



**Planetary Health Report Card
(Medicine) 2026:
*Georgetown University School
of Medicine***



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
School of Medicine

2025-2026 Contributing Team:

- Students: *Joel Licor**, *Ritika Chanda*, *Elena Iliadis*, *Kriti Shrestha*, *Yusra Rafeeqi*
- Faculty Mentors: Dr. Caroline Wellbery, MD, PhD

*Primary Contact: Joel Licor, jl3117@georgetown.edu

Land acknowledgment: Georgetown University School of Medicine acknowledges that we are located on the ancestral lands of Indigenous peoples, including the Nacotchtank and Piscataway. We honor their past and present stewardship of this land and recognize the ongoing work needed to support Indigenous communities.

Summary of Findings

Overall Grade	C-
----------------------	-----------

Curriculum	C
-------------------	----------

Key Findings

Georgetown’s curriculum provides strong early exposure to planetary health concepts, primarily through the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, which offers in-depth instruction on extreme heat, healthcare carbon emissions, cardiovascular effects of climate change, sustainable clinical practice, and nutrition-related environmental co-benefits. These topics are reinforced selectively within pulmonary and cardiovascular modules.

However, planetary health education is largely concentrated in the preclinical years, with limited reinforcement during M3 and M4 clinical rotations. Significant gaps exist in global climate health disparities, Indigenous knowledge systems, environmental toxins and reproductive health, environmental history-taking, and patient counseling on climate-related risks. The absence of planetary-health–focused electives further limits opportunities for students seeking advanced engagement.

Recommendations

1. Integrate planetary health longitudinally across clinical clerkships, including standardized environmental history-taking and patient counseling skills.
2. Reintroduce or develop elective coursework focused on planetary health, climate medicine, and environmental justice to allow deeper student engagement.

Interdisciplinary Research	D
-----------------------------------	----------

Key Findings

Georgetown hosts meaningful interdisciplinary environmental and climate-related research at the university level through entities such as The Earth Commons, the Georgetown Climate Center, and the Center for Global Health Science & Security. Faculty including Dr. Caroline Wellbery contribute scholarship at the intersection of climate, health education, and sustainability.

However, the School of Medicine currently lacks a dedicated planetary health research institute, and several key researchers previously affiliated with planetary health initiatives have departed in recent years. Medical-school–based planetary health research remains limited in visibility and coordination, and community input into research agendas occurs inconsistently outside of select university programs.

Recommendations

1. Establish a centralized GUSOM planetary health research webpage highlighting faculty, projects, and student opportunities.
2. Strengthen institutional investment in planetary health research by recruiting faculty and formally affiliating

medical school investigators with The Earth Commons.

Community Outreach and Advocacy

D+

Key Findings

While Georgetown University maintains strong community engagement infrastructure, the School of Medicine has limited formal partnerships specifically focused on planetary or environmental health. Students may participate in environmentally focused volunteer opportunities approved for community service hours, but these are not structured medical-school collaborations.

Community-facing education primarily occurs through university-wide initiatives such as Earth Commons EcoTalks, policy programming through the Georgetown Climate Center, and lectures hosted by other schools. MedStar Health offers limited CME programming addressing climate and health equity, but patient-facing educational materials on environmental risks and climate-related health impacts are largely absent.

Recommendations

1. Develop formal community partnerships between GUSOM and local environmental justice or climate advocacy organizations.
2. Create accessible patient education materials addressing environmental exposures and climate-related health risks within Georgetown-affiliated clinics and hospitals.

Support for Student-Led Initiatives

C-

Key Findings

Students at Georgetown benefit from robust university-wide sustainability funding and programming, including Earth Commons grants, the Green Office Program, and environmental research awards. The Environmental Health and Medicine Track provides structured academic engagement, and student organizations such as Climate Health and Medical Sustainability (CHMS) and Medical Students for a Sustainable Future (MS4SF) offer faculty-supported avenues for advocacy and education.

However, the medical school lacks dedicated funding streams, centralized mentorship listings, and formal leadership roles specifically for planetary health. Most opportunities require student self-initiation, and no consolidated webpage exists to guide students toward projects, faculty mentors, or research pathways.

Recommendations

1. Establish medical-school-specific funding and mentorship programs for sustainability and planetary health projects.
2. Create a centralized GUSOM planetary health webpage listing faculty mentors, active projects, student organizations, and research opportunities.

