

Review on the Strength and Weaknesses of Sustainability Implementation for Higher Education Institution

Nadzirah Zainordin, Syuhaida Ismail

Abstract: Sustainability evaluation for Higher Educational Institution had been as of late executed far and wide. There are various Higher Education Institutions guarantee their enthusiasm to accept and rehearse that idea inside the institutions. This may be demonstrated dependent upon the Declaration, Charters and Initiatives (DCIs) created by this interested Higher Educational Institution. Nonetheless, using submitting that enthusiasm on which manageability evaluation in Higher Educational Institution, there may various instruments worked as marker to quantify the maintainability rehearses in the institutions. Consequently, through extensive literature survey, this study explores the strength-ness and weakness of the current maintainability evaluation in Advanced Educational Institution use assessing announcement created previous concerning supportability in Higher Educational Institution. Around twenty inquire about to analyze paper distributed inside an previous ten years may utilized in introducing all the significant literatures, investigating and turning off within the discoveries of what is the markers may be considering for maintainability evaluation in Higher Educational Institution dependent upon the comparable of the strength-ness and weakness talked about before. These papers are relied upon to associate as far as upgrading the current information in maintainability evaluation in Higher Educational Institution on its usage.

Keywords: Utilize about 5 key words or phrases in alphabetic order, Separated by Semi-colon.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1975, the UNESCO-UNEP International Environmental Education Program mutually controlled by United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) has presented an idea of maintainability of training (UNESCO, 1984). From that point forward, introduction on the statement relating with maintainability in Higher Education Institutions have been produced and increased expansive acknowledgement, which at that point has prompted the rising subjects in the presentation, including practical physical tasks, economical analyze, public outreach, inter-university co-operation, relationship with an government and non-government association just as far as within the business, creating inter-disciplinary educational programs and good commitment (Masaru et al., 2012; Wright, 2002).

According to these thoughts, Advanced Educational Institution had been perceived has a place to be disperse learning from master facilitators just as a place where congregating imaginative thoughts and inventive activity may be create in meeting the prerequisite towards a flexible society (Fabricio et al., 2017; UNESCO, 1998, 2014). Furthermore, Lozano et al. (2015) highlighted that an emerging rising enthusiasm between improvement objective and standards can be developed by means of worldwide activity towards maintainability in Higher Education Institutions (United Nation, 2012).

However, Velazquez et al. (2005) featured that the advancement on maintainability usage in Higher Education Institutions is endlessly obtaining slower because of the Higher Education Institutions do not seriously considering sustainability assessment framework in their institutions (Masaru et al., 2012). Since 1990s after the assertion has been created, selection assessment apparatuses are produced, distributed and enforced to replicate back the objective of the declaration has been made (Masaru et al., 2012). subsequently, this paper evaluate the current announcement made before with respect to manageability in Higher Education Institutions and examines the current apparatuses for maintainability appraisal in Higher Educational Institutions as the endeavors towards investigations the strengths and weaknesses of every instruments recorded in the discussion.

Sustainable Implementation for Higher Education Institution – The Declaration

The Declarations, Charters and Incentives (DCIs), are designed to give the rule or structure to Advanced Educational Institution for good execution on the institutions (Lozano et al., 2013). According to UNEP (1972), beginning from Stockholm Conferences, instruction usually had been know has a medium to plays in cultivating the natural problems and concern (Lozano et al., 2013). Since then, maneclarations had been signing and these may outlined has appeared in Table 1.1 a timing frames of 1972 until 2012.

Revised Manuscript Received on March 08, 2019

Nadzirah Zainordin, UTM Razak School of Engineering and Advanced Technology Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia..
SEGi University, Faculty of Engineering & Built Environment, Kota Damansara, Selangor, Malaysia.

Syuhaida Ismail, UTM Razak School of Engineering and Advanced Technology, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia..

