**UW Climate Action Plan: Sustainability on Campus Questionnaire**

**Compared against 2012’s UW CAP Communication Questionnaire**

**Survey date:** 2/10/2014 10:00:00 PM PST - 2/19/2014 12:01:00 AM PST

**Responses:** 1631

**Which of the following best describes your role on the UW campus:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undergraduate | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | Faculty | |
| **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** |
| 22% | 28% | 16% | 17% | 49% | 42% | 13% | 13% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **When you think about the UW’s sustainability reputation, how important are the following recognitions?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| #12 “Cool School” ranking in the country by the Sierra Club in 2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| I don't know what this is | 36.62% | | | 21.25% | | 32.96% | | 17.60% | 24.53% | 25.95% | 28.64% | | 27.66% | | 29.06% | | 23.43% |
| Not important | 11.27% | | | 32.22% | | 13.11% | | 34.52% | 13.33% | 37.29% | 10.68% | | 37.22% | | 12.51% | | 35.40% |
| Somewhat important | 30.99% | | | 17.46% | | 32.96% | | 18.34% | 36.99% | 14.15% | 36.41% | | 13.74% | | 34.95% | | 15.73% |
| Very important | 21.13% | | | 29.06% | | 20.97% | | 29.53% | 25.16% | 22.62% | 24.27% | | 21.38% | | 23.48% | | 25.44% |
|  | **Key Findings:** More than 58% of the 2014 respondents found the “Cool School” ranking somewhat to very important, a reversal of the 58% of respondents from 2012 who found the ranking not important or were unsure what it is. Likely due to increased promotion of recent top scores for the Sierra Club’s “Cool Schools” | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Green Honor Roll award by the Princeton Review in 2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| I don't know what this is | 27.61% | | | 34.41% | | 29.21% | | 30.70% | 23.91% | 22.09% | 27.67% | | 30.14% | | 26.06% | | 30.16% |
| Not important | 6.20% | | | 35.74% | | 8.99% | | 37.81% | 10.34% | 40.00% | 11.17% | | 38.72% | | 9.32% | | 37.72% |
| Somewhat important | 31.55% | | | 8.19% | | 35.58% | | 9.79% | 35.62% | 11.96% | 34.47% | | 10.41% | | 34.58% | | 9.79% |
| Very important | 34.65% | | | 21.65% | | 26.22% | | 21.71% | 30.14% | 35.95% | 26.70% | | 20.73% | | 30.04% | | 22.29% |
|  | **Key Findings:** The percentage of respondents who found the Green Honor Roll award somewhat important to very important increased from 32% doubled to 64% largely attributed to a decrease across all groups of those who found the award not important and an increase in those who found the award somewhat important. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEED GOLD rating on all campus buildings completed since 2009. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| I don't know what this is | 24.23% | | | 34.90% | | 11.99% | | 39.76% | 14.94% | 42.32% | 16.50% | | 45.75% | | 16.68% | | 40.25% |
| Not important | 3.38% | | | 30.95% | | 7.87% | | 30.94% | 6.97% | 31.80% | 7.28% | | 32.30% | | 6.38% | | 31.48% |
| Somewhat important | 21.41% | | | 7.56% | | 27.72% | | 10.04% | 22.04% | 7.37% | 19.90% | | 6.59% | | 22.56% | | 7.78% |
| Very important | 50.99% | | | 26.59% | | 52.43% | | 19.27% | 56.04% | 18.51% | 56.31% | | 15.37% | | 54.38% | | 20.49% |
|  | **Key Findings:** The percentage of respondents who the LEED GOLD rating of campus buildings somewhat important to very important tripled from approximately 28% to 76%. Those who are unaware of what LEED GOLD more than halved with the smallest change among undergraduates. This could likely be because undergraduates who’s time is more temporary at the University and are less invested in the maintenance of buildings are less likely to be aware of LEED ratings. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd Place in the Academia category of the Seattle Business - Green Washington Award\* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| I don't know what this is | 29.01% | | | N/A | | 28.09% | | N/A | 23.16% | N/A | 25.24% | | N/A | | 25.51% | | N/A |
| Not important | 7.04% | | | N/A | | 13.11% | | N/A | 11.33% | N/A | 13.59% | | N/A | | 10.97% | | N/A |
| Somewhat important | 30.14% | | | N/A | | 33.71% | | N/A | 37.36% | N/A | 36.89% | | N/A | | 35.13% | | N/A |
| Very important | 33.80% | | | N/A | | 25.09% | | N/A | 28.14% | N/A | 24.27% | | N/A | | 28.39% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:**  The UW was recently recognized for the Seattle- Business Green Washington Award so no question was asked in 2012. A quarter of respondents were unaware, while approximately 63% found the award somewhat to very important, more than the 58% who found the Sierra Club “Cool Schools” recognition important. This could be because of values embedded in being local, giving back to the community and Seattle pride. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS) Gold ranking in 2012.\* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| I don't know what this is | 30.42% | | | N/A | | 34.46% | | N/A | 27.90% | N/A | 33.50% | | N/A | | 30.23% | | N/A |
| Not important | 5.07% | | | N/A | | 5.62% | | N/A | 8.97% | N/A | 9.22% | | N/A | | 7.60% | | N/A |
| Somewhat important | 20.85% | | | N/A | | 29.21% | | N/A | 27.77% | N/A | 23.30% | | N/A | | 25.94% | | N/A |
| Very important | 43.66% | | | N/A | | 30.71% | | N/A | 35.37% | N/A | 33.98% | | N/A | | 36.24% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:**  STARS Gold ranking in 2012 was given after the previous survey so no question was asked. This recognition received the most I don’t knows, but of those who were aware of the recognition were more likely to find it somewhat to very important. Staff were most likely to be aware of the recognitions and students were least likely. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Of the following current UW initiatives, please estimate what you believe to be the impact of each on the University’s reduction of carbon emissions:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Decreasing water consumption. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 41.13% | | | 30.41% | | 43.07% | | 30.78% | 42.96% | 28.68% | 31.55% | | 31.92% | | 41.14% | | 30.89% |
| Medium impact | 45.63% | | | 55.71% | | 41.20% | | 54.81% | 38.73% | 59.67% | 47.09% | | 59.74% | | 41.69% | | 57.76% |
| Low/No impact | 13.24% | | | 13.89% | | 15.73% | | 14.40% | 18.31% | 11.66% | 21.36% | | 8.34% | | 17.17% | | 11.34% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Respondents were more divided in 2014 on whether reducing water consumption would impact the reduction of emissions than in 2012. This change was likely due to the increase of staff and faculty by 7% and 13% respectively in selecting for low/no impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decreasing paper purchasing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 55.49% | | | 50.00% | | 52.43% | | 40.55% | 61.89% | 50.55% | 47.09% | | 40.28% | | 57.08% | | 47.41% |
| Medium impact | 36.34% | | | 41.95% | | 40.82% | | 49.27% | 31.88% | 41.29% | 38.35% | | 49.63% | | 35.13% | | 43.88% |
| Low/No impact | 8.17% | | | 8.05% | | 6.74% | | 10.17% | 6.23% | 8.16% | 14.56% | | 10.09% | | 7.79% | | 8.71% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Perceived impact of decreased paper purchasing were more likely to be ranked as high among respondents in 2014 as opposed to 2012. Faculty and students were the only group to have an increase in believing there was low/no impact, with faculty increasing by 4%. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increasing purchasing of recycled products. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 60.85% | | | 48.46% | | 52.43% | | 37.40% | 57.78% | 48.00% | 46.60% | | 39.57% | | 56.16% | | 45.27% |
| Medium impact | 33.80% | | | 43.90% | | 40.45% | | 50.62% | 36.86% | 43.85% | 41.75% | | 51.37% | | 37.40% | | 45.95% |