Campus Sustainability

C+

Key Findings

Georgetown University demonstrates strong institutional commitment to sustainability, including a 2030–2040 carbon neutrality roadmap, LEED-certified construction standards, comprehensive recycling and composting programs, and environmentally responsible dining practices. Students benefit from extensive public transportation access, bike infrastructure, and sustainability engagement initiatives.

Nonetheless, sustainability efforts are largely university-wide rather than medical-school-specific. There is no designated sustainability officer for the medical school or affiliated hospitals, limited renewable energy use at medical education facilities, optional (rather than required) green procurement and event standards, and incomplete laboratory sustainability programming. Fossil fuel divestment has not yet been achieved.

Recommendations

1. Designate sustainability leadership within the medical school or hospital system to ensure accountability and targeted progress.
2. Expand lab sustainability initiatives and formalize green procurement and event policies, particularly within medical education and clinical environments.

Statement of Purpose

Planetary health is human health.

The Planetary Health Alliance describes planetary health as “a solutions-oriented, transdisciplinary field and social movement focused on analysing and addressing the impacts of human disruptions to Earth’s natural systems on human health and all life on Earth.” This definition is intentionally broad, intended to encompass the multitude of ways that the environment can affect health, including water scarcity, changing food systems, urbanisation, biodiversity shifts, natural disasters, climate change, changing land use and land cover, global pollution, and changing biogeochemical flows. The health of humanity is dependent on our environment, and our environment is changing rapidly and in disastrous ways. Although the World Health Organization has called climate change “the greatest threat to global health in the 21st century,” many health professional school’s institutional priorities do not reflect the urgency of this danger to human health.

As future health professionals, we must be prepared to address the impacts of human-caused environmental changes on our patients’ health. This preparation is in the hands of the institutions providing our health professional training. It is imperative that we hold our institutions accountable for educating health professional students about the health impacts of climate change and other anthropogenic environmental changes, generating research to better understand health impacts and solutions, supporting related student initiatives, embracing sustainable practices as much as possible, and engaging with surrounding communities that are most affected by environmental threats. Because climate change and environmental threats disproportionately affect vulnerable populations (for example, communities of colour, older adults sensitive to health threats, and individuals in low-resource settings), these issues are inherently ones of equity and justice.

With the purpose of increasing planetary health awareness and accountability among health professional schools, we have created a Planetary Health Report Card that students internationally can use to grade and compare their institutions on an annual basis. This student-driven initiative aims to compare health professional schools nationally and internationally on the basis of discrete metrics in five main category areas: 1) planetary health curriculum, 2) interdisciplinary research in health and environment, 3) university support for student planetary health initiatives, and 4) community outreach centred on environmental health impacts 5) school campus sustainability.

Instructions for Completing the PHRC

Thank you! We are really pleased to have you and your team on board to complete the PHRC at your institution. Many of you will have already been part of a completed report card or even led the team at your school but please take a moment to read the instructions below.

For a full comprehensive step-by-step guide to completing your report card please refer to the [PHRC User Guide](#). This page serves as a brief overview of the important methodology.

Completing the report card:

The Planetary Health Report Card is a self assessment tool designed to identify an institution's strengths and areas in need of improvement in regards to its planetary health education. The metric-based report card consists of five sections; 1. Curriculum, 2. Interdisciplinary Research, 3. Community Outreach, 4. Support for Student-Led Initiatives and 5. Campus Sustainability.

- **Metrics.** There are roughly 55 metrics (depending on your discipline). Sections 2-5 are the same across all disciplines. Each metric has different criteria for either scoring 1, 2 or 3 points. Participants should read each metric carefully and answer the question with as much accuracy as possible, drawing upon multiple sources where possible. It is vital that sufficient investigation is completed for each metric to give a fair and accurate representation of your institution.

Most of the Curriculum metrics are graded by inclusion in **elective** coursework, **brief** coverage in the **core curriculum** or **in depth** coverage in the **core curriculum**.

Generic Scoring:

Elective coursework: This score applies to material that is actively selected by the students such as a module choice, or additional lecture series. By implication, only a given proportion of the cohort will receive this taught material.

Brief coverage in the core curriculum: This score applies where a topic is covered only briefly in a core curriculum session. This implies that the entire cohort receives the same material. Brief inclusion would qualify as inclusion in a single lecture slide in a single year.

