



Social Responsibility and Sustainability Committee

Thursday 1 February, 2pm

Ochil Room, Charles Stewart House

AGENDA

- 1 Minute** **A**
To approve the minute of the previous meeting on 12 October 2017
- 2 Matters Arising**
To raise any matters arising not covered on the agenda or in post-meeting notes

STRATEGIC AND SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

- 3 Community Benefits in Procurement** **B**
To discuss and endorse a paper from the Director of Procurement
- 4 Tackling Coffee Cup Waste on Campus** **C**
To discuss and endorse a paper from the Students' Association VP Activities & Services
- 5 Sustainability Awards Review** **D**
To discuss and endorse a paper from the Head of SRS Programmes

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL/NOTING

- 6 Social Impact Pledge** **E**
To note and comment on a paper from the Assistant Principal Community Relations
- 7 RELCO Final Report** (closed paper) **F**
To note a paper from the Director of SRS
- 8 New Outcome Agreement & Inclusion of Sustainability** **Verbal**
To receive an update from the Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning
- 9 Social Finance** **Verbal**
To receive an update from the Director of SRS
- 10 Sustainable Campus Fund Loan Opportunity** **Verbal**
To receive an update from the Director of SRS
- 11 Any Other Business** **Verbal**
To consider any other matters from Group members including:
 - Procurement update

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

MINUTE OF A MEETING of the Social Responsibility and Sustainability Committee
held in the Raeburn Room, Old College on Thursday 12 October 2017.

- Present:** Charlie Jeffery (Convenor), Senior Vice Principal
Michelle Brown, Head of SRS Programmes
Moirra Gibson, Head of External Affairs, Communications & Marketing
Ollie Glick, Students' Association VP Community
Dave Gorman, Director of Social Responsibility and Sustainability
Pete Higgins, Director, Global Environment & Society Academy
Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations
Janet Philp, Joint Unions Liaison Committee
Heather Rea, Project Lead, Beltane Public Engagement Network
George Sked, Acting Director of Procurement
Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning
- In attendance:** Matthew Lawson, SRS Programme Manager, for item 3
Laura Cattell, Head of Widening Participation, for item 4
- Apologies:** Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary Student Experience
Hugh Edmiston, Director of Corporate Services
Gary Jebb, Director of Estates
Zoe Lewandowski, Director of Human Resources
Phil McNaul, Director of Finance
Jane Norman, Vice-Principal People and Culture
James Smith, Vice Principal International

- 1 The minute of 31 August 2017 was approved as a correct record. A

2 **Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising not covered on the agenda or in post-meeting notes.

STRATEGIC AND SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

3 **SRS Strategy Review** B

The Programme Manager updated members on main findings of the review so far. SRS was becoming mainstreamed, with opportunities for further value creation across core business. There was need for a shared narrative and framework to link SRS issues, and greater clarity around roles and responsibilities in delivery. Consultees also highlighted a recent proliferation of strategies.

Attendees discussed a potential structure around five priority themes (Socially responsible students and graduates; Sustainable operations; Research with impact; Engaging our staff; Supporting local and global communities). Alternatively, the Sustainable Development Goals - the main guiding framework on these issues to 2030 - could be used.

Action – ML to include a commitment to the SDGs in the Strategy, and highlight the work of the Global Academies.

CMG endorsed the level of ambition expressed, but sought assurance that the scope of the strategy would keep within established boundaries. Two to four flagship projects should be

highlighted. These should be distinctive to the University, and areas where most value could be added. The key areas of focus could be sustainability and community.

SRS had been embedded in degree programmes and more students were interested in developing skills in this area for their future careers. Experiential learning would be key, and programmes including sustainability project work with the local community were already standard in institutions such as UBC. Greater focus on local health and wellbeing would be crucial, as well as the values UoE instilled in its graduates.

Members emphasised the need for clarity around ownership. The strategy could be presented as a roadmap, making clear where individual responsibilities lay. Part of its value was in bringing activities together and acting as a communications tool, but there were also opportunities to add value, particularly around Community Engagement. Just highlighting positive activities would not be enough to bring about change.

Action – ML to include how it articulates to other strategies, such as Learning & Teaching.

On staff volunteering, there was a communication challenge about framing the narrative to avoid the perception that the University was taking credit for what staff were doing.

Community Engagement work included a review of staff volunteering policy in comparison to other Russell Group institutions. Issues around staff volunteering needed to be addressed in a more structured way.

Committee members would have another opportunity to feed in to development of the Strategy at a dedicated workshop on 6 November.

4 Widening Participation Strategy

C

Development of the Strategy was moving toward a final version, though there were still opportunities for reworking and revision. Both the current and incoming Principals were in favour of thinking boldly in this area. This was an opportunity to showcase UoE as an institution with strong representation across all groups in society, where students feel they belong and have a positive experience, demonstrating to the sector that excellence and diversity can come together.

The student lifecycle model comprised four mutually-dependent strands: Aspiration and earlier engagement; Support to get in; Support to succeed; and Support to progress. Strand one contained discussion of who to engage with and where, which would be added to other stands in future. The WP strategy would align closely with the CE strategy.

Under 'support to get in' the emphasis was around communications and the final version would include a communications plan. The strategy was linking in to ongoing work around the Year 1 structure. While many students were still studying for qualifications in sixth year, it was possible that part of that year could be spent in university. Greater outreach was required at this stage to start systematically helping students become inducted into the processes of thinking required for university. This could be through summer courses, similar to those currently run for international students. The Committee noted the current policy debate about qualification structures and overlaps between the senior phase of school and first year at University. More students were mentoring within the city area, and this could be further developed, in partnership with the Students' Association. Now that agreement was in place for investment in social finance, proposals could be put forward for investment in student social enterprises to go into areas targeted for WP. Communications and Marketing were happy to offer support with workshops, case studies, filming, and use of the Edinburgh Local pages.

Under ‘support to succeed’, more data was needed to better understand current WP students, including postgraduates. Transition and induction processes would be reviewed and more value would be placed on Certificates and Diplomas of Higher Education.

Under ‘support to progress’, additional advice and information would be provided to current WP cohorts to present PG study as a viable option, with more bursaries offered at PG level and more flexible options, including part-time and Online Distance Learning, though part-time options were restricted by current funding structures.