| Low/No impact | 5.35% | | | 7.65% | | 7.12% | | 11.98% | 5.35% | 8.16% | 11.65% | | 9.07% | | 6.44% | | 8.78% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Perceived impact of purchasing recycle products decreased in the medium and low/no ranking and more than 50% of respondents found there to be a high impact on reducing carbon emissions. Faculty were the only group to experience an increase the low/no impact ranking and more likely to select for medium impact over high impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increasing purchasing of locally processed food. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 67.04% | | | 50.00% | | 64.04% | | 49.58% | 62.89% | 48.85% | 45.15% | | 40.36% | | 61.74% | | 48.23% |
| Medium impact | 24.23% | | | 37.44% | | 25.84% | | 37.19% | 28.14% | 39.98% | 37.38% | | 43.82% | | 28.08% | | 39.28% |
| Low/No impact | 8.73% | | | 12.56% | | 10.11% | | 13.23% | 8.97% | 11.17% | 17.48% | | 15.82% | | 10.18% | | 12.49% |
|  | **Key Findings:** There is an overall increase in the percentage of respondents who think there is high impact on reducing carbon emissions by increasing purchasing of locally processed food. Faculty were most likely to believe there would be low/no impact with nearly a fifth selecting that option. Undergraduates had the largest increase in selecting for high impact and had the highest proportion over all with a 67% representation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decreasing the number of UW community members who drive alone to campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 65.07% | | | 57.97% | | 70.79% | | 63.79% | 71.86% | 72.19% | 68.93% | | 70.16% | | 69.83% | | 66.49% |
| Medium impact | 25.35% | | | 34.17% | | 24.72% | | 29.40% | 22.67% | 23.43% | 25.24% | | 25.44% | | 23.91% | | 27.69% |
| Low/No impact | 9.58% | | | 7.86% | | 4.49% | | 7.11% | 5.48% | 4.38% | 5.83% | | 4.40% | | 6.25% | | 5.82% |
|  | **Key Findings:**  While overall there has been an increase in the percentage of respondents who believe there is a high impact on reducing carbon emission by decreasing single occupancy vehicles, there has also be an increase in those who believe there is low/no impact. Most noticeably among staff and faculty who experienced little change in selecting for medium impact, a decrease in selecting for high impact and an increase in selecting for low/no impact | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maintaining campus energy consumption at current levels despite increases in buildings and population. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 61.13% | | | 55.07% | | 64.79% | | 54.51% | 62.52% | 58.33% | 68.93% | | 59.94% | | 63.40% | | 56.97% |
| Medium impact | 30.70% | | | 39.21% | | 29.96% | | 38.42% | 33.50% | 37.30% | 22.82% | | 35.44% | | 30.96% | | 37.79% |
| Low/No impact | 8.17% | | | 5.72% | | 5.24% | | 7.07% | 3.99% | 4.37% | 8.25% | | 4.62% | | 5.64% | | 5.24% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Overall there has been an increase in respondents selecting for high impact of maintaining energy consumption with most groups switching from selecting for medium to selecting for high. There was little change in the low/no impact selection among all respondents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increasing number of LEED certified buildings on campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 52.68% | | | 44.58% | | 55.81% | | 44.79% | 58.41% | 49.79% | 62.62% | | 47.75% | | 57.27% | | 47.21% |
| Medium impact | 37.46% | | | 45.08% | | 36.70% | | 43.68% | 32.25% | 41.58% | 28.16% | | 44.01% | | 33.60% | | 43.23% |
| Low/No impact | 9.86% | | | 10.34% | | 7.49% | | 11.53% | 9.34% | 8.63% | 9.22% | | 8.25% | | 9.14% | | 9.56% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Across all groups, respondents increased in their likelihood to select high impact and decreased in their likelihood to select medium and low/no impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decreasing amount of waste sent to landfills. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 77.75% | | | 61.09% | | 69.29% | | 51.18% | 70.24% | 61.54% | 55.34% | | 50.47% | | 69.83% | | 58.27% |
| Medium impact | 16.90% | | | 39.27% | | 26.59% | | 39.27% | 25.03% | 32.66% | 34.47% | | 41.81% | | 24.71% | | 35.01% |
| Low/No impact | 5.35% | | | 9.56% | | 4.12% | | 9.56% | 4.73% | 5.80% | 10.19% | | 7.72% | | 5.46% | | 6.71% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Decreasing the amount of waste sent to landfills received the largest percentage of respondents selecting for high impact of suggested UW initiatives. Undergraduatesare most highly impressed upon with more than 75% believing waste reduction has a high impact and with faculty being the least with 55% selecting high impact and 10% of faculty selecting for low/no impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Providing grants and funding for sustainability focused projects and research. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| High impact | 61.69% | | | N/A | | 53.93% | | N/A | 48.82% | N/A | 39.32% | | N/A | | 51.26% | | N/A |
| Medium impact | 32.11% | | | N/A | | 38.58% | | N/A | 39.10% | N/A | 44.17% | | N/A | | 38.14% | | N/A |
| Low/No impact | 6.20% | | | N/A | | 7.49% | | N/A | 12.08% | N/A | 16.50% | | N/A | | 10.61% | | N/A |
|  | **Key findings:** The 2012 survey did not include a question on the perceived impact of grants and funding for project and research. There is a majority consensus on grants and funding for sustainability focused projects and research having a high impact on reducing emissions. This trend is more prevalent among students. Staff and faculty were more likely than student groups to believe there would be low/no impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Which sustainability initiatives do you think the UW should be putting the most emphasis on in order to reduce carbon emissions?**  **Highest Ranked:** Decreasing waste sent landfills, Decreasing solo drivers, Encouraging use of U-PASS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Decreasing water consumption. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 34.65% | | | 30.41% | | 32.96% | | 30.78% | 33.25% | 28.68% | 25.73% | | 31.92% | | 32.56% | | 30.89% |
| Moderate emphasis | 52.39% | | | 55.71% | | 51.31% | | 54.81% | 49.94% | 59.67% | 49.51% | | 59.74% | | 50.64% | | 57.76% |
| Least emphasis | 12.96% | | | 13.89% | | 15.73% | | 14.40% | 16.81% | 11.66% | 24.76% | | 8.34% | | 16.80% | | 11.34% |
|  | **Key findings:** Overall there has been a decrease in the believed amount of emphasis to be placed on decreasing water consumption. Most emphasis has modest gains while moderate emphasis decreased by 7% and least emphasis increased by 5%. Faculty experience large increases in selecting for least emphasis, increasing by 16%. Placed 11th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Creating campus office Green Teams that implement sustainable work place practices. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 55.49% | | | 27.16% | | 52.43% | | 23.49% | 61.89% | 22.44% | 47.09% | | 23.78% | | 57.08% | | 24.24% |
| Moderate emphasis | 36.34% | | | 55.58% | | 40.82% | | 54.60% | 31.88% | 59.59% | 38.35% | | 58.37% | | 35.13% | | 57.11% |
| Least emphasis | 8.17% | | | 17.25% | | 6.74% | | 21.91% | 6.23% | 17.97% | 14.56% | | 17.84% | | 7.79% | | 18.66% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Creating campus Green Teams more than doubled in respondents selecting for high emphasis as well as across all respondents groups. Staff had the highest percentage selecting for most emphasis. Placed 7th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increasing purchasing of locally sourced/processed food. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 60.85% | | | 47.62% | | 52.43% | | 46.31% | 57.78% | 38.22% | 46.60% | | 46.22% | | 56.16% | | 45.61% |
| Moderate emphasis | 33.80% | | | 40.61% | | 40.45% | | 41.76% | 36.86% | 48.58% | 41.75% | | 44.99% | | 37.40% | | 43.68% |
| Least emphasis | 5.35% | | | 11.77% | | 7.12% | | 11.93% | 5.35% | 13.20% | 11.65% | | 8.79% | | 6.44% | | 10.71% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Emphasis placed on increasing purchasing of locally source food has the most increase in support among undergraduate students, graduate and professional students and staff. Faculty remained largely consistent. More than half of all respondents believed there should be more emphasis placed on purchasing of locally sourced/processed food. Placed 8th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conducting an annual on-campus “Sustainability Summit” led by a campus-wide planning committee of students, faculty and staff. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | Faculty | | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 67.04% | | | 25.62% | | 64.04% | | 21.76% | 62.89% | 22.89% | 45.15% | | 23.20% | | 61.74% | | 23.27% |
