

The Sustainable Campus A Comparison of Comprehensive Sustainability Policies in the
& DPSXV 0DVWHU 3ODQV RI WKH 8QLYHUVLW\ RI *XHOSK

A report submitted WR WKH 6FKRRO RI 8UEDQ DQG 5HJLRQDO 3ODQ
conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Urban and Regional Planning

4XHHQ¶V 8QLYHUVLW\

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

June 2015

Copyright © Elizabeth Bang, 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Higher education institutions are increasingly welcoming the challenge to reassess their sustainability standards and to steadily implement sustainable planning practices on their campuses. Campus Master Plans (CMPs) with sustainability policies have manifested and their overall goal has been to build sustainable, healthy, vibrant, and balanced communities within their campuses. The promotion and implementation of sustainability planning practices as well as policies have propelled higher education institutions into the public realm as one of the many leaders in sustainable planning.

Despite these efforts, there has been little guidance on incorporating sustainability into campus planning policies. There has also been varying approaches to developing and implementing sustainable campus planning policies. This knowledge gap and lack of sustainability coordination has initiated strong interest in investigating how higher education institutions have approached sustainable campus planning.

characteristics looking to implement comprehensive sustainability policies in their
CMPs?

Furthermore, this report will explore perspectives on the integration of sustainability principles
in campus planning initiatives and the policy development process.

Rationale

The recent rise in sustainability principles within CMPs as well as Official Plans (or equivalent)
or local sustainability plans in Ontario and within Canada has led to an opportunity to exchange
knowledge, and explore varying sustainability planning frameworks. Noted by many to be role
models and places of innovation, higher education institutions are in a unique position to
contribute to discussions on sustainable planning. Often viewed as role models, higher
education institutions are able to provide answers to municipalities that are struggling with
incorporating broad sustainable planning principles into their planning projects, and
programs. It is the intention of this report to analyze CMP policies of two Ontario higher
education institutions and provide recommendations to campus and municipal planners in the
area of sustainable planning and policy development.

Methods

The recently updated and approved CMPs of two Ontario higher education institutions were
chosen as case studies for this report because of comparable institutional and host
municipality characteristics, both institutions were guided by similar campus planning
consultants during their master plan review, their CMPs were recently approved (2013 and
2014), and both plans have obtained important professional planning awards.

Their policies were mined for sustainable planning characteristics and principles using the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System developed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. Document review in the form of manifest and latent analysis were conducted of each master plan to draw out a comprehensive list of campus master plan sustainability policies. The policies were evaluated quantitatively and qualitatively, with a Likert scale guiding the qualitative assessment. Structured interviews with campus planning and sustainability professionals were then conducted to confirm the policies and information that were previously collected, address gaps in data, and understand the policy development processes that had occurred behind the scenes while the campus master plans were being developed as well as updated.

Findings

Document Review Findings

Quantitative evaluation of CMP policies found that between the two institutions, there was a similar policy emphasis in Landscape Management. The list of findings is similar to the list of findings in the previous study.

Prioritizing renewal and repair of campus buildings, infrastructure, and utility systems;

Re-aligning emerging space needs with existing spaces on campus;

Promoting the implementation of energy-efficient technologies either as upgrades or from the beginning of new development projects;

Promoting and encouraging the implementation of active and sustainable transportation strategies;

Life cycle approaches to landscape management;

Stormwater management strategies that addressed quality and quantity concerns; and,

Promoting sustainability research and incorporating pilot projects as well as findings into the institution's campus planning processes and initiatives.

When comparing the sustainable CMP policies of both institutions, it was found that the University of Guelph held a more comprehensive set of sustainable CMP policies than its counterpart (Table E1). Although Queen's University's CMP policies exhibited a multitude of sustainability policies and objectives that were also detailed, according to the STARS evaluation criteria by AASHE, it did not contain a comprehensive set of sustainable policies. This was the focus of the report because of the widely accepted principle that sustainability is holistic and encompasses the three pillars: environment, economics, and equity.

Table E1: Qualitatively Evaluating Sustainable CMP Policies using the AASHE (2014) STARS Evaluation Criteria (refer to Appendix E for a detailed evaluation criteria).

Theme	Criterion	University of Guelph	4 X H H Q ↑ V 8 Q L
-------	-----------	----------------------	---------------------

Recommendations

The following recommendations were proposed as a result of the study:

Lessons learned from the University of Guelph's Campus Master Plan (2013)

1. Revisit the ability of sustainability research and academia to inform campus planning and policy development processes. A mutually beneficial relationship between academic and campus planning groups can form;
2. Focus on other sectors of sustainable campus planning and policy development that are not only building construction, operations, and management. Look to emphasize other sectors such as community development, student life, and research and academics; and,
3. Prioritize reuse and renewal before looking to new and sustainable forms of development. Reuse and renewal may be more practical and financially prudent than new development.

General lessons learned from the University of Guelph's and Queen's University's Campus Master Plans

1. Increasingly integrate technical experts and expertise into the campus master planning and policy development process;
2. Secure funding and resources specifically for sustainable campus planning initiatives and policies earlier in the campus master planning stage; and,
3. Align other campus policies and sustainability plans with the sustainability objectives and policies of the campus master plan to ensure cohesion among all institutional policies.

Applying lessons outside the Ivory Tower

1. Municipalities to revisit renewal and adaptive reuse planning initiatives in their jurisdiction. Moreover, they can re-evaluate current municipal land uses to ensure they align with users' needs as well as population, employment, and service projections; and,
2. Municipalities to review higher education institutions' policy development approaches to creating compact, walkable, and mixed-use communities, which have been a growing focus of municipal sustainability planning initiatives.