The draft had been to College and central committees and a revised version would go to CMG at the end of October. The strategy would be finalised by the end of the year, including more evidence, a communications plan, and more focus on implementation, and would be launched in the new year. It would be split into internal- and external-facing versions, tailored to the needs of each audience. There would be further consultations in October and November.

The Committee welcomed the paper as important for the University, and emphasised the need to reflect how WP and CE mutually reinforced each other.

Action – LC to make more mention of Further Education colleges, include reference to the City Deal, and address potential students’ concerns about the cost of accommodation. The reach could be extended beyond Scotland to target North East England as an area of emphasis.

5 SDG Accord

D

In 2015, world leaders committed to the Sustainable Development Goals to frame their agendas and policies over the next 15 years. The SDGs linked to the University’s vision delivering impact for society. The Scottish Government was one of the first to commit. The EAUC had asked UoE to sign up to the Accord – a commitment for further and higher education. A mini gap analysis had indicated no major risk areas, though there may be issues for academics who do not feel the goals go far enough.

SRS Committee supported the proposal to sign up to the Accord, ideally in partnership with the Students’ Association, and highlighted the need to be alert to the implied resource implications.

Action – OG to raise signing up to the Accord at the next Students’ Association executive meeting.

Action – MB to take the proposal forward to next available CMG for an operational decision, and, if required, on to Court in December for strategic sign off.

6 Integrating SRS into the Mainstream - Next Steps

E

SRS Committee welcomed this paper setting out current progress and future plans. More work was needed on training, induction, and setting future direction. This would be easier to develop with a clear and simple strategic vision and would have more traction if the number of activities were restricted. Members highlighted the need for greater alignment with the Students’ Association.

7 Food Policy Implementation Plan

F

The Committee endorsed the Good Food Policy in September 2016. This paper updated members on implementation and included a supporting infographic requested by the Director of Corporate Services.

Members raised concerns about the use of non-recyclable coffee cups in university catering outlets, and the need to engage with them to further promote KeepCups.

Action – MB, with the support of the Committee, to approach ACE to propose the introduction of discounts for all types of reusable cups.

Efforts should be made to investigate ways of increasing the number of facilities capable of recycling.

Action – MB & OG to follow up with the City Council on vegware.

UoE's performance on food waste was not yet where it needed to be, and more could be done to reduce waste associated with the Festival. While its environmental impact was minimal, this had important signal value.

Members welcomed the paper, supported the direction of travel, and urged Procurement, ACE, SRS and the Students' Association to broaden the scope of issues considered.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL/NOTING

8 Modern Slavery Statement

G

The University prepared its first statement in 2016. This was compliance driven, and a good example of efforts to bring together activity across the institution, linking learning, teaching, research and operations. There was interest in establishing a funded scholarship in this area with Law and the Global Justice Academy. Any organisation would have risks in the area and it was becoming more of an issue for investors.

Action – MB to update wording in section 4 from 'While the risk of modern slavery on our campuses *is likely to be low*' to 'is low'.

Procurement and HR were currently pursuing Living Wage Accreditation, identifying all contracted suppliers that meet the criteria for accreditation to reconfirm that no staff on University premises are paid less than the living wage. UoE was unusual in the sector in not outsourcing servitorial and catering services, making for a more secure position.

Action – OG to verify and confirm to JP that all Students' Association staff are paid the living wage.

9 Conflict Minerals

H

The Committee noted the work of Professor Jason Love in the School of Chemistry recovering gold from electronic devices. It was beneficial in terms of research funding that the University had clarified its own approach to the issue. Development of the policy had been prompted by legislative issues and student interest. Members noted the update and endorsed the broadening of focus to industries beyond ICT.



Social Responsibility and Sustainability Committee

1st February 2018

Tackling Coffee Cup Waste on Campus

Description of paper

This paper proposes measures to tackle coffee cup waste across all University and Students' Association outlets.

Action requested

SRS Committee members are asked to discuss and endorse the paper.

Discussion

Context

Given the astronomical amount of waste produced by disposable cups in the United Kingdom, and the inability of current waste streams in Scotland to properly compost or recycle disposable cups, it is clear that the most impactful solution to waste reduction is to increase the use of reusable coffee cups. Given the commitments of both the University of Edinburgh and Edinburgh University's Students' Association to the UN Development Goals, including responsible consumption and production (Goal 12), it is clear we must partner together to tackle this issue. Now is an ideal time to pursue policy change following the 'Latte Levy' discussion at the UK House of Commons' Environmental Audit Committee in January, 2018, putting the University & Students' Association ahead of the curve.

There are many methods that have been trialled at Students' Unions and Universities across the UK, but research suggests that the most effective methods tend to include three key elements:

1. Introducing a tax/surcharge of 20p for the use of disposable cups, rather than a 20p discount for using reusable cups.
 - a. Note that this does not change the cost to the customer of the final product pre-intervention as the tax will match the 20p discount, but all prices are listed as if the customer has a reusable cup, and a surcharge is made if a disposable cup is needed (see table at end of document).
2. Giving free reusable cups to incoming students every year, and/or through consistent give-away events.
3. Allowing people to use any reusable cup, not just ones of a specific brand, such that any reasonable reusable cup provided by a customer would ensure avoidance of a surcharge.

Supporting Evidence

Below are a few best practice examples from other Universities in the UK, where introducing these changes has led to a sizeable uptake in the use of reusable coffee cups.

University of Winchester

Winchester first introduced a 25p discount for the use of reusable cups. This resulted in 3.78% of hot drink sales in reusable cups in October 2016. In November 2016, they reversed this pricing by reframing costs as a 25p surcharge for use of disposable cups. Over three months, this led to an increase to 21.13% of hot drinks sales being in reusable cups. Finally, in February 2017, Winchester held a 'Great Cup Giveaway', where over 3000 free reusable cups were given to students and staff. This resulted in an increase to 33.13% of hot drink sales being in reusable cups after 9 months. From October 2016, these interventions resulted in preventing the use of over 45,000 disposable cups. See the table below for another representation of this data.¹

Intervention	Reusable cup sales (=disposables saved)	Percentage sales in reusable cups
Pre-intervention: 03/10/16 - 06/11/16	689	3.78%
1) 25p surcharge: 07/11/16 - 26/02/17	9,410	21.13%
2) 25p surcharge & cups: 27/02/17 - 03/11/17	35,442	33.13%
Total	45,541	

When we contacted the Catering Manager at the University of Winchester to enquire about potential profit loss due to the intervention, this was the response:

"We started the intervention on the 6th November 2016 and that ran through the remainder of the academic year 16/17. The total coffee/hot drink sales for 16/17 were up by 7.5% on the previous academic year 15/16 so no effect. Comparing August to December 16/17 and 17/18, the overall sales are up by 2.5%. So although not as big an increase as the previous year there has been no backlash against the tax as overall sales continue to increase.