| Moderate emphasis | 24.23% | | | 52.37% | | 25.84% | | 52.16% | 28.14% | 56.75% | 37.38% | | 55.01% | | 28.08% | | 54.00% |
| Least emphasis | 8.73% | | | 22.02% | | 10.11% | | 26.08% | 8.97% | 20.36% | 17.48% | | 21.79% | | 10.18% | | 22.72% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Across all campus groups there was a 22% to 40% increase in selecting for most emphasis placed on an annual Sustainability Summit and a decrease of 4% to 16% in selecting for more emphasis. The change in results is likely from the hosting of our first Sustainability Summit which was evidently well received by the campus community. Placed 5th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decreasing the number of UW community members who drive alone to campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 65.07% | | | 38.34% | | 70.79% | | 48.07% | 71.86% | 47.25% | 68.93% | | 49.74% | | 69.83% | | 45.97% |
| Moderate emphasis | 25.35% | | | 45.78% | | 24.72% | | 39.05% | 22.67% | 42.20% | 25.24% | | 40.72% | | 23.91% | | 42.03% |
| Least emphasis | 9.58% | | | 15.89% | | 4.49% | | 12.88% | 5.48% | 10.55% | 5.83% | | 9.54% | | 6.25% | | 12.00% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Percentages of respondents who believe most and moderate emphasis should be place on decreasing the number of solo drivers is close to the percentages given by those who believe it had a high or medium impact. The percentage of those who believe it should have most emphasis has increased by 24% while those who selected for least emphasis decreased from 12% to 6%. Placed 2nd out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decreasing paper purchasing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 61.13% | | | 47.28% | | 64.79% | | 45.98% | 62.52% | 45.99% | 68.93% | | 51.57% | | 63.40% | | 48.72% |
| Moderate emphasis | 30.70% | | | 41.30% | | 29.96% | | 43.66% | 33.50% | 45.07% | 22.82% | | 42.31% | | 30.96% | | 42.61% |
| Least emphasis | 8.17% | | | 11.41% | | 5.24% | | 10.35% | 3.99% | 8.94% | 8.25% | | 6.12% | | 5.64% | | 8.67% |
|  | **Key Findings:** More than 60% of all groups felt that decreasing paper purchasing should have most emphasis with the largest representation within campus groups among faculty. Placed 4th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Promoting the Campus Sustainability Fund that allocates a portion of Student Activities Fees to fund campus sustainability projects. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 41.13% | | | 31.91% | | 33.71% | | 28.67% | 25.90% | 26.13% | 32.04% | | 24.54% | | 31.27% | | 27.98% |
| Moderate emphasis | 44.23% | | | 48.04% | | 47.94% | | 44.85% | 51.43% | 55.64% | 42.23% | | 55.63% | | 48.13% | | 51.51% |
| Least emphasis | 14.65% | | | 20.05% | | 18.35% | | 22.49% | 22.67% | 20.23% | 25.73% | | 19.84% | | 20.60% | | 20.52% |
|  | **Key Findings:** While more than 50% of all respondents thought funding and grants for sustainability projects would have a high impact on the UW reducing carbon emissions. Only 31% believe it should have most emphasis while one-fifth of all respondents thought it should have least emphasis. Placed 12th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increasing purchasing of recycled products. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | Faculty | | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 58.87% | | | 53.23% | | 52.06% | | 47.93% | 52.93% | 53.55% | 46.60% | | 51.01% | | 53.28% | | 52.18% |
| Moderate emphasis | 36.62% | | | 40.27% | | 42.70% | | 43.85% | 41.34% | 41.58% | 43.20% | | 42.78% | | 40.77% | | 41.75% |
| Least emphasis | 4.51% | | | 6.50% | | 5.24% | | 8.23% | 5.73% | 4.87% | 10.19% | | 6.22% | | 5.95% | | 6.07% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Roughly half of respondents thought most emphasis should be placed on increased purchasing on recycled products.Placed 9th out of 12 initiatives. Numbers closely reflect the respondents ranking the impact on carbon reductions at UW. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maintaining campus energy consumption at current levels despite increases in buildings and population. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 60.56% | | | 46.59% | | 64.04% | | 45.19% | 57.66% | 48.60% | 67.96% | | 49.40% | | 60.64% | | 47.56% |
| Moderate emphasis | 34.08% | | | 44.78% | | 31.46% | | 46.83% | 37.11% | 45.83% | 26.21% | | 43.37% | | 34.15% | | 45.40% |
| Least emphasis | 5.35% | | | 8.63% | | 4.49% | | 5.57% | 5.23% | 7.23% | 5.83% | | 7.23% | | 5.21% | | 7.04% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Across all campus groups there has been an increase of those who think most emphasis should be placed on maintaining campus energy consumption despite increase in population. Placed 6th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increasing the number of LEED certified buildings on campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | Graduate/Professional | | | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 46.48% | | | 38.12% | | 48.31% | | 41.34% | 51.93% | 40.83% | 53.40% | | 42.99% | | 50.34% | | 40.43% |
| Moderate emphasis | 42.25% | | | 45.94% | | 41.95% | | 43.87% | 37.61% | 46.83% | 35.92% | | 46.54% | | 39.12% | | 46.04% |
| Least emphasis | 11.27% | | | 15.94% | | 9.74% | | 14.78% | 10.46% | 12.33% | 10.68% | | 10.47% | | 10.55% | | 13.53% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Among all groups there was an increase in those who believed most emphasis should be placed on increasing the number of LEED certified buildings on campus. Across all groups, roughly 10% believe it requires least emphasis. Faculty and staff are more likely to place higher emphasis on LEED certification than students. Placed 10th out of 12 initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decreasing amount of waste sent to landfills. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | Faculty | | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 77.75% | | | 61.62% | | 75.66% | | 61.55% | 70.98% | 66.10% | 64.08% | | 60.68% | | 72.35% | | 63.39% |
| Moderate emphasis | 17.75% | | | 32.61% | | 18.73% | | 32.68% | 25.40% | 30.73% | 27.67% | | 34.92% | | 22.93% | | 32.11% |
| Least emphasis | 4.51% | | | 5.77% | | 5.62% | | 5.77% | 3.61% | 3.17% | 8.25% | | 4.40% | | 4.72% | | 4.49% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Decreasing the amount of waste sent to landfills had the highest percentage of respondents selecting for most emphasis. Within campus roles, undergraduates were the most likely to select for most emphasis. Faculty were the least likely. Placed 1st out of 12. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Encouraging the use of U-PASS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Most emphasis | 67.89% | | | 31.74% | | 68.91% | | 30.43% | 66.63% | 30.99% | 63.11% | | 32.35% | | 66.83% | | 31.27% |
| Moderate emphasis | 28.17% | | | 35.57% | | 25.47% | | 33.70% | 25.78% | 44.14% | 27.67% | | 43.16% | | 26.49% | | 39.83% |
| Least emphasis | 3.94% | | | 32.69% | | 5.62% | | 35.87% | 7.60% | 24.88% | 9.22% | | 24.49% | | 6.68% | | 28.90% |
|  | **Key Findings:** The percentage of respondents who believed most emphasis should be placed on encouraging the use of UPASS more than doubled. In 2012 respondents were more equally divided among the amount of emphasis the UW should place on encouraging UPASS. Undergraduates who thought it required least emphasis decreased from 32% to 4%. Placed 3rd out of 12th. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **The UW has many initiatives to reduce its carbon emissions. How aware are you of the following on-going initiatives at the UW:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Developing a regional Smart Grid network. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 4.79% | | | 3.93% | | 4.12% | | 2.93% | 7.72% | 6.35% | 7.28% | | 5.02% | | 6.44% | | 4.93% |
