Chapter 4: Case Study at the Business School

Introduction: Rationale for Choosing the Business School

While reviewing our audit of the University in the fall and discussing the types of projects PolPrev could undertake, we recalled a message sent to us during the summer by Professor Jonathan Bulkley, our advisor.

Project Team: I had a meeting with Joe White, Dean of the Business School. He is very interested in involving MBA students in an audit of the waste generation at the Business School. He basically offered the B-School as a focal point for your work. He pointed out that it would have all of the components except toxic labs. We can talk about this—it might be very helpful. Prof. Hart is the key contact in the B-School.

Once we met with Hart, assistant professor of corporate strategy at the Business School, we discovered that the Dean not only wanted an audit but also wanted us to create a model for a “Green Business School.” We realized that a pollution prevention project focused on the Business School would provide the opportunity to study an entire, essentially self-contained, unit. The Business School produces each type of waste stream existing at the University, with the exception of hazardous waste, and thus represents a microcosm of the University of Michigan as well as universities and colleges in general. We therefore believed that change implemented at the Business School could serve as a model for other institutions.

By offering the Business School as a site for a demonstration project, Dean White was giving us institutional support. Because the project calls for a fundamental change in many of the School’s operating procedures, such support from
a top administrator was essential. According to Waterman in his book *Adhocracy: The Power to Change* (1992),

[top management support is] an important perk. Ad hoc work is difficult and stressful for most people.... People will not spend the time, take the work seriously, or feel good about what they're doing unless top executives are involved and perceived as sharing the sense that the project is a top priority. (p. 31)

A further reason we found the Business School appealing was that business and environmental concerns have traditionally been viewed as being at odds with each other. Our project would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the possibility of cooperation between the two. Furthermore, if the Business School can engender an environmental business ethic through its curricula and operations, graduates of the school can help to spread this new ethos to corporations and other entities throughout the world.

Because of these possibilities for change, the Business School represented an exciting challenge for us. Five of PolPrev’s members therefore chose to work with the Business School to encourage it to be more environmentally responsible.

**Profile of the Business School**

To give an idea of the size of the school, we have provided a profile of the school buildings, facilities, and population. We also include a description of innovations in curricula, since these illustrate the dynamic quality of the Business School and the potential for including an environmental component in the curriculum.

The Business School is housed in four adjoining buildings, occupying a total of 331,264 square feet. The oldest building, Business Administration, was erected in 1947. This unit contains many administrative and faculty offices as well as classrooms, auditoria, and support services such as a photocopy center. Assembly Hall holds administrative offices, several larger classrooms, and an Auditorium. Paton Accounting Center houses several classrooms, the extensive three-floor Kresge library (211,000 volumes, 400,000 microforms and 3,200 periodicals and serials), a two-tier student lounge and snack bar, and a 500,000 square-foot computing center with 119 microcomputers. Finally, the Executive Education Center maintains several lecture halls, conference and meeting rooms, a restaurant, and a hotel.
During the 1991-92 academic year, this institution employed 138 faculty and 210 staff members. Faculty conduct research in 11 disciplines.

For the 1992-93 academic year, student enrollment consisted of: 536 BBA candidates, 33 dual-degree Bachelor’s/Master’s in Accounting candidates, 867 full-time MBA, 1029 part-time MBA, and 90 Ph.D. As the largest segment of the school, the MBA students are divided into six sections. In general, members of each section attend classes together over the course of the two-year program.

Several notable curriculum innovations deserve mention. The Business School blends 7- and 14-week courses so that new courses may be introduced. One such course, “Corporate Environmental Strategy,” was team-taught by Stu Hart, assistant professor of corporate strategy, and Garry Brewer, dean of the School of Natural Resources and Environment. The recently introduced Multidisciplinary Action Project (MAP) allows student teams to work with companies on core operating processes. Within this setting, they describe and analyze problems, identify improvements, outline measurements, and enumerate costs and benefits.