In depth coverage in the core curriculum: This score applies where a topic is taught in significant detail or where a topic is repeatedly brought up in different years. This might look like several dedicated lecture slides, or inclusion of the same topic in different lectures and teaching formats. Please consider amongst your team that this is the highest score awarded and a subjective decision must be made as to whether the topic should be awarded this score.

(A full list of definitions is provided on the pages below)

- **Types of evidence.** Acceptable forms of evidence include: lecture titles, learning objectives, module descriptions, descriptions of the intended learning, case titles, seminar titles, project titles, webpages, researcher profiles / biographies, news articles, publications, social media output, institutional policy documents. Please be as specific as possible.

It is essential that you have clearly justified the score for each metric, outlining in the box

provided the specific content delivered in your curriculum and why you have assigned the score. Each report card is reviewed by a member of the leadership team for accuracy and consistency across report cards. An example of the sufficient level of evidence is provided below each metric.

Please do not include **lecturers' names** without permission. The title of the lecture or module with a brief description of the material will suffice.

Where material is publicly available via an institution's website, please include hyperlinks to the webpages.

- **Recommendation for Interdisciplinary Coordination:** For the school teams that have other disciplinary teams within the same institution, also taking part in the PHRC initiative this year, we highly recommend that the teams work together to complete sections 2-5 to ensure the scoring stays the same, as these metrics specifically refer to the institution as a whole. The explanation section can highlight the respective discipline schools' unique examples or areas of improvement. Please get in touch with your respective regional/disciplinary leads to connect with your counterpart teams (if not done already).
- **Evidence deadline.** Any material from the previous academic year and the current academic year up to the draft deadline of the **17th February 2026** may be included in this report card. Any teaching planned after this date should not be scored in this report card but can be included in the 2026/27 report. You may wish to make a note of any such teaching for your colleagues producing next year's report card.

ON COMPLETION OF YOUR REPORT - DELETE ALL RED TEXT

Definitions & Other Considerations

Definitions:

- **Planetary Health:** is described by the Planetary Health Alliance as “the health of human civilisation and the state of the natural systems on which it depends.” For example, topics such as climate change, declining biodiversity, shortages of arable land and freshwater, and pollution would all fall under the realm of planetary health. Both planetary health and traditional ‘environmental health’ examine the relationship between human health and the external environment, including extreme temperatures, chemicals, vector-borne diseases, etc. Planetary health explicitly concerns itself with the potential health harms associated with human-caused perturbations of natural systems. Therefore, the human health focus of planetary health makes the field well-adapted for the context of health professional education. Throughout this report card, we use the term planetary health to refer to this broad swath of topics, but resources do not need to explicitly include the term “planetary health” to satisfy the metric.
- **Sustainable Healthcare:** As defined by the Academy of Royal Colleges, sustainable healthcare involves ensuring the ability to provide good quality care for future generations by balancing the economic, environmental, and social constraints and demands within health care settings. A sustainable healthcare system maintains population health, reduces disease burden and minimises use of healthcare services.
- **Education for Sustainable Healthcare (ESH):** is defined as the process of equipping current and future health professionals with the knowledge, attitudes, skills and capacity to provide environmentally sustainable services through health professional education, thus working to decrease the enormous environmental impact of the healthcare industry. Planetary Health Education is an integral part of this education rather than an end in itself. This is because knowledge on Planetary Health is required to be able to fully understand the necessity of sustainable healthcare as well as being part of the broader knowledge needed to fully protect and promote health. In summary, ESH is covered by the three Priority Learning Outcomes of the Centre of Sustainable Healthcare below, and Planetary Health Education is embraced in the first learning objective and is a fundamental requirement to achieve learning outcomes 2 and 3:
 1. Describe how the environment and human health interact at different levels.
 2. Demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to improve the environmental sustainability of health systems.
 3. Discuss how the duty of a doctor to protect and promote health is shaped by the dependence of human health on the local and global environment.
- **Medical School/Department vs. Institution:** When “Medical school” is specified in the report card, this only refers to curriculum and resources offered by the School/department of Medicine and does not include offerings from other parts of the university (e.g. undergraduate departments (USA), other related departments (e.g. Public Health, Population Health departments)). In contrast, when “institution” is specified in the report card, we are referring to the university more broadly including all of its campuses. Any resource reasonably accessible by medical students, no matter where in the institution the resource comes from or if it is

specifically targeted for medical students, can meet this metric.