| Somewhat Aware | 11.27% | | | 13.67% | | 10.86% | | 10.61% | 20.55% | 17.63% | 20.87% | | 17.72% | | 16.98% | | 13.35% |
| Not Aware | 38.03% | | | 41.85% | | 52.43% | | 48.37% | 42.22% | 43.62% | 43.20% | | 46.67% | | 43.10% | | 44.33% |
| I don't know what this is | 45.92% | | | 40.55% | | 32.58% | | 38.10% | 29.51% | 32.40% | 28.64% | | 30.59% | | 33.48% | | 35.40% |
|  | **Key Findings:** There has been little change in the awareness of the Smart Grid on campus. Faculty and staff remain the more aware than students do, and across all groups more than half the respondents were not aware of the Smart Grid network. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating free shuttle services around campus such as Health Sciences Express and Night Ride. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 46.48% | | | 26.73% | | 43.45% | | 21.81% | 68.74% | 43.95% | 57.77% | | 39.19% | | 58.37% | | 34.78% |
| Somewhat Aware | 37.75% | | | 39.34% | | 38.95% | | 33.67% | 25.53% | 32.39% | 34.95% | | 33.76% | | 31.58% | | 34.71% |
| Not Aware | 12.11% | | | 30.18% | | 16.48% | | 40.08% | 5.11% | 21.74% | 5.83% | | 25.39% | | 8.58% | | 27.67% |
| I don't know what this is | 3.66% | | | 3.74% | | 1.12% | | 4.43% | 0.62% | 1.92% | 1.46% | | 1.66% | | 1.47% | | 2.82% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Awareness of free shuttle services on campus have improved. This is likely because of the more marketing and promoting that has been done surrounding Husky Night Ride. In 2012, less than 70% of respondents were unaware of these free services. Now, 90% of respondents are somewhat to very aware of these services. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring all of its campus buildings' energy consumption. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 13.80% | | | 11.63% | | 10.49% | | 7.94% | 15.94% | 14.33% | 16.02% | | 11.79% | | 14.59% | | 12.17% |
| Somewhat Aware | 43.94% | | | 40.78% | | 37.08% | | 32.99% | 42.59% | 39.90% | 41.75% | | 39.32% | | 41.88% | | 38.89% |
| Not Aware | 39.72% | | | 43.74% | | 48.69% | | 55.03% | 38.85% | 43.26% | 40.78% | | 45.76% | | 40.90% | | 45.72% |
| I don't know what this is | 2.54% | | | 3.85% | | 3.75% | | 4.04% | 2.62% | 2.52% | 1.46% | | 3.13% | | 2.64% | | 3.22% |
|  | **Key Findings:** There has been a slight increase in the number of respondents who are to some degree aware of monitoring of campus building’s energy consumption, roughly 55% of respondents. There is little variation among campus groups. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offering bike lockers, bike racks, and secure indoor “bike rooms” throughout campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 53.80% | | | 37.41% | | 49.81% | | 34.46% | 54.05% | 42.09% | 54.85% | | 42.73% | | 53.40% | | 39.57% |
| Somewhat Aware | 32.96% | | | 37.28% | | 37.08% | | 41.79% | 36.24% | 39.93% | 35.92% | | 40.71% | | 35.62% | | 39.62% |
| Not Aware | 11.55% | | | 22.97% | | 11.24% | | 21.44% | 8.84% | 16.40% | 8.74% | | 15.10% | | 9.81% | | 18.92% |
| I don't know what this is | 1.69% | | | 2.34% | | 1.87% | | 2.31% | 0.87% | 1.58% | 0.49% | | 1.46% | | 1.16% | | 1.90% |
| **Key Findings:** Most of campus is aware of services offered for bicyclists, with the largest improvements in awareness among ungraduated students. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Purchasing only Energy Star rated appliances. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | Faculty | | | Grand Total | | | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 7.61% | | | 9.18% | | 5.24% | | 5.24% | 11.46% | 10.28% | 11.65% | | 8.14% | | 9.63% | | 8.84% |
| Somewhat Aware | 25.35% | | | 25.48% | | 23.22% | | 19.46% | 33.50% | 29.05% | 28.64% | | 27.15% | | 29.43% | | 26.19% |
| Not Aware | 62.54% | | | 60.02% | | 66.67% | | 70.41% | 52.55% | 57.81% | 56.31% | | 61.88% | | 57.51% | | 61.09% |
| I don't know what this is | 4.51% | | | 5.32% | | 4.87% | | 4.90% | 2.49% | 2.86% | 3.40% | | 2.83% | | 3.43% | | 3.89% |
|  | **Key Findings:** A majority of respondents were not aware of the UWs purchasing of only Energy Star rated appliances. Students were least aware, and of faculty and staff only 40% had some degree of awareness. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring all of its campus buildings' water consumption. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 12.68% | | | 10.18% | | 7.49% | | 5.33% | 11.96% | 10.25% | 7.28% | | 6.51% | | 10.79% | | 8.92% |
| Somewhat Aware | 36.90% | | | 34.31% | | 29.96% | | 27.12% | 33.25% | 33.33% | 30.58% | | 31.35% | | 33.17% | | 32.29% |
| Not Aware | 48.45% | | | 52.31% | | 58.80% | | 64.34% | 52.68% | 54.12% | 60.68% | | 59.76% | | 53.77% | | 56.08% |
| I don't know what this is | 1.97% | | | 3.20% | | 3.75% | | 3.21% | 2.12% | 2.30% | 1.46% | | 2.38% | | 2.27% | | 2.71% |
|  | **Key Findings:** A majority of respondents were not aware of the monitoring of campus building’s water consumption. Undergraduate students were the group most likely to be aware to some degree of water consumption monitoring. Awareness increased only slightly between the 2012 and the 2014 survey. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offering telecommuting options for staff. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 5.63% | | | 6.84% | | 7.12% | | 6.46% | 23.91% | 27.47% | 21.36% | | 17.06% | | 16.86% | | 16.86% |
| Somewhat Aware | 14.93% | | | 20.39% | | 19.85% | | 23.49% | 38.23% | 37.45% | 33.50% | | 38.90% | | 29.55% | | 30.53% |
| Not Aware | 70.14% | | | 65.65% | | 67.79% | | 65.25% | 36.11% | 32.89% | 43.20% | | 41.65% | | 49.60% | | 48.58% |
| I don't know what this is | 9.30% | | | 7.13% | | 5.24% | | 4.81% | 1.74% | 2.19% | 1.94% | | 2.39% | | 3.99% | | 4.03% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Most respondents were not aware of telecommuting opportunities for staff. In fact, awareness decreased slightly between 2012 and 2014. Understandably, staff were the group that was most likely to be aware while students were the least likely. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Funding for students and faculty working on sustainability focused projects and research. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 14.08% | | | N/A | | 11.24% | | N/A | 9.71% | N/A | 8.25% | | N/A | | 10.73% | | N/A |
| Somewhat Aware | 41.41% | | | N/A | | 43.82% | | N/A | 36.24% | N/A | 33.01% | | N/A | | 38.20% | | N/A |
| Not Aware | 41.13% | | | N/A | | 42.70% | | N/A | 49.69% | N/A | 56.80% | | N/A | | 47.58% | | N/A |
| I don't know what this is | 3.38% | | | N/A | | 2.25% | | N/A | 4.36% | N/A | 1.94% | | N/A | | 3.49% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:** The 2012 survey did not ask for awareness on funding for students and faculty working on sustainability focused projects and research. A majority of respondents were not aware of available funding which likely reflects the lower percentages. Student groups were more likely to be aware than faculty. This is likely because the CSF, which is geared towards students, has been existence for multiple years now while the Green Seed Fund more geared towards faculty is undergoing its first year. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Committing to a Climate Action Plan to reduce campus emissions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very Aware | 16.90% | | | 11.20% | | 13.48% | | 8.78% | 16.31% | 12.38% | 16.50% | | 10.44% | | 16.00% | | 11.19% |
| Somewhat Aware | 38.59% | | | 31.09% | | 40.82% | | 33.29% | 40.60% | 37.25% | 39.81% | | 37.45% | | 40.10% | | 34.89% |
| Not Aware | 37.18% | | | 50.52% | | 41.95% | | 52.01% | 35.99% | 44.25% | 39.81% | | 47.16% | | 37.71% | | 47.68% |
| I don't know what this is | 7.32% | | | 7.19% | | 3.75% | | 5.92% | 7.10% | 6.12% | 3.88% | | 4.95% | | 6.19% | | 6.23% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Overall awareness of the Climate Action Plan (CAP) has improved. In 2012, less than 50% of respondents were aware. Now 56% of respondents are somewhat to very aware of the CAP. Awareness increased relatively evenly among all campus groups. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Please indicate how frequently you do the following when you leave your office and/or dorm room:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Turn off my computer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 41.41% | | 39.02% | | 41.20% | | 37.34% | 28.14% | 30.55% | 41.75% | | 38.20% | | 34.89% | | 35.03% |