Another curriculum innovation parallels the format of successful executive seminars. Students are offered a range of non-credit workshops conducted by external consultants and corporate training specialists. Executive education is used as a tool for innovation and enlivenment of the curriculum. Students solve “real life” problems, particularly in the areas of Managing Critical Issues and Strategic Quality Management in which organization-wide efforts are formalized.

The recently revamped orientation program includes a two-day “Global Citizenship” module that places students in community action settings. Through this, students form ties with local non-profit organizations and continue to work with them while enrolled in the MBA program. This experience highlights the interdependence of business and society. In 1992-93, one Global Citizenship curriculum focused on the environment.

**Project Overview**

As described in Chapter Three, our demonstration projects were influenced by the principles of action research and community participation.

The community participation approach proved important at the Business School, where our group was an outside force. It was essential to include members of the Business School community within the planning process to ensure that the any plan we conceived would be appropriate to the needs of that
community. Our group had previously had little contact with the Business School and we now found it necessary to learn new ways of framing problems and to familiarize ourselves with a new vocabulary. Since we needed to orient ourselves to the School, we allotted much of our time to gathering information about the School and surveying existing attitudes.

Our partnership with members of the Business School community was very influential in the development of our project. Initially, we envisioned the greening project as a series of pollution prevention strategies that we would initiate. After a semester of meetings with our contacts at the School, however, we realized that we did not possess enough inside information to be the primary change agents. If the greening of the School was to be a continuing process, we would have to create a structure within the Business School which could initiate pollution prevention efforts itself. We therefore decided to create a core committee, the Green Team, comprised of students, faculty and staff at the School.

The following chronology outlines the development of our project, highlighting the importance of our contacts in the Business School, our efforts to familiarize ourselves with the community, and the problems we faced as outsiders. In closing, we provide a list of recommendations that we believe will help to establish the Green Team as a permanent committee within the Business School.

**Chronology**

**October 8, 1992: First Meeting at Business School**

The Business School group met for the first time with Stu Hart, our Business School liaison. Hart, assistant professor of corporate strategy, has been working to promote the concept of environmentally responsible corporations. Our contact with Hart was important throughout the project. As an insider, he was able to listen to our proposals and ideas and then translate them into business terms; in one of our first meetings he reminded us that the Dean was now our “client.”

From Hart, we learned that Dean White was committed to “greening the school.” However, the Dean did not want a “laundry list” of different intervention projects, but rather wanted us to create a model for a “green school.” He requested lists of recommendations, curriculum changes, issues to consider when remodeling the building, and other factors which should be considered when re-
ating an environmentally responsible institution. Hart also mentioned that White was willing to invest money in greening projects that fell within his jurisdiction.

We agreed that, in order to look to the future, we needed to assess the current situation and obtain baseline data for the Business School. We therefore decided to come to the next meeting with a list of contact people and a first draft of a Business School audit. (See Appendix II for audit results.)

At a Business group meeting, we divided the responsibilities for conducting a preliminary audit. The areas we investigated included:

- **Physical Waste Streams**: solid waste, utilities (water, electricity, heat, gas, oil), food, cleaning chemicals;
- **Operations**: landscaping, parking, purchasing, standard operating procedures, organizational structure.

While we understood that we were to create a model, we still envisioned implementing specific pollution prevention strategies as part of that model. Our group’s goal was to institute several technical changes along with the behavioral changes that might be required to make those technical changes effective. We also planned to continually solicit input and recommendations from students, staff and faculty.

### November 4: Genesis of the Business School Survey

During our weekly group meeting we decided that, since we were unfamiliar with the Business School community, we should conduct a survey to help us gauge attitudes. We wanted to learn to what extent the community was aware of, interested in, and concerned about environmental practices at the school. The survey would also provide an opportunity to solicit suggestions and observations from those in the school. This information would augment our baseline data and help us shape an appropriate intervention for the School.