- **Environmental history (Curriculum Section):** This is a series of questions students are taught to ask during medical encounters that elicits patients' exposures and environmental risk factors. Historically, this has included consideration of exposures like pesticides, asbestos, and lead, though in the modern era shaped by climate change, it can be expanded to include things like wildfire smoke exposure, air pollution and mould after flooding. Key components include place of residence over the lifecourse, occupational history, food and water sources (e.g. meat from industrial feeding operations, regular fishing in contaminated water, access to clean drinking water), and exposure to air pollution. Please be as specific as possible when providing evidence for this metric.
- **Elective:** The word "elective" refers to an optional course or lecture series that a student can opt to take part in but is not a requirement in the core curriculum. Generally, these elective courses take place in the preclinical curriculum but vary by school.
- **Core Curriculum:** This refers to the taught material that is delivered to the entire cohort of students in one year.
- **Clerkship / Outreach:** This is a term used in the USA to refer to placements that medical students go on e.g. Pediatrics, General medicine, Psychiatry. In the UK these are referred to as rotations, outreach or placements. This is a relatively short (approximately 4-8 weeks) period of study and patient-centred clinical experience that takes place as part of the undergraduate programme.
- **Clinical rotation:** This is a term used to refer to placements that students go on (e.g., ophthalmology, surgery, cardiology).
- **Physiotherapy vs Physical Therapy:** For the purposes of this report card these terms are considered interchangeable. However, physiotherapy will be used primarily.
- **Community organisations:** For most institutions, there are existing groups that are not directly affiliated with the university and exist as a product of what the community the institution exists in cares about or needs. These specific community organisations relevant to this report include those that are focused around some aspect of climate and health preservation. These community organisations can include but are not limited to local mutual aid initiatives, underserved-resource distribution groups, clean-up and nature conservation groups, community gardeners, and other environmental-related organisations. If your institution does not have access to local volunteerships with community groups, please report any community organisations your institution or school has collaborated with.
- **Climate justice:** The idea that certain population groups and geographical locations which are disproportionately more impacted by climate change are already economically and socially disadvantaged. This double vulnerability sits alongside pre-existing social justice concerns and should therefore shift policy and practice to mitigate the inequitable effects of the climate crisis.
- **Extractivism:** The removal of natural resources typically in large quantities. Within anthropology this term is often used in the context of colonialism to refer to

the historic seizing of natural resources, a practice which has developed business models tied to ecological degradation and loss of biodiversity.

- **Global South:** Nations that often have less economic and industrial development and are typically in the southern hemisphere. These nations have been found to be disproportionately impacted by the climate crisis.
- **Low socioeconomic status (SES):** An individual or geographical area that across a variety of socioeconomic factors (e.g., income, education, race/ethnicity) is considered vulnerable. This vulnerability has been correlated to more adverse health outcomes often as a consequence of encountering more barriers in accessing and receiving healthcare.
- **Low and Middle-Income Countries (LMIC):** Countries that have lower degrees of economic affluence.
- **Anthropogenic:** Created through human activity
- **Marginalized communities:** Groups excluded from mainstream economic, educational, social, and/or cultural experiences due to race, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, physical ability, language, and/or immigration status (Sevelius et al., 2020).

Scoring Matrix

- Elective coursework (1 point): This score applies to material that is actively selected by the students such as a module choice, or additional lecture series. By implication, only a given proportion of the cohort will receive this taught material.
- Brief coverage in the core curriculum (2 points): This score applies where a topic is covered only briefly in a core curriculum session. This implies that the entire cohort receives the same material. At minimum brief inclusion would qualify as inclusion in a single lecture slide in a single year.
- In depth coverage in the core curriculum (3 points): This score applies where a topic is taught in significant detail or where a topic is repeatedly brought up in different years. This might look like several dedicated lecture slides, or inclusion of the same topic in different lectures and teaching formats. Please consider amongst your team that this is the highest score awarded and a subjective decision must be made as to whether the topic should be awarded this score.

Other considerations:

- If there are more than one “tracks” at your institution with two different curricula (for example, Harvard Medical School has a Pathways and HST curriculum track), you can choose to fill out a report card for each track, or fill out just one report card and average the scores received by each track in cases where the scores are different (see the 2021 Harvard or Oxford report cards as examples). Where possible please indicate the proportion of students that are on each track.