Regarding costs. We charge a 25p tax for taking a single use cup. The overall cost of cup, lid and the sleeve is around 13p per hot drink sold, so effectively each reusable cup actually costs the department 12p of the profit from each hot drink.

So, whilst there is potential for a minor impact on profit per drink, this doesn't necessarily translate to profit margins overall. And there are other financial savings realised in terms of less cup waste produced = reduced waste disposal costs."²

Cardiff University Research

A report, commissioned by Bewley's Tea & Coffee UK Ltd, was published by Prof. Poortinga in March 2017, with compelling results. In collaboration with four Universities and a private catering contractor across twelve business and university

¹ University of Winchester, (2017). *Green Campus*. [online] Available at: <https://www.winchester.ac.uk/about-us/sustainability-and-ethics/green-campus/> [Accessed 11 Jan. 2018].

² Based on email correspondence between Kai & Liz Harris, Environmental Projects Assistant at the University of Winchester (January 15th 2017)

café sites, the field experiments looked at different measures to change customer behaviour towards using reusable cups.³

Interventions made:

- All sites displayed “a poster with an environmental message on the number of cups ending up in landfill, and asking customers to bring their own cup.”⁴
- Eight of the sites sold reusable coffee cups within the establishment.
- Four of the sites gave free reusable coffee cups to customers at the beginning of the experiment.
- Four of sites introduced a financial incentive: three sites “provided a discount of between 15-25 pence for customers using a reusable cup; and one site introduced a 25 pence charge on disposable coffee cups.”⁵
- Any reusable cup was accepted

Results:

- Post-intervention uptake of the use of reusable cups increased from 3.3% of sales to 7.6% of sales on average
- An environmental message on its own can increase the use of reusable coffee cups by 2.3%
- Having reusable alternatives available within the café can increase the use of reusable coffee cups a further 2.5%.
- The distribution of free reusable coffee cups can increase their use by another 4.3%
- While a discount on reusable cups did not make any difference for reusable cup sales, a charge on disposable cups increased the use of reusable coffee cups by 3.4%
- The study found that the provision of free reusable alternatives in combination with a financial incentive is particularly effective: the site that distributed free reusable coffee cups in combination with a charge on disposable cups saw an increase in the use of reusable cups from 5.1% to 17.4%.⁶
 - This conclusion is in line with ‘Prospect Theory’, which posits that customers are more sensitive to losses than gains, making a charge on disposable cups (a loss) more likely to result in behaviour change.⁷

UK Parliament: Environmental Audit Committee Findings

On January 5th 2018, the UK House of Commons’ Environmental Audit Committee published a report entitled, ‘Disposable Packaging: Coffee Cups’.⁸ They similarly report having evidence that “consumers are more responsive to a charge than a

³ Poortinga, W. (2017). Results of a field experiments to reduce coffee cup waste. Summary report to Bewley’s Tea & Coffee UK Ltd. Cardiff: Welsh School of Architecture & School of Psychology, Cardiff University

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47 (2), 263-292.

⁸ House of Commons: Environmental Audit Committee (2018). *Disposable Packaging: Coffee Cups*. London, United Kingdom: House of Commons.

discount and that a charge on disposable cups could reduce use by up to 30%.”⁹ They have therefore recommended that the Government introduce a 25p levy on disposable cups, with profits going towards building infrastructure to make recycling of disposable cups more feasible.

The Report provides overwhelming evidence in favour of introducing a surcharge for buying hot drinks in disposable cups. It also rebuts fears that such a tax would be unwelcome by UK consumers, citing a YouGov survey which shows that 74% of people in Britain would support a charge on single-use cups (with 72% in favour in Scotland).¹⁰ Given the government’s stance on the so called ‘latte levy’ it seems like we would be getting ahead of the curve on what may well be widespread implications soon.

Potential Cost Implications

It’s worth noting that discounting Keep Cups was always a sustainability move, and not a money saving one, so increasing the use of them is embracing the same principles, and continuing the our joint strategies towards making the University of Edinburgh forward-thinking in its sustainability projects.

The actual switch to a surcharge (rather than discount) should not create new immediate costs, as the profit made at an outlet will be the same. There should be no additional cost to customers, which is why 20p has been chosen – the impact is in the psychology rather than financial penalty. This change implies to customers that ‘being sustainable’ is the norm, and using disposables should be taxed. See the table below.

	Pre-Intervention (Discount)		Proposed Intervention (Surcharge)	
	No Keep Cup	Keep Cup	No Keep Cup	Keep Cup
Price on menu	£2.00	-	-	£1.80
Discount/tax charge	N/A	£2.00 – 20p	£1.80 + 20p	N/A
Cost of disp. cup	-£0.13	N/A	-£0.13	N/A
Profit minus Cup Cost	1.87	1.80	1.87	1.80

Alternative costing scenarios can be found in Appendix 1, at the end of this document, should this discussion be useful.

However, the potential indirect costs that will immediately jump to one’s mind are the physical costs of ‘giveaways’, the opportunity cost of fewer coffee sales, and the potential medium-term cost impact of an increased rate of reusable cup use.

1. The cost of providing free Keep Cups

⁹ *ibid*, p. 3.

¹⁰ <https://www.mcsuk.org/news/support-for-coffee-cup-charges>. [Accessed 11 Jan. 2018]

- If given to all incoming students, at a unit price of £5.39¹¹ and approx. 8,000 new students, this could amount to just under £45,000 per year. This does not include staff.
 - Note that some Schools already provide free Keep Cups as part of a broader community-building effort, whereas this project would equalize this benefit to all students.
- If Keep Cups are bought for all incoming students, and thousands given away to staff, this could amount to ~£60,000.
- If provided in a give-away style to both staff and students, alike Winchester University, fewer units could be bought. This could amount to however much the budget allows for, however further cost implications of organizing the give-aways effectively should be accounted for.

