestic Bursar who will be able to advise you as to whom to contact, as well as being able to answer some of the questions. This year we are encouraging more collaboration between the Green Officer and the Bursar, and as such we require that **both sign the questionnaire upon completion.**

The major sections are as follows:

- Kitchen, college bar
- Computers, printers and photocopiers
- Gardens
- Insulation, lighting
- Waste
- Housekeeping
- College commitment towards environmental issues

You may find it helpful to print off different sections separately for different departments. The questionnaire **must** be signed by both yourself and your college bursar before being returned. Failure to do this will result in your questionnaire being discounted.

3. Please return your form as soon as possible to your CUECS representative and no later than November 30<sup>th</sup> 2007. You can do so via UMS to your CUECS rep.
4. If you face any difficulties in filling in this questionnaire, please contact your CUECS representative.

**Remember that if you do not return the questionnaire by the above date your college may not be included in the league table.**



**College:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Green Officer(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Bursar(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(don't forget the signatures at the end too)*

**Please tick all appropriate answer(s).**

### **Kitchens**

Does the college kitchen have a policy to use any of the following?

Organic ingredients	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local produce	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	--------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------

Which of the following are available from refillable containers (as opposed to individual packets)?

(If they are not available at all put n/a)

Salt/pepper	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ketchup	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayonnaise and other sauces	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jam	<input type="checkbox"/>
Butter/margarine	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cereal	<input type="checkbox"/>

Which of the following are recycled?

Foil	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cans	<input type="checkbox"/>	Glass	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cork	<input type="checkbox"/>
Food waste (composted)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cooking oil	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cardboard	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

### **College Bar**

Which of the following are used in the college bar?

Reusable plastic tumblers and/or glasses	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-reusable plastic tumblers	<input type="checkbox"/>
Both	<input type="checkbox"/>

Does the bar return bottles and recycle them where bottles are non-returnable?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

**Computers, Printers and Photocopiers**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Student Computer Rooms</b>		<b>Staff Offices</b>		<b>Libraries</b>	
Are photocopiers supplied with recycled paper?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Are the printers supplied with recycled paper?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Do photocopiers have a duplex (double-sided) facility?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Do photocopiers have CLEARLY marked duplex/reduction instructions?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Do printers have a duplex facility?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Do printers have CLEARLY marked duplex instructions?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Do all printers have "power-down" settings enabled?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Do computers have "power down" settings enabled?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Are there notices to staff / students encouraging them to turn computers off at the end of the day?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Are there clearly marked recycling paper bins?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	
Is scrap paper available?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	No		No		No	

How many, if any, sheets of A4 paper are students allowed to print free of charge per term?

None	0-100	101-200	201+	
------	-------	---------	------	--

### Gardens

Do you water established formal lawns?

Almost never		Occasionally		Regularly	
--------------	--	--------------	--	-----------	--

Do you water well-established plants / bedding displays?

Almost never		Occasionally		Regularly	
--------------	--	--------------	--	-----------	--

Do you apply pesticide / herbicide to lawns or paths?

Never		0-4 times/year		4-8 times/year		8-12 times/year	
-------	--	----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------------	--

Is garden waste composted?

Never		On site		Green bin uplift	
-------	--	---------	--	------------------	--

Where do you source new plants?

Locally		Produce your own		Mail order	
---------	--	------------------	--	------------	--

### Insulation

Are the hot water tanks and pipes (in particular externally running pipes) lagged/insulated?

Almost none		Some		Almost all	
-------------	--	------	--	------------	--

Is there effective insulation on the college lofts/roofs?

Almost none		Some		Almost all	
-------------	--	------	--	------------	--

Is there effective wall insulation in college buildings?