### November 6: Meeting with the Business School’s Environmental Club

In order to increase our knowledge of attitudes at the Business School and to continue soliciting ideas, opinions, and impressions from the community, the Business group scheduled a meeting with the Business School Environmental Society. Our conversation with students in the club gave us some insights into potential interventions and the barriers to success. The students had themselves instituted several intervention projects and were somewhat skeptical about the chances for effective behavior change. However, their lack of success may have
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occurred because they worked alone without administrative support or recognition. Their experience emphasized the need for such support.

November 15: A Model Begins to Emerge

The Business group met to review each member’s vision of an environmentally sound Business School. Ideas ranged from the practical issues to consider when creating this type of school to a vision of the “ideal green school,” at which, for example, companies with poor environmental records would be banned from recruiting. We then began to build a framework for the model, incorporating these different perspectives: a strategic plan, an outline of the philosophy behind the model, a diagram of “The Green Business School,” and a list of the policies, behaviors, and tenets that should be encompassed in a “Green Business School.”

November 18: Draft Model Reviewed

In a meeting with Hart, we discussed the first draft of the model. We had broken our model of the “Green School” into three components: a diagram mapping out the different areas of the School that would need to become environmentally responsible if the School itself were to be called “green” (policy, operations, and curricula); criteria for a strategic planning process that could lead to such a School; and a list of the specific goals and objectives which could guide the planning process. (For first draft models see Appendix III.)

After examining the plans, Hart helped us reframe them in terms more suited for the Business School. For example, our list of goals included the term “low-impact school,” but he informed us that this phrase would not be well received: while the term “low impact” has positive connotations in the environmental context (suggesting that an activity causes minimal disturbance to the environment), in the business context it means “ineffectual”! Working with Hart, we translated our model from a list of goals and objectives into a mission statement and goals. The mission is a long-term vision that is potentially achievable; goals are more specific and have a short-term timeframe.

At this meeting, we gained a better idea of strategic planning in the business world. Hart advised us that, once our goals had been set, the first strategies to be implemented should be the “low-hanging fruit”—strategies that are easily accomplished and have a high return rate (e.g., installing new energy-saving light fixtures). Such strategies would create momentum for projects which will take longer to complete.
November 19–December 19: Toward A Clearer Model

Through a series of meetings and planning sessions, a coherent model for an environmentally responsible Business School emerged. This model represented a process through which the “Green School” might be created. First we provided a mission statement, the ultimate goal. This was followed by a list of shorter term goals which would achieve that mission. In order to accomplish each goal, the team developed strategies and then smaller projects which would work toward accomplishing the strategies.

A major goal was to encourage students, faculty and staff to value environmental responsibility. One of the strategies for achieving this goal was to provide experiential opportunities for increasing environmental awareness; a project that would help promote this strategy was incorporating environmental advocacy into the Global Citizenship module. Another strategy to achieve the same goal of environmental responsibility was to educate and motivate students, faculty and staff with informational prompts. A project included in this strategy could be to post “turn off the lights—conserve energy!” prompts by light switches. Clearly, the effects of one project would go beyond the specific strategy for which it was intended, but we arranged projects, strategies and goals in separate groupings in order to clarify the greening process.

After lengthy deliberation over the tone of the mission, we decided to write a bold, all-encompassing statement that would incite feedback and comments. We debated each word, knowing each was important, but fearing that these powerful words might be a tough veneer for an ineffectual policy and no change. Each word of the mission statement was ultimately agreed upon by consensus. It read as follows:

The University of Michigan Business School will become environmentally responsible in every aspect of its operation, including administrative policy, physical operations and curriculum. The Business School will provide students and executive education participants with direct experience in an environmentally sensitive culture, which will influence their decisions and actions throughout their careers. Other universities and University of Michigan departments will look to this ethos as a model for their own operations. (See Appendix IV for the complete model.)