| Sometimes | | 32.11% | | 35.23% | | 25.47% | | 27.82% | 20.30% | 22.16% | 23.79% | | 27.59% | | 24.16% | | 27.44% |
| Never | | 18.03% | | 16.31% | | 19.10% | | 17.69% | 34.12% | 32.07% | 22.82% | | 24.23% | | 26.73% | | 24.25% |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 8.45% | | 9.44% | | 14.23% | | 17.15% | 17.43% | 15.21% | 11.65% | | 9.98% | | 14.22% | | 13.28% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Percentage of respondents who turn off the computer experienced no noticeable changes between the 2012 and 2014 survey. A majority of respondents do sometimes, or almost always turn off their computer upon leaving the room. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Adjust the temperature | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 33.24% | | 29.94% | | 27.34% | | 28.70% | 6.85% | 8.48% | 9.22% | | 9.09% | | 16.25% | | 17.95% |
| Sometimes | | 20.56% | | 21.34% | | 13.48% | | 19.34% | 7.72% | 9.41% | 8.74% | | 9.64% | | 11.59% | | 14.43% |
| Never | | 18.87% | | 18.66% | | 10.86% | | 12.55% | 12.70% | 14.74% | 12.14% | | 15.55% | | 13.67% | | 15.55% |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 27.32% | | 30.06% | | 48.31% | | 39.42% | 72.73% | 67.37% | 69.90% | | 65.73% | | 58.49% | | 52.06% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Undergraduates had a 5% increase of those who almost always adjust the temperature upon leaving their dorm rooms. Staff and faculty made up the majority of those who did not have control or found it applicable to their office setting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Make sure windows are closed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 66.20% | | 58.77% | | 56.18% | | 52.94% | 31.63% | 29.55% | 50.49% | | 45.03% | | 45.55% | | 43.61% |
| Sometimes | | 14.65% | | 20.05% | | 9.74% | | 12.24% | 5.23% | 5.44% | 5.83% | | 6.93% | | 8.09% | | 10.84% |
| Never | | 7.32% | | 9.55% | | 3.37% | | 3.52% | 3.36% | 4.29% | 1.94% | | 2.64% | | 4.05% | | 5.41% |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 11.83% | | 11.63% | | 30.71% | | 31.30% | 59.78% | 60.72% | 41.75% | | 45.40% | | 42.31% | | 40.14% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Of those who had control over closing the windows upon leaving their dorm room/office, a majority of respondents almost always closed the windows. Numbers among these respondents experienced a slight improvement from 2012. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turn off lights | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 85.63% | | 79.28% | | 80.90% | | 75.98% | 63.64% | 65.37% | 86.41% | | 84.23% | | 74.13% | | 73.43% |
| Sometimes | | 7.32% | | 11.00% | | 11.24% | | 6.63% | 24.28% | 9.00% | 7.28% | | 6.11% | | 16.31% | | 8.78% |
| Never | | 0.85% | | 1.17% | | 0.75% | | 54.00% | 2.62% | 2.50% | 0.97% | | .73% | | 1.72% | | 1.57% |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 6.20% | | 8.55% | | 7.12% | | 16.85% | 9.46% | 23.13% | 5.34% | | 8.93% | | 7.85% | | 16.21% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Respondents who are likely to never turn off the lights upon leaving the room was below 1% for all groups except staff. As mentioned in the 2012 analysis, turning of the lights is the low hanging fruit of conserving energy and is almost always practiced by ¾ of respondents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turn off my fan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 62.25% | | 50.10% | | 49.06% | | 42.96% | 33.62% | 28.72% | 29.13% | | 21.56% | | 41.81% | | 36.19% |
| Sometimes | | 5.35% | | 8.82% | | 3.75% | | 2.91% | 2.86 % | 1.69% | 0.49 % | | .64% | | 3.25% | | 3.74% |
| Never | | 1.69% | | 3.01% | | 1.50% | | 0.81% | 1.37% | 1.39% | 1.46% | | .55% | | 1.47% | | 1.63% |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 30.70% | | 38.07% | | 45.69% | | 53.32% | 62.14% | 68.19% | 68.93% | | 77.25% | | 53.46 % | | 58.43% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Of those who did have control of turning of their fan, more than 75% are likely to almost always turn off their fan upon leaving the room. Staff and faculty are least likely to have control of turning off the fan upon leaving the room. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Please indicate how frequently you practice the following actions in your campus life:**  \*This question was added to the 2014 survey to address topics not previously mentioned in the 2012 survey. The topics relate to communications projects and ideas that have been pursued in the last two years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Sort waste according to compost, recycling or landfill | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 73.24% | | N/A | | 81.65% | | N/A | 78.08% | N/A | 84.47% | | N/A | | 78.42% | | N/A |
| Sometimes | | 21.97% | | N/A | | 13.86% | | N/A | 17.56% | N/A | 11.65% | | N/A | | 17.17% | | N/A |
| Never | | 1.13% | | N/A | | 1.12% | | N/A | 0.87% | N/A | 1.94% | | N/A | | 1.10% | | N/A |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 3.66% | | N/A | | 3.37% | | N/A | 3.49% | N/A | 1.94% | | N/A | | 3.31% | | N/A |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Over ¾ of respondents sort waste accordingly almost always. However, students were the group with the smallest percentage of respondents to fall under almost always. Strangely, 3% of respondents felt they have no control over this, despite the presence of separate and labeled bins throughout campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Opt to print double-sided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 60.28% | | N/A | | 65.92% | | N/A | 45.83% | N/A | 54.37% | | N/A | | 53.34% | | N/A |
| Sometimes | | 16.62% | | N/A | | 17.60% | | N/A | 24.16% | N/A | 20.39% | | N/A | | 20.97% | | N/A |
| Never | | 7.89% | | N/A | | 5.24% | | N/A | 11.46% | N/A | 6.31% | | N/A | | 9.01% | | N/A |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 15.21% | | N/A | | 11.24% | | N/A | 18.56% | N/A | 18.93% | | N/A | | 16.68% | | N/A |
|  | | **Key Findings:** A majority of respondents almost always print double sided. Students who do not believe they have control over this are likely printing at campus libraries that default to double sided printing. Staff who are the most likely of the four campus groups to never print double-sided, likely print single-sided as the default in the office setting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Use a reusable water bottle or thermos | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 77.18% | | N/A | | 75.28% | | N/A | 76.96% | N/A | 70.39% | | N/A | | 75.90% | | N/A |
| Sometimes | | 12.96% | | N/A | | 12.73% | | N/A | 12.45% | N/A | 13.59% | | N/A | | 12.75% | | N/A |
| Never | | 3.38% | | N/A | | 3.00% | | N/A | 3.24% | N/A | 5.34% | | N/A | | 3.49% | | N/A |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 6.48% | | N/A | | 8.99% | | N/A | 7.35% | N/A | 10.68% | | N/A | | 7.85% | | N/A |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Across all campus groups, a majority of respondents are likely to almost always use a reusable water bottle or thermos. Faculty are the most likely group to claim they never use a reusable water bottle or thermos, or do not have control over it. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Choose local food options over non -local | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Almost Always | | 23.38% | | N/A | | 26.97% | | N/A | 30.39% | N/A | 28.16% | | N/A | | 28.02% | | N/A |
| Sometimes | | 30.42% | | N/A | | 25.84% | | N/A | 27.65% | N/A | 29.61% | | N/A | | 28.20% | | N/A |
| Never | | 7.04% | | N/A | | 5.99% | | N/A | 7.97% | N/A | 10.68% | | N/A | | 7.79% | | N/A |