Updated in 2025, a complete literature review by metric is available for the 2024/25 Medicine Report Card Template. This largely translates across disciplines although we are hoping to expand this process across all of our covered d

isciplines. A link to the 2025 literature review by metric is available [here](#).

Planetary Health Curriculum

Section Overview: *This section evaluates the integration of relevant planetary health topics into the medical school curriculum. Today's health professional students will be on the frontlines of tackling the health effects of climate and other environmental changes. Therefore, it is critical that students are trained to understand the health effects of these changes, as well as planetary health issues and principles more broadly. Topics like the changing geography of vector-borne diseases, the health consequences of air pollution, environmental health inequities, and disaster response principles must be part of every medical school's core curriculum.*

Curriculum: General

1.1. Did your <u>medical school</u> offer elective courses (student selected modules) to engage students in Education for Sustainable Healthcare or Planetary Health in the last year?	
Yes, the medical school has offered more than one elective whose primary focus is ESH/planetary health in the past year. (3 points)	
Yes, the medical school has offered one elective whose primary focus is ESH/planetary health in the past year. (2 points)	
The medical school does not have any electives whose primary focus is ESH/planetary health, but there are one or more electives that include a lecture on planetary health. (1 point)	
No, the medical school has not offered any electives on planetary health or electives that include ESH/planetary health topics in the past year. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University School of Medicine did not offer any medical-school-specific elective courses focused on education for sustainable healthcare or planetary health during the 2025–2026 academic year. Although a fourth-year elective dedicated to planetary health and environmental determinants of health was offered in prior years, this elective is no longer listed in the current course catalog and was not available to students within the past academic year.</i></p> <p><i>While planetary health concepts are incorporated into required coursework-most notably within the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession-these sessions do not qualify as lecture-based, student-selected medical school electives as defined by this metric. Additionally, no elective courses offered by the medical school in the past year included a dedicated lecture focused on planetary health or education for sustainable healthcare.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, this metric receives a score of 0, reflecting the absence of eligible planetary health-focused electives during the reporting period.</i></p>	

Curriculum: Health Effects of Climate Change

1.2. Does your medical school curriculum address the relationship between extreme heat, health risks, and climate change?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

3

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the relationship between extreme heat, health risks, and climate change in depth within the required core curriculum. During the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, students receive structured instruction on the health consequences of extreme heat, including heat exhaustion, heat stroke, dehydration, and cardiovascular stress.

Teaching emphasizes the disproportionate burden of heat-related illness in urban environments such as Washington, DC, highlighting the roles of heat-trapping infrastructure, limited green space, and housing instability. This content is reinforced through case-based discussions that allow students to apply climate science to real-world public health scenarios, meeting criteria for in-depth coverage through dedicated instructional time and applied learning.

1.3. Does your medical school curriculum address the impacts of extreme weather events on individual health and/or on healthcare systems?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the health impacts of extreme weather events briefly within the required core curriculum. During the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, students are introduced to the effects of climate-related disasters such as wildfires, hurricanes, and severe storms on individual health and community well-being. Instruction highlights the disproportionate burden these events place on vulnerable populations, particularly in urban settings.

In addition, connections are made within the cardiovascular curriculum regarding physiologic stress during extreme environmental conditions. However, discussion of extreme weather events is limited in duration and depth, with no dedicated lecture or assignment focused specifically on disaster response, healthcare system preparedness, or long-term system-level impacts. The topic is not revisited longitudinally across later phases of the curriculum.

1.4. Does your medical school curriculum address the impact of climate change on the changing patterns of infectious diseases?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned: 2

*Score explanation:
Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the relationship between climate change and changing patterns of infectious disease briefly within the required core curriculum. During the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, students are introduced to how warming temperatures and environmental disruption influence the geographic distribution of infectious diseases.*

Instruction highlights the expansion of vector-borne illnesses such as malaria and dengue due to shifting mosquito habitats, as well as the role of changing ecosystems in enabling bacteria and fungi to thrive in new regions. While these concepts establish an important foundational understanding of climate-related infectious disease risk, coverage is limited in duration and is not reinforced with dedicated lectures, case-based assignments, or longitudinal integration within the Infectious Disease module.

1.5. Does your medical school curriculum address the respiratory health effects of climate change and air pollution?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned: 2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the respiratory health effects of climate change and air pollution briefly within the required core curriculum. During the M1 Pulmonary block, students learn the pathophysiology, diagnosis, and management of asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, with environmental exposures-including air pollution, tobacco smoke, mold, pollen, and industrial emissions-identified as contributing risk factors.