2. Potential opportunity cost of sales lost by customers deterred by the surcharge

- Although research has suggested that 72% of people in Scotland support a charge for single-use cups,¹² there is a chance that people will be less likely to buy from our outlets because of the surcharge. This is largely due to the increase in perceived decisions the consumer must make (drink type, size, cup or not) to determine price, or a feeling they could buy the drink cheaper, without the surcharge, nearby.
 - However, the University of Winchester did not find that this change impacted profits negatively, as noted above.
- We believe that accepting *only* Keep Cups will greatly increase this likelihood, as people will feel slighted if their other reusable cups aren't accepted and they must pay an additional tax.
- Clear signage on the final prices, the reasons behind introducing the surcharge, the environmental effect of disposable cups, and clarifying that gross prices have not increased, should minimize this cost implication.

3. Cost Impact of Increased Uptake of Reusable Cup Use

- Considering disposable cups cost approx. 13p, it therefore costs 7p to give a 20p discount on reusable cups. This cost already exists in the current system, but the increase in uptake would result in this being a higher gross cost.
- However, this will not represent a high cost until a point at which the uptake reached a critical mass. At this point, the reduction in waste collection and waste contamination costs should also be accounted for, potentially offsetting some of this cost.
 - Note: waste is charged per bin rather than weight, so this cost reduction would require a reduction in bins.

Recommendations

We would recommend that:

1. All outlets run by the University and the Students' Association which sell hot drinks introduce a tax/surcharge for the purchase of hot drinks in disposable cups, with clear signage of the end price, the environmental issues with disposable cups and clarifying that gross costs have not increased.

¹¹ Price sourced from Ian Macaulay, Assistant Director (Catering) at ACE

¹² *ibid.*

- a. See Appendix 2 for example images
2. The University provide all incoming students who would like one with free Keep Cups, at least for the first few years, starting September 2018. Having an active sign up to get said Keep Cup, as opposed to giving them out to everyone regardless of interest, would save costs and wasted Keep Cups.
3. The University give free Keep Cups to staff through specific events / give aways.
4. All outlets accept both branded Keep Cups and other reusable hot drink cups.

Further Information

Authors & Presenters

Kai O'Doherty

Vice President Activities & Services

24th January 2018

Ollie Glick

Vice President Community

Freedom of Information. This is an open paper.

Appendix 1: Alternative Pricing Models

The below scenarios present alternative models for the levy, which involve an increase in price for consumers, and therefore potential for lessened loss or profit. These were calculated with help from SRS. Sales figures can be applied to ACE (not the Students' Association), as they are based on hot drink sales at University cafes in 2016-17. They assume current uptake of Keep Cup discounts at 0%, as current uptake figures were not available. They assume the intervention will lead to a 30% uptake in sales in reusable cups.

Scenario 1: Flip existing pricing model and raise the price of a single use drink by 5p (25p levy)		
Pricing		
Proposed levy on single use cups	£0.25	
New base price	£1.80	
New price with single use cup	£2.05	
Impact on overall revenue		
Loss per Keep Cup drink sale compared to single use drink sale	-£0.13	
Total revenue from hot drink sales under scenario 1	£967,516.95	
Revenue change compared to business as usual	-£12,247.05	
Revenue change as a percentage of business as usual	-1.25%	
Main points		
Cost neutral for current Keep Cup owners		
5p increase for single use cups users		
1.25% revenue loss for ACE		
Levy in line with government proposals		
Increase in income (5p per disposable cup)		

Scenario 2: Flip existing pricing model and raise the price of a single use drink by 30p, aka a 50p levy	
Pricing	
Proposed levy on single use cups	£0.50
New base price	£1.80
New price with single use cup	£2.30
Impact on overall revenue	
Loss per Keep Cup drink sale compared to single use drink sale	-£0.18
Total revenue from hot drink sales under scenario 3	£1,053,246.30
Revenue change compared to business as usual	£73,482.30
Revenue change as a percentage of business as usual	7.50%
Main points	
Cost neutral for current Keep Cup owners	
Larger price increase for single cup users - even higher disincentive to use disp. cups	
7.5% higher revenue for ACE with levy introduction	
Substantial price increase for single use cups users	
Risk of drop in coffee sales	
Levy income is significantly over what would be required to sustain Keep Cup provision	

Appendix 2: Menu Images from the University of Winchester

coffees

double espresso

americano

cappuccino

latte

mocha *white or dark chocolate

flat white

other drinks

hot chocolate

chai latte *spiced or vanilla

turmeric latte

tea

speciality tea *peppermint, green, red berries, vanilla chai, decaf white tea with elderflower, earl grey and chamomile

extras

extra espresso shot

shot of syrup

whipped cream

marshmallows

milk alternatives

organic soya milk

lactose free milk

coconut milk

oat milk

regular

large

£1.25

£1.45

£1.85

£1.85

£2.25

£2.25

£1.65

£2.10

£1.85

£2.10

£1.20

£1.20

£0.35

£0.40

£0.35

£0.40

£0.35

£0.35

£0.40

£0.40

large

£1.60

£2.25

£2.25

£2.60

£2.45

£2.20

£2.45

£1.25

£1.25

£0.40

£0.40

£0.35

£0.35

£0.40

£0.40

CYBER

Natta



milkshakes

ice blended refreshing drinks, blended with organic milk or organic soya milk

Choose up to 3 flavours

banana

caramel

chocolate

fudge

gingerbread

hazelnut

mint chocolate

mint

raspberry

salted caramel

strawberry

sugar free caramel

toasted marshmallow

toffee

vanilla

£2.70

frappes

smooth and creamy delicious drinks blended with organic milk or organic soya milk

strawberries & cream

banana split

chocolate delight

minty choc

£2.70

mocha

£2.70

latte

£2.40

chunky chocolate

a refreshing chocolate frappe with a fairtrade chocolate brownie blended in

£3.25

smoothies

double berry blast

mad about mango

perfect peach

tropical twist

zesty lemon

strawberry

banana

£2.75

iced teas

a light brew of tea, infused and sweetened with fruit

jasmine lime

peach

raspberry

£2.20

freakshakes!

an overindulgent and overloaded treat

check the specials board for this month's freakshake!

iced coffee

delicious cold drinks on the rocks, a caffeine hit without the heat

latte

mocha


£2.20

£2.60


all hot and cold drinks will be subject to a 25p surcharge for a takeaway cup

we cater for life

local • independent • fair • ethical



COLD DRINKS



PLEASE NOTE: all drinks will be subject to a 25p surcharge for takeaway cups

MOCHA vs LATTE

ALWAYS KEEP A COOL HEAD WHEN PICKING SIDES IN A COFFEE BATTLE

LATTE OVER ICE..... £2.30

MOCHA OVER ICE..... £2.70

ICED LATTE FRAPPES..... £2.60

ICED MOCHA FRAPPES..... £2.85

REMEMBER

BRING YOUR OWN REUSABLE CUP & YOU CAN EARN DISCOUNTS ON SELECTED DRINKS

FEELING FRUITY?