| I do not have control over this/ Not applicable to me | | 39.15% | | N/A | | 41.20% | | N/A | 34.00% | N/A | 31.55% | | N/A | | 35.99% | | N/A |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Of the four suggested actions, choosing local foods received the lowest overall selection for almost always. This is likely because the single most option with the largest percentage by respondents was I do not have control over this. This might suggest a sentiment about the lack of available local food options on campus or lack of knowledge about how much of the food available on campus is locally produced or processed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Do you live in campus housing?**  **\*** Because no question was asked on the 2012 survey that directly asked how respondents primarily commute to campus this question and the following question were added to the 2014 survey. Respondents who selected for yes to living in campus housing were skipped past the following question. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 21.69% | | | N/A | | 5.24% | | N/A | 0.37% | N/A | 0.00% | | N/A | | 5.76% | | N/A |
| No | 78.31% | | | N/A | | 94.76% | | N/A | 99.63% | N/A | 100.00% | | N/A | | 94.24% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings** As would be expected, 94% of all respondents commute to campus with undergraduate students making up the majority of participants who do live on campus. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **How do you primarily commute to campus?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Bus | 44.96% | | | N/A | | 48.62% | | N/A | 49.13% | N/A | 28.16% | | N/A | | 45.48% | | N/A |
| Carpool with 2+ people | 2.52% | | | N/A | | 1.98% | | N/A | 9.63% | N/A | 6.80% | | N/A | | 6.70% | | N/A |
| Drive yourself | 14.03% | | | N/A | | 17.39% | | N/A | 28.25% | N/A | 39.81% | | N/A | | 25.44% | | N/A |
| Walk or Bike | 38.49% | | | N/A | | 32.02% | | N/A | 13.00% | N/A | 25.24% | | N/A | | 22.38% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:**  The majority of respondents selected that they bused to campus in second were those who selected driving themselves. Undergraduate were the most likely group to walk or bus to campus, but still had roughly 14% of respondents stating that they drive themselves to campus. Faculty made up the majority of those who drive themselves to campus followed by staff. However, staff made up the majority of those who bused to campus. Suggestions for improvement might be improved carpool coordination and encouragement among all groups. Sentiments were expressed in the comments section about wishing motorcycles had been included as another option and that the current metro scheduling and routes alongside impending bus cuts makes busing unreasonable. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Which of the following UW transportation programs do you use:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| UPASS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 86.48% | | | 75.40% | | 83.90% | | 68.35% | 62.89% | 60.13% | 48.06% | | 39.26% | | 69.59% | | 63.13% |
| No | 13.52% | | | 24.60% | | 16.10% | | 31.65% | 37.11% | 39.87% | 51.94% | | 60.74% | | 30.41% | | 36.87% |
|  | **Key Findings:** UPASS has experienced a close to 10% increase among undergraduate and faculty groups, and slighter increases among graduates and staff. Faculty were the only group to have a majority of respondents say they do not use UPASS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Zipcar |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 1.69% | | | 2.19% | | 6.37% | | 2.62% | 2.62% | 2.03% | 6.31% | | 1.90% | | 3.50% | | 2.16% |
| No | 98.31% | | | 97.81% | | 93.63% | | 97.38% | 97.38% | 97.97% | 93.69% | | 98.10% | | 96.51% | | 97.84% |
|  | **Key Findings:** A large majority of respondents, 96%, say they do not use Zipcar. Graduate students and faculty were the groups most likely to use Zipcar. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carpool Permits | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 7.32% | | | 2.77% | | 12.73% | | 2.22% | 17.06% | 1.73% | 15.53% | | 1.27% | | 14.04% | | 2.05% |
| No | 92.68% | | | 97.23% | | 87.27% | | 97.78% | 82.94% | 98.27% | 84.47% | | 98.73% | | 85.96% | | 97.95% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Despite carpooling being the least likely form of commuting selected across all groups, the number of respondents who said they used carpool permits increased by more than 10%. The largest increase was found among staff who increased by roughly 15%. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Price Parking | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 6.20% | | | 15.20% | | 5.99% | | 20.90% | 12.58% | 23.78% | 15.05% | | 34.27% | | 10.42% | | 22.23% |
| No | 93.80% | | | 84.80% | | 94.01% | | 79.10% | 87.42% | 76.22% | 84.95% | | 65.73% | | 89.58% | | 77.77% |
|  | **Key Findings:** The number of respondents who said they paid full price parking decreased from 22% to 10% between 2012 and 2014, likely due to rising parking costs. Largest decreases were found among graduate students and faculty. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Husky Night Ride | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 17.18% | | | N/A | | 4.49% | | N/A | 0.99% | N/A | 1.46% | | N/A | | 5.15% | | N/A |
| No | 82.82% | | | N/A | | 95.51% | | N/A | 99.00% | N/A | 98.54% | | N/A | | 94.85% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:** Husky Night Ride was not included as an option in the previous survey. We wanted to gauge how well known and frequented this service is among students. A majority of Husky Night Ride users are undergraduates but there is an existing percentage of users among staff and faculty. Most respondents do not take advantage of the free Husky Night Ride service. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Health Sciences Express | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 6.76% | | | N/A | | 17.60% | | N/A | 27.64% | N/A | 20.87% | | N/A | | 21.09% | | N/A |
| No | 93.24% | | | N/A | | 82.40% | | N/A | 71.36% | N/A | 79.13% | | N/A | | 78.91% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:** Health Sciences Express was not included as an option in the previous survey. We wanted to gauge how well known and frequented this service is among campus members. Staff and faculty are the groups most likely to use the Health Sciences Express with 1/5 to 1/4 of the groups having ridden. Undergraduates were least likely to have ridden the Health Sciences Express with less only 7%, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vanpool | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 0.28% | | | N/A | | 0.37% | | N/A | 1.87% | N/A | 0.97% | | N/A | | 1.16% | | N/A |
| No | 99.72% | | | N/A | | 99.63% | | N/A | 98.13% | N/A | 99.03% | | N/A | | 98.84% | | N/A |
|  | **Key Findings:** Based on our survey, vanpool is the least frequently used of the UW transportation services. Only 1% of all respondents said they used the service. More than 80% of those who did use the service are staff and faculty members. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None of the above | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 7.60% | | | 15.57% | | 10.86% | | 21.91% | 19.30% | 25.62% | 33.50% | | 38.08% | | 17.17% | | 23.78% |
| No | 92.39% | | | 84.43% | | 89.14% | | 78.09% | 80.70% | 74.38% | 66.50% | | 61.92% | | 82.83% | | 76.22% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Faculty and staff were the campus groups most likely to have not used any of the campus transportation services. However, these numbers have improved since 2012 by roughly 5%. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Please select the following statement(s) that apply to you:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| I use public transportation more as a result of UPASS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 78.31% | | | 46.09% | | 72.28% | | 34.27% | 52.80% | 21.64% | 41.75% | | 13.23% | | 60.15% | | 29.90% |
| No | 21.69% | | | 53.91% | | 27.72% | | 65.73% | 47.20% | 78.36% | 58.25% | | 83.77% | | 39.85% | | 70.10% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Public transportation usage has more than doubled among participants because of the use of UPASS. These numbers are reflective of earlier findings discussing the increase in impact and emphasis placed on UPASS. Largest increases were found among faculty and staff, however faculty are the only group with a majority saying they do not use public transportation more as a result of UPASS. In 2012, all groups had the majority of participants saying that UPASS did not increase their usage of public transportation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I drive less as a result of UPASS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 38.03% | | | 17.68% | | 46.82% | | 17.88% | 35.99% | 13.41% | 28.64% | | 11.79% | | 37.28% | | 15.15% |