Assessment of Project

After almost a semester of meetings with members of the Business School community, our vision of the project had shifted considerably. Initially, we had
envisioned group members as instituting pollution prevention strategies while enlisting support and input from within the Business School. We now realized that the dramatic changes involved in creating a “Green School” could barely begin within the next four months. In addition, we no longer felt that it was appropriate to choose which strategies should be implemented. As Kaplan and Kaplan (1981) assert, “[t]he degree to which an individual comprehends a situation and understands what can be done is often crucial. The very perception an individual has of a situation may create or destroy the opportunity for participation.” People within the Business School had an intimate knowledge of the institution, while we were outsiders and lacked such knowledge.

During this time of transition, we conceived of the idea for an environmental advisory committee. This would become the group’s major contribution to the “greening of the Business School.” This committee, or Green Team, would be comprised of Business School students, staff, and faculty, and would promote the greening process from within the School. At this time, we still planned to implement some pollution prevention strategies in addition to forming the Green Team; it was not until the middle of January that the Green Team became our primary focus.

To inform the Dean of our project’s evolvement, we wrote him a letter describing accomplishments to date and outlining our plans for the future.

January 11: Meeting with Deans of Business and Natural Resources

Dean White, Professor Hart, the Business group, Professor Bulkley, and Garry Brewer, dean of the School of Natural Resources and Environment (SNRE), were present. Brewer was invited to this meeting because he was co-teaching a course in the Business School.

This was the team’s first meeting with our client. Having sent out all meeting materials well in advance, we expected White and Brewer to have read them. When it became apparent that we needed to give a brief summary of PolPrev and our demonstration project, both deans explained how many pieces of paper pass their desks each day. We then understood that we could not expect them to remember (or even read) the materials we sent them—it was necessary to remind them of what we were doing.

After hearing about our Green Team idea, White expressed enthusiasm. He said that it would be a major new committee in the structure of the school—a steering group that would feed into existing systems. We were beginning to feel
some success. Then the conversation took an unexpected turn: White asked Brewer, “Is there something like this going on in your school, Garry?”

While seemingly asked in jest, this put Brewer somewhat on the defensive. He replied, “No, but there ought to be!” We suddenly found ourselves agreeing to take on another project: the greening of our own school. Being somewhat intimidated by the presence of two deans (most of us had never even spoken with them before this meeting), none of us felt able to disagree.

After the meeting, our group discussed how to handle this new development. After re-evaluating our time-frame and seeking Professor Bulkley’s advice, we sent Brewer a memo explaining that we would be unable to carry out his suggested project. The next week we met with him to confirm our answer. He was adamant about the need to “green” the School of Natural Resources and Environment, so we offered to recruit new graduate students to work on that project. (See Appendix XIV, “Conference Presentations.”)

We learned that we needed to have as clear an idea as possible about how much we could reasonably accomplish in our timeframe—and that we should not be afraid to decline other projects, no matter how exciting they might sound.

January 19–21: Survey of the Business School

We postponed our survey of the Business School until the beginning of the winter semester, when students would be less preoccupied with exams and assignments. Our purpose for this survey was threefold: (1) to assess the current situation by learning the problems and solutions that people have already considered, (2) to gain a clearer picture of the attitudes of people in the Business School, and (3) to provide an initial method of involving the Business School community in the greening of the institution. We conducted the survey in the Business School student lounge 10:00 a.m – 2:00 p.m. on two consecutive days, and then for an hour during the break in night school classes.

Because U-M Business School students are over-surveyed, we decided to provide them with a material incentive. Two signs reading “Food for Thoughts: Fill out a short questionnaire for a free bagel” were posted, one at the entrance to the lounge and one at the survey table inside. Because we did not want to only target individuals interested in environmental issues, our signs did not divulge the survey topic. The team solicited staff respondents from the Offices of Admissions, the Dean, and Research Administration; the Library; the Cognitive Science
and Machine Intelligence Laboratory; Plant Building Services; and the Executive Residence. The survey consisted of the three questions listed below:

1. “Have you ever noticed energy or materials being used inefficiently in this building? Please give examples.”