GO OUT ON A LIMB, THAT'S WHERE THE BEST FRUIT CAN BE FOUND.

FRUIT SMOOTHIES..... £2.75

FLAVOURS INCLUDE:

STRAWBERRY

PEACH

MANGO

SUMMER FRUITS

"LIFE IS A SPORT... DRINK IT UP."

MICHAEL JORDAN

MY MILKSHAKE

BRINGS MOSTLY STUDENTS TO THE YARD

MILKSHAKES

1 FLAVOUR..... £2.35

2 FLAVOURS..... £2.50

3 FLAVOURS..... £2.70

FLAVOURS INCLUDE:

ALMOND

BANANA

CARAMEL

SALTED CARAMEL

SUGAR FREE CARAMEL

CHOCOLATE

CINNAMON

COCONUT

GINGERBREAD

HAZELNUT

HONEYCOMB

PEACH

PINEAPPLE

RASPBERRY

SPICED CHAI

STRAWBERRY

WHITE CHOCOLATE

VANILLA





Social Responsibility and Sustainability Committee

February 2018

Sustainability Awards Review

Description of paper

This paper proposes terms of reference for reviewing the University of Edinburgh's Sustainability Awards in 2018.

Action requested

SRS Committee is asked to review the paper and provide any comments or suggestions.

Background and context

The Sustainability Awards recognise staff and students who take sustainability related actions such as conserving resources, saving energy, fundraising for good causes and building links with the local community.

Monitoring and evaluation is built into programme management but we recognise the importance of doing a more thorough review and committed to do so in 2018.

Annex A (attached) provides the background, draft objectives, scope, methodology. It was requested that this go to the Committee before taking forward next steps.

Next steps

Following feedback from the SRS Committee, the draft terms will be shared with stakeholders to further develop. It is hoped that there may be a PhD student interested in working on the project. Lessons learned and recommendations following the review will be shared with the SRS Committee.

Resource implications

Costs related to the review were budgeted within 17/18 unit planning.

Risk Management

Risks have been considered and appropriate mitigation responses in development.

Equality & Diversity

Due consideration has been given to equality and diversity as part of this review. An Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

Consultation

The paper was drafted following preliminary discussions with interested colleagues and team members.

Further information

Michelle Brown, Head of SRS Programmes.
Department for Social Responsibility & Sustainability
26th January 2018

Freedom of Information

This is an open paper.

University of Edinburgh Sustainability Awards

2018 Review and Programme Evaluation

Terms of Reference (working draft for discussion)

Background:

The Sustainability Awards recognise staff and students who contribute towards the University becoming more socially responsible and sustainable and provides toolkits and criteria for action. In 2017, teams from 28 schools and departments across the University participated in the Office and Lab Awards categories. Applicants representing every college and campus found new ways to conserve resources, save energy, streamline scientific and research practices, fundraise for good causes and build links with the local community.

The Sustainability Awards are accredited as part of the National Union of Students' Green Impact scheme, which runs in over 50 UK further and higher education institutions. The lab awards are also informed by the international S-Lab programme.

See: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/about/sustainability/about/programmes/awards/about>

The Awards have been in place since 2010 and were incorporated in the work of the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability when it was established in 2013.

The Awards receive positive feedback from participants. One senior director at the University noted that the awards in his area *"had a positive impact on the work environment, provided cost and time savings, and improved specific business processes"*. At the same time, questions have been raised about whether participation in the awards generates additional carbon/cost/other sustainability savings and whether we are only recognising existing good practices vs inspiring/enabling improvements to practices (additionality). Student participation has grown considerably over the last year – particularly for student accommodation.

Within the SRS Department plan 2016-2020 there is a commitment to undertake a review of this programme in 2018. We would like to use this opportunity to carry out an evaluation, to understand what works best, lessons learned and to make recommendations on next steps.

Purpose:

The 2018 Awards Review will carry out an evaluation and make recommendations on outcomes and impact and lessons learned and make recommendations for the future.

This is intended to contribute to an improvement of the services and support of the SRS Department.

Objectives:

The evaluation seeks to support analysis and understanding of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and legacy (sustainability) of the programme¹:

- **Relevance:** Are we doing the right thing? How important is the relevance or the significance of the intervention regarding university and sustainability priorities?

¹ These objectives are based on OECD Guidelines for Evaluations - aimed at development interventions (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability)

- The University has clarified its long term vision of becoming a (net) zero carbon university by 2040 and is working to update its wider social responsibility and sustainability strategy. How do the awards inspire and support action across the university which is relevant to University strategies? This evaluation should review the relevance of the programme in relation to the University strategy and the wider context (environmental and social issues: climate change, human rights) and make recommendations.
- **Effectiveness:** are the objectives of the intervention being achieved? How significant is the effectiveness or impact of the programme compared to the objectives planned?
 - The department strategy notes that ‘across various SRS issues we will ensure that staff are supported with the awareness, knowledge and skills to contribute to SRS in their areas of work and that efforts are celebrated and encouraged. The Awards Programme has continued to provide tools, support and encourages best practices for taking practical action around the University and to celebrate efforts. This evaluation should review effectiveness of the programme and make recommendations
- **Efficiency:** Are the objectives being achieved economically by the development intervention? How big is the efficiency or utilisation ration of the resources used?
 - The engagement team within the department manages the programme which involves time from various staff members. The communications team supports the marketing of the programme and the underlying system used to track progress. The delivery has been continuously reviewed to look for and implement efficiencies. There may be further opportunities which this review can help with. This evaluation should review efficiency of the programme and make recommendations
- **Impact:** Does the intervention contribute to reaching higher level sustainability objectives? What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected?
 - The programme is able to clarify the outputs achieved in terms of numbers of participants and whether participants have signed up to activities or committed to taking actions related to sustainability priorities at the University. Due to systems in place it is less easy to attribute action to impact (ie because a team member did ‘x’ this led to a carbon reduction...). This evaluation should review sustainability impacts of the programme (with specific links to the climate strategy and other SRS goals) and make recommendations
- **Legacy** (i.e. sustainability of benefits...): Are the positive effects or impacts lasting? How is the permanence of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?
 - The Awards have run since 2010. It would be interesting to learn if those teams who participated in the early years (or more recently) continued to participate and whether the benefits of participation were sustained in terms of positive environmental or social outcomes. This evaluation should review the legacy impacts of the programme and whether benefits can be sustained after the life of the programme and make recommendations