In addition, the Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession introduces the role of air pollution in exacerbating respiratory disease and emphasizes disparities among communities living near highways, industrial sites, or areas with poor air quality. While these concepts provide important foundational knowledge, instruction is limited in duration and not reinforced through dedicated lectures, assignments, or longitudinal integration across later clinical years.

1.6. Does your medical school curriculum address the cardiovascular health effects of climate change, including increased heat?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

3

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the cardiovascular health effects of climate change in depth within the required core curriculum. During the Population Health Aspects of Cardiovascular Disorders module, students receive structured instruction on how environmental exposures-including extreme heat and chronic air pollution-contribute to cardiovascular morbidity and mortality.

Teaching emphasizes the physiological consequences of heat stress on cardiac output, blood pressure regulation, dehydration, and thrombotic risk, as well as the role of long-term air pollution exposure in promoting systemic inflammation, endothelial dysfunction, fibrosis, and ischemic heart disease. These topics are integrated into core cardiovascular teaching and population-health discussions, meeting criteria for in-depth coverage through dedicated instructional time and clinically relevant learning objectives.

1.7. Does your medical school curriculum address the mental health and neuropsychological effects of environmental degradation and climate change?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in elective coursework. (1 point)	
This topic was not covered. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	2
<p><i>Score explanation:</i> Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the mental health and neuropsychological effects of environmental degradation and climate change briefly within the required core curriculum. During the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, instructors acknowledge the psychological consequences of environmental stressors, including climate-related anxiety and the role of community connectedness and green space in supporting mental well-being.</p> <p>While the curriculum introduces the concept that environmental change can impact mental health, including stress, anxiety, and reduced psychological resilience, coverage is limited in depth. There is no dedicated lecture, longitudinal integration, or clinical skills training focused on diagnosing or managing climate-related mental health conditions such as eco-anxiety, trauma following extreme weather events, or displacement-related stress.</p>	

1.8. Does your <u>medical school</u> curriculum address the relationships between health, individual patient food and water security, ecosystem health, and climate change?	
This topic was explored in depth by the core curriculum. (3 points)	
This topic was briefly covered in the core curriculum. (2 points)	
This topic was covered in elective coursework. (1 point)	
This topic was not covered. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	3
<p><i>Score explanation:</i> Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the relationships between human health, food and water security, ecosystem health, and climate change in depth within the required core curriculum. During the M1 Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, students receive structured instruction on how climate change disrupts food systems, water availability, and ecosystem stability, with direct implications for nutrition, infectious disease risk, and chronic disease outcomes.</p> <p>Instruction includes discussion of agricultural yield disruption, food insecurity, and the environmental co-benefits of plant-forward nutrition, as well as the effects of water contamination and scarcity on population health. These concepts are reinforced through systems-based frameworks linking ecosystem degradation to downstream human health impacts, meeting criteria for in-depth coverage through dedicated instructional time and defined learning objectives.</p>	

1.9. Does your medical school curriculum address the outsized impact of climate change on marginalised populations such as those with low SES, women, communities of colour, Indigenous communities, children, homeless populations, and older adults?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the disproportionate impact of climate change on marginalized populations briefly within the required core curriculum. During the MI Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, instruction highlights how climate-related exposures such as extreme heat, air pollution, housing instability, and limited access to green space disproportionately affect low-socioeconomic status communities and communities of color.

The curriculum introduces the concept of environmental injustice and emphasizes that structural factors-including redlining, urban heat islands, and unequal exposure to environmental hazards-contribute to climate-related health disparities. While these issues are clearly acknowledged, coverage remains introductory and is not reinforced through dedicated learning objectives, extended case-based instruction, or longitudinal integration across clinical clerkships.

1.10. Does your medical school curriculum address the unequal regional health impacts of climate change globally?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the unequal regional health impacts of climate change globally briefly within the required core curriculum. During the MI Environmental Health and Climate Change P3 intersession, students are introduced to the global nature of climate-related health inequities, including how climate change disproportionately affects low- and middle-income countries through food insecurity, water scarcity, displacement, and increased infectious disease burden.

Instruction highlights global disparities in vulnerability and adaptive capacity, emphasizing that populations contributing least to greenhouse gas emissions often experience the greatest health consequences. While these concepts provide an important global framing, coverage is limited in depth and is not reinforced through a dedicated global health module, extended case-based learning, or longitudinal integration across clinical years.