| No | 61.97% | | | 82.32% | | 53.18% | | 82.12% | 64.01% | 86.59% | 71.36% | | 88.21% | | 62.72% | | 84.85% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Decreased driving has more than doubled among participants because of the use of UPASS. These numbers are reflective of earlier findings discussing the increase in impact and emphasis placed on UPASS. Largest improvements came from the graduate/professional group. Though the number of those who say they do not drive less as a result of a UPASS has decreased by 20%, this response is still the majority across all groups. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| My use of public transportation has not changed as a result of UPASS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Yes | 23.38% | | | 50.81% | | 26.59% | | 60.48% | 44.21% | 71.70% | 55.83% | | 74.61% | | 38.26% | | 64.35% |
| No | 76.62% | | | 49.19% | | 73.41% | | 39.52% | 55.79% | 28.30% | 44.17% | | 25.34% | | 61.74% | | 35.65% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Percentages for respondents who do not feel their use of public transportation has changed as a result of UPASS has flipped since 2012. A majority of respondents do now feel that the UPASS has affected their use of public transportation. All groups experienced more than a 20% decrease of those who felt their use of public transportation has not changed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **People receive news and information in a variety of ways. Please indicate how frequently you use the following types of media to receive information about the UW:**  \*A breakdown of each media type is provided but to provide a more cohesive and effective analysis of results, media type has been ranked based on the combined percentages usage classified as “frequently” or “sometimes”.     |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **Undergraduate** | **Graduate/ Professional** | **Staff** | **Faculty** | **Overall** | | **1** | Email | Email | Email | Email | Email | | **2** | Facebook | Online News | Online News | Online News | Online News | | **3** | Classes and Seminars | Classes and Seminars | Radio News | Radio News | Radio News | | **4** | Online News | Facebook | Hardcopy News | Hardcopy News | Hardcopy News | | **5** | Flyers | Radio News | Televised News | Televised News | Classes and Seminars | | **6** | Hardcopy News | Flyers | Flyers | Classes and Seminars | Facebook | | **7** | Booths on Red Square | Bus Shelters | Facebook | Facebook | Televised News | | **8** | Bus Shelters | Hardcopy News | Classes and Seminars | Flyers | Flyers | | **9** | Televised News | Billboards | Bus Shelters | Bus Shelters | Bus Shelters | | **10** | Billboards | Televised News | Billboards | Billboards | Billboards | | **11** | Radio News | Blogs | Blogs | Blogs | Blogs | | **12** | Blogs | Booths on Red Square | Twitter | Booths on Red Square | Booths on Red Square | | **13** | Twitter | Twitter | Booths on Red Square | Twitter | Twitter | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Email |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 83.94% | | 86.22% | | 89.14% | | 88.77% | 90.66% | 89.95% | 91.26% | | 90.15% | | 89.03% | | 88.74% |
| Sometimes | | 11.55% | | 11.57% | | 9.74% | | 8.37% | 7.22% | 7.91% | 4.85% | | 7.74% | | 8.28% | | 8.98% |
| Rarely | | 2.82% | | 1.45% | | 0.37% | | 1.86% | 1.25% | 1.16% | 0.97% | | 1.14% | | 1.41% | | 1.36% |
| Never | | 1.69% | | 0.77% | | 0.75% | | 1.00% | 0.87% | 0.98% | 2.91% | | 0.97% | | 1.29% | | 0.92% |
|  | | **Key Findings:**  The percentage of respondents who rely on email for receiving information about the UW has remained mostly consistent across all groups and frequency of usage. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Facebook | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 36.62% | | 44.81% | | 26.59% | | 26.55% | 11.33% | 13.61% | 8.25% | | 7.50% | | 18.95% | | 23.75% |
| Sometimes | | 27.04% | | 21.27% | | 21.72% | | 19.81% | 13.45% | 13.50% | 15.05% | | 10.45% | | 17.96% | | 16.36% |
| Rarely | | 16.62% | | 15.52% | | 19.48% | | 22.08% | 22.17% | 18.17% | 13.59% | | 18.30% | | 19.44% | | 18.11% |
| Never | | 19.72% | | 18.40% | | 32.21% | | 31.55% | 53.05% | 54.71% | 63.11% | | 63.75% | | 43.65% | | 41.78% |
|  | | **Key Findings:**  The percentage of respondents who rely on Facebook for information on UW has experienced slight decreases among those who use it frequently and increase among those who use it never. These changes are most reflected among undergraduate students, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Twitter | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 6.20% | | 6.31% | | 2.62% | | 2.61% | 3.49% | 2.23% | 0.49% | | 0.63% | | 3.56% | | 3.23% |
| Sometimes | | 6.20% | | 7.12% | | 6.74% | | 4.69% | 4.73% | 3.68% | 2.43% | | 2.42% | | 5.09% | | 4.65% |
| Rarely | | 13.52% | | 11.27% | | 14.61% | | 12.53% | 12.83% | 9.61% | 12.14% | | 9.30% | | 13.18% | | 10.53% |
| Never | | 74.08% | | 75.30% | | 76.03% | | 80.16% | 78.95% | 84.48% | 84.95% | | 87.66% | | 78.17% | | 81.59% |
|  | | **Key Findings:**  The percentage of respondents who rely on Twitter for receiving information about the UW has remained mostly constant with slight increases in those who use it sometimes, mostly among graduate students and staff. There has been an overall decrease across groups among those who say they never use it. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Blogs | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 3.66% | | 4.32% | | 1.87% | | 3.90% | 2.37% | 3.08% | 1.46% | | 1.70% | | 2.45% | | 3.39% |
| Sometimes | | 9.01% | | 11.12% | | 11.61% | | 12.64% | 12.70% | 12.07% | 8.25% | | 11.26% | | 11.16% | | 11.80% |
| Rarely | | 21.13% | | 20.86% | | 25.09% | | 22.80% | 25.40% | 20.30% | 26.70% | | 21.63% | | 24.59% | | 21.05% |
| Never | | 66.20% | | 63.69% | | 61.42% | | 60.66% | 59.53% | 64.55% | 63.59% | | 65.42% | | 61.80% | | 63.76% |
|  | | **Key Findings:**  Overall, the frequency of respondents who use blogs for information from the UW has decreased from frequently and sometimes to a slight increase among those who use it rarely. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Online News | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 18.31% | | 21.33% | | 22.47% | | 26.92% | 33.75% | 36.88% | 33.50% | | 30.52% | | 28.51% | | 30.07% |
| Sometimes | | 25.92% | | 35.69% | | 31.84% | | 36.91% | 39.48% | 40.62% | 36.41% | | 42.06% | | 34.89% | | 38.81% |
| Rarely | | 29.30% | | 22.63% | | 26.22% | | 19.39% | 15.19% | 12.45% | 15.05% | | 15.35% | | 20.05% | | 16.82% |
| Never | | 26.48% | | 20.35% | | 19.48% | | 16.79% | 11.58% | 10.04% | 15.05% | | 12.07% | | 16.55% | | 14.30% |
|  | | **Key Findings:**  Aside from faculty, all other groups have experienced a decline in the frequency of online news as a source of information for the UW. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hardcopy News | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 9.30% | | 9.28% | | 4.12% | | 6.23% | 15.07% | 16.07% | 25.73% | | 24.24% | | 13.37% | | 13.55% |
| Sometimes | | 21.69% | | 29.96% | | 21.72% | | 25.60% | 28.02% | 29.60% | 25.73% | | 29.41% | | 25.32% | | 29.00% |
| Rarely | | 32.96% | | 31.58% | | 38.20% | | 35.32% | 31.63% | 30.00% | 26.70% | | 24.87% | | 32.37% | | 30.69% |
| Never | | 36.06% | | 29.18% | | 35.96% | | 32.84% | 25.28% | 24.33% | 21.84% | | 21.48% | | 28.94% | | 26.76% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Overall, percentages have stayed mostly consistent on the usage of hardcopy news for information on the UW. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Televised News | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 4.79% | | 8.62% | | 4.87% | | 7.48% | 15.32% | 19.53% | 10.19% | | 14.78% | | 10.67% | | 13.85% |
| Sometimes | | 16.06% | | 23.82% | | 10.11% | | 21.58% | 26.65% | 31.49% | 24.27% | | 24.58% | | 21.34% | | 26.81% |