2. “What strategies could help the Business School use energy and materials more efficiently?”

3. “What do you think Business School students, faculty, staff, and administrators could do to save energy and materials in this building?”

The surveys were copied on the blank sides of paper recovered from the recycling bins. The words “This survey is printed on 100% reused paper” were printed on the bottom. It seemed appropriate to use this opportunity to model conservation behavior.

A total of 77 students responded to the survey. The response rate was quite low during the night school classes, because people were in a hurry, and free bagels were not offered. Of the 36 staff members we solicited, 32 responded, many writing several sentences for each survey question. Sixteen staff and students expressed interest in finding out more about the Green Team and gave us their names and addresses.

The responses were quite consistent. Students and staff cited two major problem areas: energy (lights, heating and cooling, electricity) and solid waste (paper consumption, recycling, disposable items). Solutions were creative and pragmatic, covering behavioral and information strategies as well as policy changes. The students had ideas such as: “replace most paper flyers with information on TV monitors and e-mail,” “recycle more paper,” and “turn off lights/turn down the heat.” One general comment was that “too much money is spent on providing redundant information.” Other responses are listed below.

“Ask for input from staff and faculty and listen to it. There is a large amount of experience you’re not relying upon.”

“Students don’t look for ways to recycle but will likely participate if it is handed to them.”

“Make everyone aware of the inefficiencies and ask for everyone’s help in implementing change.”

“Put can and bottle recycling containers in more places.”
“Make recycling mandatory for all people at the business school (professors as well as staff people).”

“I am not sure but I think lights are left on too long.”

“More careful planning or utilization of existing school resources.”

“Encourage people to take more pride in facilities or more consideration for their peers.”

“[Give] feedback as to good efforts we’ve done.”

(For more detailed survey results and a copy of some completed surveys, see Appendix V, and Appendix VI, respectively.)

January 29–February 8: Meeting with Dean White; Constructing the “Green Team”

We met with Dean White, Professor Bulkley, and Susan Svoboda, an MBA graduate working as a business-environmental consultant. All three provided us with useful suggestions and insights for the formation of the team.

We were advised to identify the areas of expertise needed in the Green Team and to write a charter which would help team members visualize their mission. In addition, the Green Team would need clear goals, which could provide motivation, and measures with which they could assess their success in achieving these goals. The initial Business School audit, for example, could provide the baseline data for setting waste reduction goals.

During the week following this meeting, the Business group drafted the charter. It included a mission statement and described the Green Team’s role in fulfilling it. It also suggested operating procedures and criteria for membership. To reflect the composition of the School, we suggested a membership of two students, two faculty and four staff. (See Green Team Charter, Appendix VII)

February 18: Presenting the Project to Targeted Students

We gave a 20 minute presentation in which we described our project to the Corporate Environmental Strategy class. This class seemed a likely source for potential Green Team applicants. After the presentation, six students expressed interest in joining the team.
March 3: Evaluation of Green Team Formation

The Green Team had now become our primary goal in the greening of the Business School, and we met to evaluate the progress of its formation. In our revised approach, the Green Team would be the sole implementor of the demanding task of “greening” of the School. It was essential to provide as much support as possible. We decided to compile a resource folder for the Green Team; this would contain the information we had already gathered. This folder would include a copy of the baseline audit, a list of University members with a range of expertise who have agreed to serve as resources for the Green Team, copies of the survey results, the mission statement and model, the Green Team charter, a copy of this report, and selected bibliographical material. We would also provide the Green Team with suggestions as to where they should be able to effect change that is: (1) easy and visible, (2) money-saving in the short term, (3) money-saving in the long term, and (4) not money-saving but still environmentally important.