Almost none		Some		Almost all	
-------------	--	------	--	------------	--

Which of the following draft-proofing measures have been taken:

1. Door-brushes

Almost no rooms		Half of rooms		Most rooms	
-----------------	--	---------------	--	------------	--

2. Rubber lined windows

Almost no rooms	Half of rooms	Most rooms	
-----------------	---------------	------------	--

3. Self-closing doors

Almost no rooms	Half of rooms	Most rooms	
-----------------	---------------	------------	--

4. Layered curtains

Almost no rooms	Half of rooms	Most rooms	
-----------------	---------------	------------	--

What temperature is the heating system set to?

< 17°C	17°C – 20°C	21°C – 23°C	
> 23°C	No centralized heating policy		

Are the radiators in student rooms adjustable?

Almost no rooms	Half of rooms	Most rooms	
-----------------	---------------	------------	--

**Lighting**

Are low energy light bulbs used in the college?

Almost no rooms	Half of rooms	Most rooms	
-----------------	---------------	------------	--

Which of the following light saving measures are installed in the college?

Motion sensors in bathrooms/corridors	Timers for corridor lights	
‘Switch Off’ stickers on light switches	Solar powered lights/lanterns	
Others (please write)		

**Waste**

Where are recycling bins for student use located in college?

Location	Paper	Glass	Metal
Student rooms			
Student staircases / kitchens			
Focal points (e.g. JCR, Porters’ Lodge, Bar)			
Somewhere less convenient than the above			

Are there collection facilities in college for any of the following discarded materials?

Plastic		Textiles		Batteries		Other (please state)	
Cardboard		Books		Ink cartridges			

### Housekeeping

Are environmentally friendly cleaning products (e.g. Ecover washing-up liquid) provided for residents and cleaners/bedders?

Almost never		Some products		Almost always	
--------------	--	---------------	--	---------------	--

Are there signs encouraging students to hang-dry clothes (as opposed to tumble dry)?

No		Some		Yes	
----	--	------	--	-----	--

Is the toilet roll that the college supplies made from recycled paper?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Do washing machines have a water-save or half-load setting?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Does the college supply student rooms with individual fridges?

Almost all		About half		Almost none	
------------	--	------------	--	-------------	--

### College Commitment towards Environmental Issues

Answers to the following questions can probably be obtained from your senior bursar.

Is there a green travel plan for the college staff (e.g. car sharing schemes)?	Yes	No	
Does the college have its own environmental policy?	Yes	No	
Is there a student green officer?	Yes	No	
Is there a staff member responsible for environmental issues in college?	Yes	No	
Is there a committee for the discussion of environmental issues within the college administration hierarchy?	Yes	No	

### **Qualitative Questions**

[If there are any questions you would like to expand on, or additional comments you would like to make, please add information either at the end of this questionnaire or on an attached sheet.]

1. Do you have any ideas about how your college could feasibly reduce its environmental impact?

---

---

---

2. How involved are college administration and staff in your environmental ideas and campaigns (please give examples e.g. who is responsible for emptying recycling bins)?

---

---

---

3. What channels are available for educating staff and students about environmental issues and ways in which they can reduce their environmental impact (e.g. college website, posters)?

---

---

---

4. How well do college members and staff respond to environmental initiatives? Are there any specific ideas that have been particularly successful in your college?

---

---

---

5. What measures do your college take to reduce the environmental impact of their may ball / events?

---

---

---

6. Feedback from previous years has highlighted that some colleges are prevented from, for example, improving insulation in buildings by virtue of these buildings being listed. It would be helpful if you could outline:

- How old is the college?\_\_\_\_\_

- Roughly what proportion of buildings are listed?\_\_\_\_\_

- What grade are these listed buildings?\_\_\_\_\_

- and comment on any limitations:\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

**Feedback**

Do you have any comments about this questionnaire? Is there anything we could do to improve it in the future? Is there anything you feel we have missed out?

---

---

---

**Declaration:**

I confirm that, to the best of my knowledge and knowledge that I have been able to obtain, the information provided in this questionnaire is accurate and any areas of

uncertainty have been clearly marked with comments. I understand that any questions left blank will result in no credit being given for those questions.

Green Officer: Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_

Bursar: Name\_\_\_\_\_

Signature\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.**