Review on the Strength and Weaknesses of Sustainability Implementation for Higher Education Institution

Table.1.1 Sustain-able Declarations for Advanced Education Institutions

Source: Expanded from Wright (2002), Leal Filho (2011), United Nations (2012), Copernicus Alliance (2012b), Lozano *et al.* (2013b), Antje *et al.* (2013)

Years	Declaration
2012	United Nation Higher Educational Sustainability Initiative inside Rio + 20
2012	Individual Sustainability Treaty on Higher Educations
2011	Copernicus Chart 2.0
2010	G8 Universities Summits: Statement of an actions
2009	Worldwide Conferences on Advanced Educational(UNESCO)
2009	Turin Declaration of training and Research for maintainable and Responsible Improvement Italy
2009	Tokyo Declaration of HOPE (coordinated to everytraining territories, not advanced educationalex- plicit)
2009	Abuja Declaration on maintainable Development in Africa's
2008	G8 University Summits Sapporo's Sustainability Declarations
2006	Declarations on the Responsibility of Advanced Educational for a Democratic Culture Citizen- ship, Human Right ad Sustainability
2005	Graz Declarations on Committed Universities to Maintainable Improvement
2005-2004	The International Decade Educational for Maintainable Improvement
2002	Ubuntu Declaration
2001	LueneburgDeclaration
2000	Earth Charters (coordinated to all instruction zones, not advanced education-explicit)
1998	Worldwide Declaration on Advanced Education for the twentieth Centuries: Vision and Action
1997	Worldwide Conferences on Environment and Society –training and Public Mindfulness for maintainability: Declaration of Thessaloniki
1994	CRE Copernicus Charters
1993	Relationship on Common-wealth UniversitiesfifteenthQuin-quennial Conferences: Swansea Decla- rations
1993	Ninth Worldwide Association of Universities Round Table: The Kyoto Declarations
1992	Plantwenty first Reports of the International Conferences on Environment and Advancement - Chap. 36: Promoted Educations, Public Awareness and Trainings
1991	The Halifax Declarations
1990	College President for a Maintainable Future: The Tallories' Declarations
1988	The Magna Charta's of European University
1977	Tbilisi Declarations
1972	The Stockholm Declarations of the Human Environment

Lozano and his associates (2013) find which the DCIs foreseen using Advanced Educational Institution of within the world had started rule, system and instruments of Advanced Educational Institution on good implant of maintainability idea inside the institutions. The proof is appeared on Calder and Chugston (2003) and continuous to highlighting of Lozano *et al.* (2013), where about thousand Advanced Educational Institution pioneers corrected the dedication of cultivating their maintainability of including in this DCIs. Be that as it may, the quantities of Higher Education Institutions occupied with DCIs are still low in correlation with 14,000 Advanced Educational Institution activated operating of within the world (Lozano, 2011; Lozano *et al.*, 2013). This brings up the issue on what number of maintainability appraisal apparatuses are accessible has been executed using the Advanced Educational Institution within the world? Is the Advanced Educational Institution building up the very our appraisal apparatuses of gauge manageability inside the organizations? Is the appraisal instruments responding with boosts begin manageability markers themselves?

Existing Tools of Sustainability Assessment for Higher Education Institutions

According to Gomez *et al.* (2015), in order to facilitate the assessment procedure for Higher Educational Institutions, it requires direction and strategy for correlation with survey their accomplishment and advancement with concerning the vision of supportability in Higher Educational Institutions itself. Shriberg (2002) highlighted that numerous devices have been produced so as to evaluate their advancement towards sustainability in the Higher Education Institutions. Notwithstanding, as a rule, devices didn't allow different comparison between one institutions with another (Gomez *et al.*, 2015). Table 1.2 demonstrates manageability devices for advanced educational institutions available around the globe.