Participation and participatory approaches to be a key part of the evaluation. Balanced with risk of overloading teams for feedback and over-consultation.

Stakeholders and Audience

Key stakeholders will include students and staff who are currently or were previously involved in the programme as well as NUS who accredits the scheme. We foresee the audience as primarily internally in terms of staff and students in order to improve our programmes and practices. The review would be part of our SRS programme management and therefore used by staff in the department. Lessons learned and reports could also be shared with other key stakeholders in Corporate Services Group, students and through specific committees. Lessons learned can be shared with other universities. The evaluation lead/team may also want to use any research and findings for academic publishing purposes.

Scope

Included projects / sub programme areas:

- Office Awards: Bronze, Silver and Gold
- Lab Awards: Bronze, Silver and Gold
- Student Accommodation Awards:
- Special Awards

Methodology

The methodology would be confirmed at project kick off but is envisioned to include both desk based work and key informant interviews.

Desk based review and literature review:

- All project related documentation, case studies from previous reviews, project reports, monitoring and evaluation reports
- Literature review: including topics such as best practice in 'awards' style recognition (across sectors) of sustainability as well as toolkits, staff engagement, student engagement from HE/FE perspectives as well as private sector and other public sector perspectives... Literature on 'behaviour change' (including ISM etc...)

Key informant interviews:

- Including SRS department staff, other university estates staff and other corporate services groups and professional services, academic staff specialising in the topics and from schools participating and not participating in awards, students who have been involved, NUS, EUSA, EAUC, ISCN members. In person or in skype with budget available for travel if required.

Workshop

- In person and or by webinar: present findings, review recommendations involving stakeholders and inviting other universities as part of peer review

Resourcing

Evaluator: This could either be a consultant or a University of Edinburgh academic. This is a potential opportunity for a PhD student. The University of Edinburgh has a scheme whereby PhD students can work up to 9 hours a week. It is roughly estimated that the evaluation would need 40 FTE days.

Project Steering Group:

It is proposed that a project steering group meet 3 times – beginning, middle, end to provide input into project and to review recommendations

- Chair:
- Members:
 - Internal: SRS staff, awards team rep, student rep.
 - External: NUS, ISCN members
- Evaluator: phd student, researcher or consultant

Timing

April 2018 to November 2018

Risk Management

Risk area	Mitigation
Non impartiality of review	Find arms-length approach. Either external consultant or PhD. Request non department staff as chair of group. Project staff directly involved with delivering aspects of the programme would not oversee the review but would be via the Senior Responsible Owner of the programme.
Stakeholder over consultation	Awards teams have been asked to fill in evaluations, contribute to case studies etc... We would need to ensure that we do not annoy teams with over consultation. Seek to also consult those who have not participated....
Quality control	Lead link in department for consultant or PhD internship. Project steering groups. Clear Terms of Reference and Job Descriptions.

Next Steps

- Share draft TOR internally with SRS team and with SRS committee and other interested stakeholders
- Liaise with Employ.ed and advertise job description for PHD internship
- Recruit Project Steering Committee members

Social Responsibility and Sustainability Committee**1st February 2018****Renewing the University of Edinburgh's Social Impact Pledge****Description of paper**

1. This paper gives an update of progress in meeting the three pledges made by the University, in academic session 2016/17, responding to the Scottish Government's [Social Impact Pledge](#) initiative (see Annex 1), and sets out proposals for pledges to be made for 2018 (see Annex 2).

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The committee is invited to note and comment on the paper.

Background and context

3. In 2016, the Scottish Government launched the Social Impact Pledge, an initiative aimed at enabling organisations to demonstrate leadership by challenging their policies and operations to ensure that they make a positive contribution to their *local* communities. Each participating organisation is asked to sign up to three commitments or pledges. These should comprise new activities or significant development of current activity. Universities are encouraged to involve all parts of their organisation in the discussion and development of the pledges, including students. The pledges have to be implemented within one year and can be renewed annually (although at least one pledge each year must involve new activity, to ensure that organisations are continuously reviewing their operations and impact). In return for sign-up, organisations are provided with a logo acknowledging commitment to the Social Impact Pledge and their pledges are showcased on the Scottish Community Development Centre's [Community Channel Scotland](#) website.

Discussion

4. The Community Engagement Strategy (approved by CMG in May 2016) is aimed at making step change in the University's relationship with its City, placing our research and teaching in the service of the local community, and contributing, thereby, to the promotion of good health, economic growth, cultural understanding and social wellbeing. Aligning our response to the Scottish Government Initiative with the evolving projects associated with the Community Engagement Strategy has meant that we are in a strong position to have a phased programme of pledges.

5. Students have been fully consulted about the Community Engagement Strategy and mechanisms are in place, via the Community Engagement Programme Board, to ensure ongoing collaboration in shaping key priorities. For each pledge, the University is required to nominate a contact point, and it is planned that at least one of these key contacts will always be a student leader. This will underscore our commitment to making the Social Impact Pledge an exemplar of common purpose within our scholarly community of staff and students.