We hoped this information would help the team target the most promising areas for interventions and would provide the resources that would facilitate their work. Such information is important because often both procedural and declarative knowledge are needed before people feel comfortable and confident to make behavioral changes (DeYoung, 1989). Specific data and directions for where to obtain expert advice would help guide the Green Team in choosing intervention strategies.

March 8: Preparation for the Initial Meetings

While the group wanted the Green Team members to plan their own meetings, we also wanted to ensure that key content areas were discussed in the first few meetings. We identified all the issues which we thought should be addressed and then prioritized them. Most crucial was that Green Team members gain a clear idea of the group’s purpose. Although a draft charter would have been distributed to all members, further discussion and refinement of the charter would be necessary. Green Team members need the opportunity to react to the charter and tailor it to their situation. (See agendas in Appendix VIII.)

March 11: Facilitating the Green Team Formation

We met with Hart who suggested that we facilitate the Green Team formation by drafting an invitation letter for White to send out. It had become clear to us that “dean as manager” was not the same as “dean as active participant.” The team now recognized that through him the process of team formation could
occur, but only in the sense of a door being open. An open door allows people to pass through, but does not help them through. Again, we re-evaluated our approach, and realized that we would have to take a more active stance if we were to ensure that the Green Team could meet enough times to be comfortable with its charge by the end of the semester.

We also discussed Green Team leadership, and decided that the leader should be allowed to emerge rather than being chosen from the outset. After a meeting or two, it should become clear who is enthusiastic and has initiative.

March 12: Initial Intervention — Energy Audit

Although we believed that the Green Team should identify its own areas of concern and enjoy its own success, we also thought it important to provide Team members with some momentum in the process of making the Business School more environmentally responsible.

Yoshiko Hill, Utilities Engineer at the Plant Department, had agreed to perform an in-depth audit of electricity use at the Business School and to recommend energy-saving strategies. The team helped with the audit, describing our project to the staff we encountered. The reception was generally favorable.

When the Green Team meets, it will already have a project underway at the School which should serve as inspiration for further projects. (For lighting audit worksheet, see Appendix IX.)

March 14–16: Student Green Team Members Recruited; Groundwork Laid

Having drafted a charter and an invitation letter, we were ready to recruit members for the Green Team. Time did not allow a wider search, so we chose members from the lists of people who had already expressed interest. Hart was better acquainted with the Business School community than we were, so we asked him to make the selections. Although potential team members had already been chosen, there was a delay in the proceedings: the Dean, who was to send out the invitations, was away for the week. We decided to meet with the student members to get them involved as soon as possible.

March 23: First Meeting with Potential Green Team Member

We met with Jim Hanley, one of the potential student members of the Green Team, and presented him with the Green Team charter and the mission statement for an environmentally responsible Business School. He expressed enthusiasm about most of the plans but was concerned that Green Team
members would not know the right questions to ask or the right people to consult for advice. We told him about the resource folder and he agreed that this would be helpful. At the end of the meeting, he said that he would call the other potential student member so they could discuss the project.

**May 10: First Green Team Meeting**

The first Green Team meeting was attended by two members of the Business School group, three staff, two faculty, and one student, who chaired the meeting. Everyone made introductions and reviewed the documents in their resource folders. The Business School group members explained the purpose and scope of the Green Team, with one of the professors adding that all members should have a chance for their ideas to be heard.

The entire group expressed desire to begin with some visible and easily performed projects. The staff member in charge of document processing suggested that two-sided photocopies become the standard in the Business School. A professor asked if this would cost more, but the staff member explained that it would actually cost less money while, obviously, saving paper. After discussing this, the Team agreed that all document-processing requests in the Business School would be automatically done on two-sided copies; people wanted single-sided copies would have to specifically request them.

The Team members were very enthusiastic about their challenge. They decided to attempt several projects over the summer. Two members of PolPrev’s Business Group agreed to stay on as “consultants” during the summer, with two others taking over that responsibility in the fall.