| Rarely | | 28.17% | | 31.22% | | 29.59% | | 30.39% | 29.76% | 26.08% | 28.64% | | 28.67% | | 29.25% | | 28.57% |
| Never | | 50.99% | | 36.34% | | 55.43% | | 40.55% | 28.27% | 22.90% | 36.89% | | 31.97% | | 38.75% | | 30.77% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Across all groups, televised news as a source of information on the UW has slightly decreased. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Radio News | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 5.07% | | 7.24% | | 12.73% | | 16.34% | 23.29% | 24.75% | 29.13% | | 31.04% | | 18.33% | | 19.26% |
| Sometimes | | 9.86% | | 17.22% | | 18.73% | | 25.62% | 31.13% | 32.34% | 31.07% | | 30.24% | | 24.46% | | 26.73% |
| Rarely | | 26.48% | | 29.02% | | 25.47% | | 25.28% | 25.03% | 23.50% | 21.84% | | 21.59% | | 25.02% | | 25.09% |
| Never | | 58.59% | | 46.52% | | 43.07% | | 32.76% | 20.55% | 19.41% | 17.96% | | 17.13% | | 32.19% | | 28.92% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Across all groups, radio news as a source of information on the UW has decreased. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Billboards | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 1.97% | | 3.35% | | 1.12% | | 1.88% | 2.12% | 2.83% | 0.97% | | 1.26% | | 1.78% | | 2.61% |
| Sometimes | | 13.24% | | 15.75% | | 14.61% | | 15.94% | 16.81% | 17.13% | 12.14% | | 14.62% | | 15.08% | | 16.22% |
| Rarely | | 29.86% | | 33.13% | | 32.58% | | 32.69% | 42.22% | 38.07% | 38.83% | | 39.91% | | 37.52% | | 36.01% |
| Never | | 54.93% | | 47.78% | | 51.69% | | 49.50% | 38.85% | 41.97% | 48.06% | | 44.22% | | 45.62% | | 45.15% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Billboards are not a useful source of information for those who seek out information about the UW. Billboards are probably better served as a one-time attention grabbing announcement. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bus Shelters | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 3.38% | | 3.02% | | 2.25% | | 2.68% | 2.62% | 2.96% | 0.49% | | 1.25% | | 2.45% | | 2.71% |
| Sometimes | | 17.75% | | 17.41% | | 24.34% | | 18.43% | 20.42% | 18.15% | 16.99% | | 12.08% | | 20.05% | | 17.22% |
| Rarely | | 33.52% | | 31.77% | | 31.84% | | 32.51% | 36.99% | 35.07% | 33.98% | | 34.44% | | 35.01% | | 33.64% |
| Never | | 45.35% | | 47.80% | | 41.57% | | 46.38% | 39.98% | 43.83% | 48.54% | | 52.24% | | 42.49% | | 46.43% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Overall, percentages have stayed mostly consistent on obtaining information about the UW from bus shelters. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flyers | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 5.92% | | 6.43% | | 3.75% | | 2.61% | 2.99% | 2.69% | 0.97% | | 1.88% | | 3.49% | | 3.62% |
| Sometimes | | 35.49% | | 28.68% | | 24.72% | | 20.09% | 26.03% | 24.01% | 21.36% | | 20.18% | | 27.28% | | 24.17% |
| Rarely | | 31.55% | | 36.37% | | 32.21% | | 37.64% | 37.98% | 38.92% | 41.75% | | 41.97% | | 36.11% | | 38.38% |
| Never | | 27.04% | | 28.52% | | 39.33% | | 39.65% | 33.00% | 34.37% | 35.92% | | 35.96% | | 33.11% | | 33.84% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Overall, percentages have stayed mostly consistent on obtaining information about the UW from flyers. However, previous polling at a Sustainability Summit event found that most attendants had heard about the even through flyers. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Classes and Seminars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 21.41% | | 21.30% | | 14.61% | | 17.81% | 2.62% | 3.68% | 5.34% | | 5.55% | | 9.01% | | 11.22% |
| Sometimes | | 39.15% | | 38.21% | | 38.20% | | 39.49% | 22.04% | 22.92% | 22.82% | | 25.07% | | 28.51% | | 30.26% |
| Rarely | | 23.94% | | 23.25% | | 26.59% | | 24.42% | 35.24% | 34.99% | 34.95% | | 33.57% | | 31.33% | | 29.74% |
| Never | | 15.49% | | 17.24% | | 20.60% | | 18.28% | 40.10% | 38.42% | 36.89% | | 35.81% | | 31.15% | | 28.77% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Overall, percentages have stayed mostly consistent on obtaining information about the UW from classes and seminars. Among undergraduates and graduates, this is a promising way to spread information. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Booths on Red Square | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Undergraduate | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Frequently | | 3.10% | | 5.55% | | 0.75% | | 0.94% | 0.50% | 0.48% | 0.00% | | 0.54% | | 1.04% | | 1.98% |
| Sometimes | | 19.44% | | 22.53% | | 10.11% | | 6.59% | 4.73% | 4.81% | 4.85% | | 3.15% | | 8.83% | | 9.85% |
| Rarely | | 40.56% | | 31.02% | | 27.34% | | 25.81% | 25.40% | 23.41% | 25.24% | | 21.96% | | 29.00% | | 25.76% |
| Never | | 36.90% | | 40.90% | | 61.80% | | 66.67% | 69.36% | 71.30% | 69.90% | | 74.35% | | 61.13% | | 62.41% |
|  | | **Key Findings:** Across all groups, using booths on Red Square as a source of information on the UW has decreased. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **How concerned are you about the consequences of climate change:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Very concerned | 72.11% | | | 51.51% | | 78.28% | | 63.23% | 72.10% | 63.75% | 79.61% | | 72.60% | | 74.06% | | 61.38% |
| Somewhat concerned | 21.97% | | | 38.33% | | 18.73% | | 28.96% | 22.29% | 29.34% | 15.53% | | 22.14% | | 20.78% | | 30.86% |
| Not concerned | 5.92% | | | 10.15% | | 3.00% | | 7.81% | 5.60% | 6.91% | 4.85% | | 5.26% | | 5.15% | | 7.76% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Since 2012 there has been an increase of those who are very concerned about the consequences of climate change, likewise there has been a decrease among those who are only somewhat concerned or not concerned at all. Faculty remained the group with the highest likelihood of being concerned about climate change, while undergraduates and graduates have experienced the largest increase by more than 20%. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **To what extent do you agree with the following statement: There are things I can do to help stop climate change.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Undergraduate | | | | | | Graduate/Professional | | Staff | | | Faculty | | | | Grand Total | |
|  | **2014** | | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** | **2014** | **2012** | **2014** | | **2012** | | **2014** | | **2012** |
| Strongly agree | 59.15% | | | 33.28% | | 56.18% | | 34.98% | 52.18% | 37.53% | 56.31% | | 43.73% | | 54.87% | | 36.70% |
| Somewhat agree | 33.24% | | | 43.50% | | 35.58% | | 43.15% | 36.24% | 41.09% | 33.01% | | 37.82% | | 35.07% | | 41.69% |
| Somewhat disagree | 4.79% | | | 17.86% | | 5.24% | | 16.61% | 6.60% | 16.22% | 5.34% | | 13.55% | | 5.82% | | 16.41% |
| Strongly disagree | 2.82% | | | 5.36% | | 3.00% | | 5.27% | 4.98% | 5.16% | 5.34% | | 4.91% | | 4.23% | | 5.20% |
|  | **Key Findings:** Despite an apparent increase in concern since 2012, there has also been an increase in the percentage of participants who believe they can help stop climate change. The increase among those who strongly agreed was roughly 20% across all groups. Those who strongly disagreed decreased slightly and those who somewhat disagreed decreased by 10%. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2014 Undergraduates only, what groups on campus do you identify with:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None/ I’d rather not say | | | 58.31% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Non-Environmental Registered Student Organization Member | | | 17.18% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Environmental Registered Student Organization Member | | | 8.45% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| UW Greek System | | | 7.61% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Other | | | 6.76% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| International Student | | | 2.82% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| UW Student Athlete | | | 0.85% | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |

Undergraduates were given the optional opportunity to classify their role on campus to provide a tool for potential further analysis.