6. In 2016/17 our pledges related to: the enhancement of numeracy and literacy amongst the families of primary school children ('Read, Write, Count'); the enhancement of digital literacy amongst older citizens (Digital Ambassadors Programme); and the creation of infrastructure to support student social enterprise (Social Enterprise Pathway). These have all been successfully implemented (as detailed at Annex 1). For 2018 we propose to scale-up the digital ambassadors programme and to make enhancements to the infrastructure for supporting student social enterprise; we also propose one new pledge - to establish a Centre

for Homeless and Inclusion Health (further details of 2018 pledges can be found in Annex 2). The University of Edinburgh will be the first institution across Scotland to report back to the Scottish Government on outcomes from the 2016/17 pledges and to make new pledges, signalling our leadership in promoting community benefit.

Resource implications

7. The costs of the pledges for 2018 will be met from within existing budgets as follows:

- Homeless Health and Inclusion Centre: this is included in the strategic plan of the School of Health in Social Science and will be included in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine Plan (agreed at meeting of the CMVM Strategy Group, 15th January 2018); the Social Responsibility and Sustainability Department has met the start-up costs of providing the Free Legal Advice Centre (see Annex 2).
- Digital Ambassadors: this programme comes under the remit of the Community Engagement Manager (post funded by CSG from May 2017, as part of its commitment to the Community Engagement Strategy)
- Student Social Enterprise: the new elements of the programme are being resourced by Edinburgh University Students' Association and Launch.Ed.

Risk Management

8. There are reputational risks in failing to implement a strategic approach to community engagement. As has happened in England, it is likely that there will be increasing political pressure for universities to demonstrate their support for, and value to, their local communities. There is benefit to the University in building local support for, and goodwill towards our activities and our ambitions. Participating in the Social Impact Pledge will be one way of communicating and underscoring our commitment to the values outlined in the University Strategic Plan.

Equality & Diversity *

9. Participation in the Social Impact Pledge is aimed at enhancing equality and diversity across the city and our communities. Each of the pledges will be carefully evaluated to assess impact. Participation should not impair equality and diversity internally.

Next steps/implications

10. The Assistant Principal Community Relations will oversee the implementation of the social impact pledges in collaboration with the named colleagues across the University (see Annex 2).

Consultation

11. In addition to the named colleagues (see Annex 2), the pledges for 2018 have been developed in consultation with members of the Community Engagement Programme Board: Ollie Glick (Edinburgh University Students' Association); Dave Gorman (Director, Department of Social Responsibility and Sustainability); Michelle Brown (Director of Programmes, Department of Social Responsibility and Sustainability); Moira Gibson (Director of External Affairs CAM). The paper was approved by PRC at its meeting of 13th November 2017 and the new pledges will be signed by the incoming Principal in early February.

Further information

12. Author and Presenter
Professor Lesley McAra
Assistant Principal Community Relations
23rd January 2018

Freedom of Information

This is an open paper.

Annex 1: Progress in implementing 2016/17 pledges

Commitment 1: ‘Edinburgh University students will work with families of primary school children across the City encouraging them to include easy and fun reading, writing and counting activities in their everyday lives, as a means of enhancing pupil literacy and numeracy’.

We delivered this commitment through the implementation of ‘*Moray House: Read, Write, and Count*’. This project (led by Dr Gale Macleod) aimed to enhance parental engagement with children’s learning, a core objective being to raise attainment amongst primary school pupils. As stated, students on the Postgraduate Diploma in Education programme at the Moray House School of Education worked with families of P1, P2 and P3 pupils across Edinburgh Schools, to promote engagement with literacy and numeracy, encouraging families and parents to include easy and fun reading, writing and counting activities in their everyday lives. The project was developed in partnership with the Scottish Book Trust (who provided pupils with a free bag of books, counting games and writing materials) and Edinburgh City’s Family Learning Team (who provided expertise, training and ongoing support to students). It was evaluated by B.Ed. (Education) students as part of their final year research projects and the results are now being used to inform evolving best practice in family-schools engagement. A half-day seminar was held on 5th June 2017 to feedback results from the research to key stakeholders including Edinburgh City schools, life-long learning and psychological services.

‘It is inspiring to work with the University of Edinburgh and to link theory with practice. It has enabled all involved to explore different ways in which to develop our experience and understanding of meaningful partnership with parents.’
Mhairi McNeill, Communities and Families, City of Edinburgh Council

Commitment 2: ‘We will increase the number of student social enterprise start-ups and provide the infrastructure to ensure their sustainability over the longer term’.

This commitment has been delivered through the implementation of the new ‘Social Enterprise Pathways Programme’ over the academic session 2016/17. The programme was developed by the Assistant Principal Community Relations and the Director of Finance in consultation with key stakeholders across the University including student leaders, Launch.Ed, and members of the Business School. It comprised:

- A taster seminar/workshop series to raise awareness of social entrepreneurialism amongst students in the University;
- The development of a bespoke course in social entrepreneurship (led by Dr Winston Kwon, Chancellor’s Fellow, Business School) open to all students across the University, and a managed portfolio of elective courses focusing on business acumen, leadership, innovation, resilience and risk management, as well as communication and community engagement;
- A fund to support student social enterprise start-ups and new projects developed by existing student social enterprises, with students pitching for small grants to a panel of experts.

The overall aim of the programme was to provide students with the requisite skills and support to produce step-change in the number of new student-led locally-based social enterprises and to enhance the sustainability of existing social enterprises over the longer term.

In 2016/17, seminars/workshops included:

- ‘Exploring Social Enterprise’: Social Responsibility and Sustainability Student Forum in collaboration with Edinburgh Social Enterprise and the Charteris Community Centre, 25th November 2016
- ‘Design for well-being’: Festival of Creative Learning, multi-disciplinary design challenge involving students and staff, exploring whether the 19th century concept of a model village could be updated to provide a framework for community building and social enterprise in two contexts: a new-build in Edinburgh City; and a post-conflict

living environment for displaced peoples in the South Sudan. Led Prof. Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations, 20th February 2017

- [#makeyourmark](#) was a two-day challenge involving undergraduates across schools matching profit with purpose, with the support of inspiring business leaders and bright minds from the University.
- ‘Getting your Hands Dirty: How Social Enterprise can make a difference’: Visions for Change Lecture by Dr Winston Kwon, 21st March 2017
- Social Enterprise Showcase: Edinburgh University Students’ Association in collaboration with Edinburgh Social Enterprise and the Charteris Community Centre, 11th May 2017
- A Dragon’s Den was held on 28th November 2016 and 8 student social enterprises were awarded grants totalling £5,500. These included:
- ETC a partnership between IKEA and ECA fashion students utilising waste textiles to make garments.
- Dimple’s Cooking Classes: partnership with local farms and restaurants to reduce food wastage and produce nutritious meals for dispersal to homeless people.
- ECO-SET – builds on Project Elpis (creation of solar hubs in refugee camps), proof of concept initiative involving programming and piloting of a Raspberry Pi computer, preinstalled with educational content and legal information, which migrants can access through their mobile phones.