Table. 1.2 Sustainability Tools for Higher Education

Institutions Source: Expanded from Lozano et al., (2011), Lozano et al., 2013), Masaru et al., (2012), Francisco Urquiza et al., (2015)

No.	Sustainability Assessment Tools
1.	Examining Instruments for Maintainability in Advanced Educations (AISHE)
2.	Sustainability Instrument for Assessing University Curriculum Holistically (STAUNCH)
3.	Graphical Assessing of Sustainability in University (GASU)
4.	3 Dimensional University Ranking (TUR)
5.	Supportability Tracking and Assessment Rating Systems(STARS)
6.	Green Metric (GM)
7.	Evaluation of University Supportability Policies and their connection to International Campus of Excellence Programs (AUSP)
8.	Alternative Universities Appraisals (AUA)
9.	Unit-Based Sustainability Assessment Tool (USAT)
10.	The Green Plan
11.	School Sustainability Report Card
12.	Grounds/Campus Sustainability Assessment Framework (CSAF)
13.	Advanced Educational 21's Sustainable Indicators
14.	Feasible Pathways Toolkit
15.	Feasible Livelihood Approach (SLA)

Gomez et al., (2015) claim that there are many differences between apparatuses, which concentrate for the most part in manageable improvement which are conceptualized for measurement, inter-linkage among classes then legitimization of determination for the totals of pointers. Lozano (2015) indicated 3 primary methodologies for assessment and report maintainability in the Advanced Educational Institutions, which any of that is pointer based. It was critical for feature which inter-linkage in maintainability exertion required increment coordination of capacity in Advanced Educational Institutions (Lozano, 2013).

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

About 20 chosen papers distributions had been utilized to legitimate and analyses data with respect to the accessible apparatuses in evaluating sustainability in Higher Educational Institutions. The 20 selected papers' sources from Index publication journal. As indicated by Karatzoglou (2013), an investigation ought not consider creator's subjective cognizance and clarification for certain discovers and designs. Along these, a point by point perusing is really required relating to avocation of the dimension or pointer, the rating strategy just has the strength-ness and weakness on every supportability appraisal. There were any elements might considered on analyzing every device of maintainability evaluation on Advanced Educational Institution. According to Shriberg (2002) and further highlighted by Lozano (2013) and Gomez et al. (2015), the devices ought to be analyzed dependent on the pointers, rating strategy, strengths and weaknesses of every maintainability evaluation device. As indicated by Shriberg (2002) and further stretched out by Lozano (2013), the perfect instruments to quantify supportability evaluation in

Higher Educational Institution may contains the accompanying 5 certainties: a. Identification of the vital problems: tending to and highlighting suitable problems with respect to supportability in Higher Educational Institution;

b. Move past natural: the pointers in surveying maintainability in Higher Educational Institution would not be restricted into eco-productivity problems, a part of financial and social ought to may considering on appraisal itself;

c. Quantifiable and measurable: the pointers utilize should measurable and sufficiently adaptable with the goal which has Advanced Educational Institution may refers on the similar instruments or markers;

d. Inspirational procedure: considered the manageability count in Advanced Educational Institution, superior procedure that contain methodologies and the procedures ought to far reaching complete; and Comprehensibility of the pressure: an apparatuses should complete that may be additionally stretched out have various foundation for institution and every pointers and outcomes initiate the evaluation should be available plainly and legitimization should be in basic for best understanding.

III. RESULT AND FINDINGS

Initially the advancement of manageability appraisal of Advanced Educational Institution, the marker based methodology area standout amongst the more dependable signs may be utilized of survey. To comprehend this, diverse devices referenced previous that will thought about of answer the target on this paper. Table 1.3 demonstrates the summarization of evaluation devices in comparable their strength-ness and weakness dependent upon the total fifteen devices analysed.

Review on the Strength and Weaknesses of Sustainability Implementation for Higher Education Institution