For More Information on How the Green Team Has Fared Since its Inception, Please Refer to Page 49.

**Conclusions**

When we began the Business School demonstration project, we saw our group as the change agents: armed with baseline data from the audit and with input from members of the Business School community, we would design pollution prevention strategies that would transform the School into an environmentally responsible institution. However, after a period of information gathering and meetings, we realized that merely soliciting input from the community was
insufficient. Change could not be effectively initiated by outsiders, and the community itself should therefore provide the structure for the greening process. As outsiders we faced several disadvantages. Most importantly, we were only at the School occasionally and had no one to actively promote the project in our absence. Our realization that the greening project would be much better accomplished from within the school, caused a fundamental shift in our approach: our group’s role would become that of facilitator, and we would step back from taking too active a part in the greening. This new thinking prompted the conception of our idea for a “Green Team.”

The greening project also required much more time than we had available. For instance, more time was required to publicize the project and thus extend the opportunity of joining the Green Team to all interested applicants.

Recommendations

The Green Team will soon be ready to begin its mission of greening. We would therefore like to provide the following recommendations, drawn from our recent experiences of project development. These recommendations represent not only those strategies which we found effective, but also those which, with hindsight, we believe would have made our project run more smoothly.

Gaining Recognition. Although members of the Green Team have the advantage of being insiders, they still must work to give the Green Team a high profile within the Business School community. Greening will necessitate institution-wide change, and this cannot be easily effected by a committee which remains peripheral to the community. By publicizing the Green Team’s mission and goals, the team will also start to integrate the concept of greening into the Business School culture. Furthermore, as the Green Team gains recognition, it will become the focal point for other Business School members who are interested in helping to institute environmental responsibility.

The Monroe Street Journal, the widely read Business School newspaper, can provide the Green Team with a method of communication with the School and the wider community. The Journal has a weekly circulation of 3,000 comprised of students, staff, faculty, executive education attendees, other Business Schools and corporations. (See Appendix X for a copy of the article.)
Administrative Support. As part of its campaign to gain wider acceptance, the Green Team must continue to utilize the Dean’s support. Although our group did not work in an active partnership with the Dean, we were able to channel the mission statement and charter through his office where these documents could receive the stamp of administrative approval. The fact that the Green Team invitations came from the Dean’s office lent greater validity and weight. Further, it indicated that spending time on Green Team activities during the work day was condoned.

Financial Support. The Team will require both high administrative recognition and financial support if it is to endure. A permanent financial basis for its operations should prevent the “Green Team” from fading to the precarious status of a “nice idea.” The Team should therefore request a line item in the Business School budget which will secure funds for its activities and provide the Team with a permanent base.

Creating and Evaluating Goals. The Green Team must create concrete goals to guide their work. Although the Charter provides a mission statement indicating long-range goals as well as projects which can be accomplished in the shorter term, it does not provide any specific measures of success. Therefore, should the Green Team decide to enact a “prompt project” and to post prompts requesting people to “turn off the lights,” the Team should also create a measure with which they can gage the effectiveness of the project. For example, are they aiming for a 50% reduction in the number of rooms left lit when unoccupied or a 100% reduction. Once goals are set, a project can be evaluated to ensure that the chosen tactics are effective. A survey conducted after the prompt project might reveal that 75% of classrooms with prompts are left just as brightly lit as those without prompts—suggesting that new tactics must be devised.

Utilizing Existing Structures. The Green Team’s work will be easier if its members can enact their strategies within pre-existing organizational structures. As previously mentioned, the Business School curriculum is open to change and has recently incorporated innovative educational approaches. The curriculum could thus provide a logical place for the Team to promote its message. For example, educational units which encourage discussion of environmental issues could help to incorporate an environmental ethic within the School’s culture.
Forging Cross-Campus Links. Lastly, we recommend that the Green Team continue to forge and maintain cross campus links with departments and individuals who can provide useful feedback for their projects. At a large university, resources and expertise that could be of great benefit to one department are often available in another. However, the lack of communication and connections between departments works against sharing of such useful information. For example, Brent Chrite, Administrative Manager at the Business School, was not aware that the Plant Department could assist with evaluation, planning, and sometimes even funding of lighting projects until the Business group asked Hill to conduct an energy audit at the School. This new contact promises to be beneficial since the Business School may now use the University Plant Department as a consultant.