Commitment 3: ‘We will increase the number of student digital ambassadors to support digital literacy and participation amongst older people in the community.’

The commitment was achieved through the expansion of the *Student Digital Ambassadors Project* which was successfully piloted in the Spring and early Summer of 2016. This project was instituted and led by the Professor Lesley McAra (Assistant Principal Community Relations) and Amy Woodgate (MOOC Project Manager), and managed by Dr Ben Fletcher-Watson (Student Community Engagement Development Officer). The pilot programme ran in collaboration with the University’s [WEEE Recycling programme](#) (via [WarpIT](#) Equipment Exchange, who provided i-pads), and in discussion with Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations whose Scotland-wide [Digital Participation programme](#) ran in parallel.

As part of the programme, students were trained to support older people to use computers and touchscreens when they encountered them in their daily lives, such as at GP surgeries and supermarket check-outs. The students then put their training into practice by working at the Charteris Community Centre, to support eight participants (aged between 70 and 87) to develop basic digital skills. The evaluation of the pilot found that self-efficacy increased across all basic digital skills for all participants, with users feeling most confident using Google, email and online tutorials / MOOCs. The social impact pledge for 2016/17, committed us to recruiting a further 20 student ambassadors and to work with Edinburgh City libraries to support their on-going digital literacy programme.

We now have 53 registered student ambassadors and the programme has expanded to include: reruns of the Charteris Community Centre project for older people (a six week course); and a weekly drop in session at the Edinburgh Central Library, being run throughout the year (33 advice consultations have taken place so far, mostly with citizens aged 50+).

Annex 2: Pledges for 2018

The proposed pledges for 2018 include one new community engagement ‘flagship programme’¹ on homeless health and inclusion, and expansion of two of the existing pledges: digital ambassadors and student social enterprise.

Commitment 1: ‘We will establish a Centre for Homeless and Inclusion Health’

Working collaboratively with, and located in, the [NHS Access Practice for Homeless People](#), this Centre will be led by the School of Health in Social Science in partnership with NHS Lothian, City of Edinburgh Council, the Scottish Government, Cyrenians, and Heriot-Watt University. It will bring together academics from a range of disciplines across the University of Edinburgh (including *inter alia* medicine [primary care], nursing, veterinary medicine, social work, law, psychology, art and design, and education). Key activities of the centre will be: community outreach; learning and teaching; and practice-led research development. Its core objectives are to:

- Build the capacity of the Access Practice to deliver a range of services which will support pathways out of homelessness, through collaborative working between the University of Edinburgh, third sector organisations, NHS Lothian, City of Edinburgh Council, and Scottish Government;
- Provide a community environment outside the classroom (Living Lab) to enhance teaching and learning, and develop student skills for employment (in 2017/18 this will involve the establishment of a free legal advice clinic and critical literacy service);
- Develop a stream of high quality, collaborative research relevant to finding out ‘what works’ for different groups of homeless people (on the themes of: Data Driven Policy Innovation and Service Delivery; Health and Social Care Integration; Transitions and Life Course Development; Harm Reduction and Trauma-Informed Practice including critical issues linked to substance misuse, mental health, head injury and other forms of cognitive impairment; Efficacy of Risk, Resilience and Asset -Based Approaches; Identity, Citizenship and Place).
- Act as a nodal point to promote and facilitate a network for all those with an interest in homeless and inclusion health;
- Develop pathways for people who are ‘experts by experience’ to contribute to teaching, learning and research in homeless and inclusion health;
- Provide opportunities for student-led social enterprise and to demonstrate leadership through innovation.

Geographical location of impact: City of Edinburgh

Lead contact: Dr Fiona Cuthill (School of Health in Social Science)

Commitment 2: ‘We will enhance our infrastructure for the support of student social enterprise with the aim of increasing the number of start-ups and ensuring their sustainability over the longer-term’

Building on the work undertaken as part of the social impact pledge 2016/17, we will implement a pilot programme aimed at improving the eco-system within the University in support of student social enterprise. The pilot will be led by the Edinburgh University Students’ Association in collaboration with Launch.Ed. It will involve a set of new services including: banking; insurance; marketing; provision of office space; bespoke mentoring programme involving the local business community; and workshops on how to write a business plan, how to pitch, sessions about assertiveness, problem solving, accounting and finance.

Geographical location of impact: City of Edinburgh

¹ Community engagement ‘flagship programmes’ have the following characteristics: integration of research and learning and teaching (students as agents of social change); aim to have a transformative impact on the community and on the student experience; have spin-off potential for research grant applications; and are evaluated, and learning used to up-scale.

Lead contacts: Ollie Glick (Vice President Communities, University of Edinburgh Students' Association) and Meher Kalenderian (University of Edinburgh Students' Association)

Commitment 3: 'We will expand our digital ambassadors service to promote digital inclusion and enhance employability amongst community groups'

Digital literacy is increasingly becoming a prerequisite for social inclusion and economic well-being. In 2017/18 we will build on the digital ambassadors programme established as part of our previous Social Impact Pledge, by launching two further services: digital ambassador support for the [Amina Muslim Women's Resource Centre](#), aimed at enhancing employability amongst Muslim women; and a collaboration with [People Know How](#) (a Charity based in the Community Centre, Ocean Terminal, Edinburgh) on digital literacy within the wider community. We will also work closely with the Edinburgh Futures Institute and external stakeholders in local and central government, to review how outreach and engagement on the theme of digital literacy (via student digital ambassadors) can be used to enhance life-long learning from childhood through to older age, and skills development in the workforce most at risk of redundancy from automation. A report will be produced early in 2018 and the learning from this used to engage community groups through a series of workshops.

Geographical location of impact: City of Edinburgh

Lead Contacts: Sarah Anderson (Community Engagement Programme Manager) and Prof. Lesley McAra (Assistant Principal Community Relations).