

Climate Action Plan Analysis Codebook

Coding Metric:	Question:	1: Absent	2: Problematic	3: Present, Incomplete	4: Fully Answers Question
Baseline	How does this plan develop a baseline?	This plan does not develop a baseline.	A baseline is discussed, but methods in developing this baseline are not discussed.	A baseline is discussed, as well as methods in developing this baseline. However, more information is needed to fully understand baseline.	A baseline is discussed, and the methods of developing this baseline are explained in full detail.
Success Metric	By what metric is success tracked and reported?	Success is not tracked or reported.	Plan discusses success in the abstract, but provides no metrics for actually tracking and reporting that success.	Plan discusses success and metrics for tracking and reporting it. However, plan has not been revisited to actually track and report progress.	Plan discusses success and metrics for tracking and reporting it. Plan reports progress towards success since original inception.
Implementation	What goals, strategies, or action items does the plan outline?	Goals, strategies, or action items are not addressed.	Goals are discussed ambiguously. However, strategies and action plans for implementation are absent.	Goals are discussed and are explicit. However, it is unclear how the CAP plans to reach those goals.	Goals are discussed explicitly and strategies / action items for implementation are adequately fleshed out.
Funding	How is this plan funded?	No information is provided on funding the plan.	Funding needs are discussed in passing. However, actual monetary amounts are not explicitly stated and sources of funding are not listed.	Funding the plan is discussed, with explicit reference to monetary demands of the plan. However, sources of funds are not listed or lacking.	Funding the plan is discussed, with explicit reference to monetary demands of the plan. Funding sources are stated and meet the needs of the plan.
Stakeholders	How did this plan inform/engage stakeholders?	Stakeholders are not discussed.	Stakeholders are discussed, but are not informed/engaged.	Effort is made to inform and engage stakeholders. However, more could be done.	Plans to inform and engage stakeholders are described explicitly, and these plans adequately involve stakeholders.
Gaps / Uncertainties / Challenges	What gaps in data, uncertainties, and challenges are	No discussion of gaps, uncertainties, and challenges.	Passing reference to gaps, uncertainties, or challenges, but more information is needed.	Gaps, uncertainties, and challenges are discussed explicitly, but addressing	Gaps, uncertainties, and challenges are discussed explicitly, along with plans

	identified in the plan?			them in the future is not discussed.	for addressing these in the future.
Appendices	What purpose do the appendices serve?	The document does not contain appendices.	The document contains appendices, but the purpose they serve is uncertain.	The document contains appendices and their purposes are apparent, but more appendices would be helpful.	The document contains appendices and their purposes are apparent. The appendices contain sufficient supplementary information.

Climate Action Plan Assessment

Coding Metric				
Institution	Baseline	Success Metric	Implementation	Funding
Montana State University	4: MSU developed a comprehensive GHG inventory in 2009 that the 2011 plan was based on.	3: MSU failed to fulfill its goal of creating CAP updates every two years. However, GHG inventories were gathered to track MSU's progress towards its 20% emissions reduction goal. STARS report was not mentioned.	4: MSU set the implementation goal of reducing emissions by 20% by 2025, and demonstrates how projected projects will achieve those emissions through projected GHG emissions figures. Projects are proposed for achievement of CAP goals.	3: Funding requirements of CAP projects are discussed, and potential funding sources are listed. However, no funding had been secured at the publication of this plan.
Colorado State University	4: CSU developed a comprehensive baseline that is well outlined in the plan.	4: CSU develops annual GHG inventories, regular STARS reports, and has published a number of updated CAPs	4: CSU's plan breaks implementation strategies into short-, medium-, and long-term projects that all together are projected to allow them to meet their 2050 neutrality goal.	4: CSU's plan developed a revolving Green Fund and identified other potential areas for funding. Costs and savings are extensively estimated for all proposed projects.
University of Montana	4: UM developed a comprehensive baseline centered around a 2008 GHG inventory.	3: UM's plan discusses tracking success through regular energy audits and CAP updates. However, the plan has not been revisited to actually track or report progress.	4: UM's plan lists several goals with strategies that lead to the achievement of the goal. The plan states various different items for implementation.	3: Some sources of funding are discussed in UM's plan, but explicit monetary amounts are scarce. Funding sources do not meet the needs of the plan.
Utah State University	4: USU created a comprehensive emissions portfolio establishing its baseline.	3: USU's plan commits itself to produce annual emissions reports to use as a framework to follow its progress.	4: USU outlined its implementation strategies focusing on energy, community	4: USU's plan recognized its critical need for funding by providing a comprehensive list of financing opportunities. The