Follow up: May - December, 1993 - The Green Team on Its Own

Since this document was first printed in May, 1993, the Green Team has been very active. The following is a brief summary of what transpired in the months following the official “end” of the Master’s Project.

Throughout the summer, the core committee members, with the exception of the students who were not in Ann Arbor, met and put into place the duplex copying policy which was agreed upon on May 10. Several members also addressed the Quality Team, a group of the 20 most senior administrators in the school.

When school started in September, other staff, students, and administrators wanted to join the Team. As it turned out, there was so much interest in being a member of the Green Team that the meetings proved unwieldy. Debates were being held on what direction or action to take but nothing substantive was resulting from the meetings. Thus, the Green Team decided to split the Team up into three sub-committees. The committees were Operations Management, Curriculum Development, and Behavior Change/Marketing. These three groups represented three areas within the school that the Green Team was trying to make more environmentally sensitive.

The membership on these sub-committees was loosely coordinated. Since there were now three students involved in the Green Team, one student coordinator was assigned to each committee. Other than the student coordinators, no one was assigned to a specific group. In retrospect, for accountability’s sake, this was not the best option for the Team. The next few months resulted in low attendance at the sub-committee meetings and the
creation of a sense of isolation among those who were going ahead with individual projects.

In December, the sub-committees decided to coalesce back into one Green Team. The Team had lost a few members along the way but the resulting group of 10 people were truly committed and ready to move forward with the tasks at hand. In a sense, the member’s endurance was tested from having taken the wrong approach.

The following is a list of the projects which the Team started in the interim: a staff magazine collection for reuse at local Nursing Homes; a coursepack drive during exam week for reusing and recycling students’ coursepacks; the adoption of the duplex printing option (printing out on both sides of the piece of paper) by the computer center; and the creation of a pamphlet for staff entitled “A Guide to Office Recycling.” There are several other projects which are in the planning stages, such as having confidential and non-confidential re-use/recycle boxes for paper so that drafts can be printed on reused paper that has non-confidential materials on the back. Also, the person in charge of the Snack Bar is looking into purchasing recyclable plastic forks, knives and spoons.

Despite the success of all of these great projects, by late November, the Team was really beginning to feel frustrated by the lack of “buy-in” from the administration. The members, with their grassroots approach, found it difficult to ascertain what was going on in the school. For example, the Team members wanted to get large recycle containers placed on the loading dock for materials which heretofore had not been recycled; however, the Team had no idea who would need to be present at a meeting to discuss the matter.

The members also decided to focus on one topic, solid waste reduction, for the next two years rather than trying to do everything at once. Since Dean White had been so supportive of the Green Team concept, the student members decided to meet with him to see what he could do to help get the higher echelons of the Administration more on board. The Dean reaffirmed his interest in helping the Green Team succeed in its mission of “greening” his school and said that he would appoint some of his upper level staff to create a sub-committee of the Quality Council whose job it would be to interact with the Green Team and keep the Council abreast of the Green Team’s efforts. Brent Chrite, Administrative Manager for the School, and Brenda Ostrowski, who manages the Documents Processing Division, were appointed.
These two will meet with the Green Team in January to set out a policy statement which will lead to the inclusion of environmental criteria in staff’s and administrator’s job evaluations. The goal is to have the evaluative criteria in place within six months. The Green Team is confident that, with its own grassroots pressure pushing the school from the ground up and the Dean’s pressure pushing the school from the top down, the vision of an environmentally sensitive Business School will slowly unfold and become a reality.
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