Table. 1.3 Summary of Assessment Tools

Sustainability Assessment Tools	Strength	Weaknesses
Auditing Instrument for Sustainability in Higher Education (AISHE)	Process related. Adaptable system for institutionequivalence. Grants prioritization. Fractional objectivesadvancement levels.	Factors out close to home inspiration. High level of intricacy and deliberation. Utilize no sign for traditional sense.
Sustainability Tool for Assessing Universities' Curricula Holistically (STAUNCH)	Efficiently evaluate Higher Educational Institutionadded to the sustainability by surveying just in an inclusion of educations.	No clarification and brief portrayal on tending to the indicators for assessment.
Graphical Assessment of Sustainability in Universities (GASU)	Consider an entire picture of establishment's execution by covering immeasurably imperative issues. Helpful technique for encourage the comprehension and correspondence of dataassembled by maintainability report.	Require vast measure of information. Entangles longitudinal correlations and benchmarking. At global dimension – quick evaluation of Higher Educational Institution.
Three Dimensional University Ranking (TUR)	Straightforward and compliment Advanced Education Institutionpositioning instruments. Utilize a triangle chart to encourage understanding.	Oversimplify and limit inclusion of maintainability issues, which just have five markers.
Sustainability Tracking and Assessment Rating System (STARS)	Give motivating to enhance sustainability exercises under advancementclassification. Markers may clear and simplicity to count.	Maintainability coverage is well and excessively advance secured and it triggers trouble for apprentice to use as a rule.
Green Metric (GM)	Dynamic help to initiate IndonesianAdvanced Educational Institutions. No well explanation on pointers of approach.	Coverage top to bottom on eco-proficiency. Expert exertion to be benchmarked on natural endeavours in Higher Educational Institution.
Assessment of University Sustainability Policies and their relation to the International Campus of Excellence Program (AUSP)	Cover practicallyextremely critical problems. The technique isn'tclarified clearly.	Require a noteworthy exertion with respect to Higher Educational Institution and the appraisal gathering to incorporate outcomes. Really require inward encouraging on comprehensive self-evaluating procedure.
Alternative University Appraisal (AUA)	Utilized close by a subjective assessment. The methodology isn'tclarified clearly.	Don't cover social issues and environmental administration pointers.
Unit-Based Sustainability Assessment Tool (USAT)	Utilize triangle chart to encourage understanding the devices. Take into consideration self-evaluation by individual, division or resource. Additionally capable of assessing the organization as a whole.	Don't cover social problems and troublesome for tenderfoot to use as a rule.
The Green Plan	Cover practically extremely vital problems. The philosophy of markers is well-explained.	Having two renditions of 2010 and 2012 with various structure and it is hard to think about and see an improvement. Troublesome for initiator to utilize as a rule.
College Sustainability Report Card	Give motivating forces to enhance sustainability exercises under advancement class. Clear sign of assessment.	Scope concentrating just on maintainability exercises in Higher Educational Institution with no inclusion from effort.
Campus Sustainability Assessment Framework (CSAF)	Participative and client situated Process based and suited on accomplishbase-top and top-down equalization. Reason able structure loans great comparability.	Unmanageable information volume. Missing association short and long-haul objectives. Absence of clearness and still in unpleasant stage.
Higher Education 21's Sustainable Indicators	Process related- modest no. of. Key pointers and strategic orientation.	Limited comparability and open doors for benchmarking. Inconsistencies between pointers and issues regions.
Sustainable Pathways Toolkit	Quantifiable and activity arranged, clear, sensible and simple to execute because of its consensual premise.	Under-estimation of the instruction and social angle. Excessively centred around accord asfundamentalprerequisite, subsequently upsetting basic reflection.
Sustainable Livelihood Approaches (SLA)	Using 'Humanuniversities' has a primaryrule, where the angle tallies are social, cultural, monetary and ecological maintainability. Clear and straightforwardness to implement.	Designed not for perceivability, but rather for in-house reason and not road to interchange thoughts on enhancement of the evaluation.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper thus sees which the Declarations, Charter and Initiative (DCIs) are viewed has a kick off to encourage the maintainability idea into Advanced Educational Institution. In spite of the fact that these activities are proposed to fill in has supported, directing and documented all through Advanced Educational Institution framework, this still doesn't guarantee that the establishments should be implemented the manageability up-to the foundations, has no following document appears of that advancement. There may likewise be another Advanced Educational Institution which had not marked an DCI's yet rather connected effectively on the sustainability execution using cultivating the maintainability themselves which is in accordance inside the given system, rule or instrument on however the maintainability components may be inserted. The distinctive activities had additionally to effectively talking about. The structure or appraisal pointers which have been set must be compliment within the idea of reasonable advancement columns – monetary, social and condition. Also, adjacent to the concepts themselves, the additional straight forwardness execution of supportability Evaluation for Advanced Educational Institution's must think about a decent progressing in embracing maintainability in these separate establishments. Along these lines, this paper has just talked about 15 accessible sustainability appraisal apparatuses utilized for Higher Educational Institution's by researching their strength-ness and weakness. These may help for further enhancement for an evaluation structure advancement to be progressively broad and dependable to utilize and this can make a superior progress on the appraisal with the goal that it tends to be effortlessly followed and monitored.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors might want to offer their genuine thanks to the Ministry of Education Malaysia, University Technology Malaysia (UTM) and the Research Management Center (RMC) of UTM for giving money related help to these papers may distributed. This investigation are back to the UTM Razak School Research Fund under Cost Centre No. R.K130000.7740.4J290.