			engagement, and climate research.	appendices provided specific information on funding mechanisms.
Weber State University	3: WSU presents a baseline primarily with the Progress Report based on 2007 data.	3: WSU planned to have annual updates and comply with AASHE reporting.	4: WSU's CAP is unified through the 2050 carbon neutrality goal and defines benchmarks along the way.	3: The CAP does not state specific funding amounts, but multiple sources of funding are considered, such as federal and state grants and donations.

Coding Metric			
Institution	Stakeholders	Gaps/Uncertainties/Challenges	Appendices
Montana State University	4: MSU's plan discusses engagement with the City of Bozeman, MSU students/staff/faculty, and Northwestern Energy utility. These stakeholders are engaged thoroughly and extensively with plans for future engagement.	4: The CAP mentions a number of gaps in its data, particularly for its GHG inventory (Scope 3 emissions), in addition wastewater and paper. Strategies for addressing these limitations are discussed, and a number of them are addressed in the 2016 CAP update.	4: Extensive appendices are provided to elaborate on data discussed in the document, from the GHG inventory to commuter survey and more.
Colorado State University	4: The plan extensively engages with students, faculty, staff, and the City of Fort Collins in both planning and implementation.	4: CSU's CAP designates a specific section to uncertainties, in addition to discussing a number of projects that were considered but deemed not currently feasible. Future adaptations are discussed.	3: CSU's CAP has a short section of appendices, listing people that have been involved in planning and implementation and providing information on CSU's Nitrogen emissions. However, additional appendices detailing the proposed and completed projects discussed in the plan would be helpful.
University of Montana	4: The plan adequately discusses its engagement with students, faculty, and staff as well as the City of Missoula. UM implemented a high level of community engagement when planning action items for implementation.	4: UM's plan consistently states barriers to implementation for most action items listed. Many data gaps are recognized throughout the plan. Future plans for addressing these barriers are discussed.	3: UM's CAP contains a fairly comprehensive section of appendices, including ideas suggested through the public involvement process, recommended GHG reduction goals, comparison to other universities, and survey results. However, more appendices detailing implementation plans would be helpful.

<p>Utah State University</p>	<p>4: The plan comprehensively discusses its role in engaging stakeholders. USU actively promotes sustainability on campus and in the greater community by hosting events, creating programs focused on community outreach, and integrating climate issues into its curriculum.</p>	<p>2: The plan vaguely mentions challenges and uncertainties. Funding is considered an issue, but the CAP fails to discuss financial difficulties in detail. Data gaps are noted but are not explained adequately.</p>	<p>4: USU's CAP provides a detailed appendix detailing the emissions inventory, student organizations and courses related to sustainability, research partnerships, and funding opportunities. Each section comprehensively described the planning and implementation process in richer detail. The financing section was instrumental in outlining tools and resources available to provide a solid foundation for USU's CAP to ensure its longevity.</p>
<p>Weber State University</p>	<p>3: The CAP recognizes that involvement from University President's Council, facilities management, the City of Ogden, as well as faculty, students, and staff will be required for successful implementation but often does not outline how or what this involvement will look like.</p>	<p>2: The CAP recognizes areas which lack of available data but does not go in-depth on other challenges or uncertainties.</p>	<p>1: No appendices are present.</p>