REFERENCES

1. Abdul Ghapor. S., Abd Aziz. M., Abdul Razak. D., AbidinSanusi. Z., (2015). Implementing Education for Sustainable Development in Higher Education: Case Study of Albukhary International University Malaysia.
2. AASHE (2011). Technical manual STARS.
3. AUA (2012). Alternative university appraisal model for ESD in Higher Education Institutions, pp 0-35.
4. Calder, W., Clugston, R.M., (2003). International efforts to promote higher education for sustainable development. *Planning for higher education* 31, 30-44.
5. Cortese, A.D., 2003. The critical role of higher education in creating sustainable future. *Planning for Higher Education*. Vol. 31 No. 3, pp.15-22.
6. Folke, C. Carpenter, S., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., Holling, C. S. and Walker B., 2002.
7. Resilience and Sustainable Development: Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformations, *Ambio*, 31(5), 473-40.
8. FabricionCaserejos, Laura Morten Gustavan, Mauricio NogueiraFrota (2017), Higher Education Institutions in the United States: Commitment and coherency to sustainability vis-à-vis dimension of the institutional environment, *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
9. Francisco Urquiza Gomez, Cesar Saez-Navarrete, SolangeRencoretLioi, VartanInshangluMarzuca (2015). Adaptable model for assessing sustainability in higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 107, 475-485.
10. Karatzoglou, B., (2013). An in-depth literature review of the evolving roles and contributions of universities to education for sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 49, 44-53.
11. Lozano, R., 2004. A tool for easy benchmarking sustainability reports in universities. *Environmental Management Sustainable University Monterrey, Mexico*.
12. Lozano, R. (2006). A tool for a Graphical Assessment of Sustainability in Universities (GASU). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 14(9-11), 963-972.
13. Lozano, R., Ceulemans, K., Alonso-Almeida, M., Huisigh, D., Lozano, F., Tom Waas, Hüge, J., 2015. A review of commitment and implementation of sustainable development in higher education: results from a worldwide survey. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 1-18.
14. Lozano, R., Peattie, K., (2011). Assessing Cardiff University's Curricula Contribution to Sustainable Development using the STAUNCH System. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development*.
15. Masaru Yarime, Yuko Tanaka (2012). The issues and methodologies in sustainability assessment tools for higher education institutions: a review of recent trends and future challengers. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development* 6(1), 63-67.
16. Schriberg, M., (2002). Institutional assessment tools for sustainability in higher education: strength, weaknesses and implication for practices and theory. *International Journal Sustainable Higher Education* 3(3), 254-270.
17. United Nations (2012), Report of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, United Nation New York, NY, USA. Pp. 1-126.
18. ULSF (2001). Sustainability assessment questionnaire (SAQ) for colleges and universities. Universitas Indonesia (2012). Green Metric World University ranking.
19. UNEP (1972). Declaration of the United Conference on the Human Environment.
20. UNESCO (1984). The Luneberg Declaration.
21. UNESCO (1997). Educating for sustainable future: a transdisciplinary vision for concerted action in development.
22. Velaquez, L., Munguia, N., Sanchez, M., (2005). Deterring sustainability in higher education institutions: an appraisal of the factors which influence sustainability in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 6(4), 383-391
23. Wright, T. (2012). The evolution of sustainability declaration in higher education in Corcoran. *Higher Education and the lenges of Sustainability*. Kluwer Academic Publisher. The Netherland.