Curriculum: Environmental Health & the Effects of Anthropogenic Toxins on Human Health

1.11. Does your medical school curriculum address the reproductive health effects of industry-related environmental toxins (e.g. air pollution, pesticides, microplastics)?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the reproductive health effects of industry-related environmental toxins briefly within the required core curriculum. During the preclinical curriculum, students are introduced to environmental exposures relevant to reproductive health, including air pollution, endocrine-disrupting chemicals, and teratogenic agents, particularly within foundational teaching on embryology, pregnancy, and teratogenesis.

The curriculum acknowledges that exposures such as pesticides, heavy metals, and environmental pollutants may contribute to adverse pregnancy outcomes and developmental abnormalities. However, discussion of environmental toxins is limited in depth, with no dedicated lecture or longitudinal instruction explicitly focused on the reproductive effects of industrial pollutants, microplastics, or endocrine-disrupting compounds.

1.12. Does your medical school curriculum address important human-caused environmental threats that are relevant to the university's surrounding community?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses human-caused environmental threats relevant to the surrounding Washington, DC community briefly within the core curriculum, primarily during the MI Environmental Health and Climate Change intersession. Instruction highlights local air pollution burdens, particularly in neighborhoods located near major roadways and industrial areas, and discusses the disproportionate prevalence of asthma and chronic respiratory disease among affected populations.

Teaching emphasizes how historic redlining, housing quality, traffic density, and industrial zoning have contributed to environmental exposure disparities within Washington, DC. While these topics provide important local context, they are not explored longitudinally and are not consistently integrated into clinical case-based learning or later clinical years.

1.13. To what extent does your medical school emphasise the importance of Indigenous knowledge and value systems as essential components of planetary health solutions?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

0

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine does not include structured teaching on Indigenous knowledge systems, traditional ecological knowledge, or Indigenous-led approaches to planetary health within the required medical school curriculum. While students are exposed broadly to discussions of health equity and cultural humility, these sessions do not specifically address Indigenous perspectives, Indigenous environmental stewardship practices, or the role of Indigenous knowledge in developing planetary health solutions.

Some students may encounter Indigenous history or culture through optional campus programming, such as visits to the National Museum of the American Indian or university-wide events. However, these experiences are not integrated into the medical school curriculum, are not linked to planetary health learning objectives, and do not involve instruction on Indigenous environmental knowledge or leadership in sustainability.

As a result, Indigenous knowledge is not meaningfully incorporated into planetary health education at GUSOM.

1.14. Does your medical school curriculum address the outsized impact of anthropogenic environmental toxins on marginalised populations such as those with low SES, women,

communities of colour, children, homeless populations, Indigenous populations, and older adults?	
This topic was explored in depth by the core curriculum. (3 points)	
This topic was briefly covered in the core curriculum. (2 points)	
This topic was covered in elective coursework. (1 point)	
This topic was not covered. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i> Georgetown University School of Medicine does not include structured instruction on the disproportionate impact of anthropogenic environmental toxins on marginalized or vulnerable populations within the required medical school curriculum. While students receive foundational teaching in toxicology, pharmacology, and pathology, these topics are not framed within an environmental justice or planetary health context.</p> <p>There is no required content addressing how environmental toxins-such as air pollution, pesticides, heavy metals, or microplastics-disproportionately affect populations including children, pregnant individuals, low-socioeconomic status communities, unhoused populations, Indigenous communities, or older adults. Additionally, the curriculum does not explicitly link environmental exposures to structural factors such as housing segregation, industrial zoning, or historic redlining.</p> <p>As a result, environmental toxins are discussed primarily as biological or mechanistic concepts, rather than as socially patterned exposures contributing to health inequities.</p>	

Curriculum: Sustainability

1.15. Does your <u>medical school</u> curriculum address the environmental and health co-benefits of a plant-based diet?	
This topic was explored in depth by the core curriculum. (3 points)	
This topic was briefly covered in the core curriculum. (2 points)	
This topic was covered in elective coursework. (1 point)	
This topic was not covered. (0 point)	
Score Assigned:	3
<p><i>Score explanation:</i> Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the environmental and health co-benefits of plant-based diets in depth within the core curriculum, primarily during the Nutrition intersession. Students receive structured instruction on the health impacts of dietary patterns, including plant-forward and plant-based diets, with emphasis on cardiovascular and metabolic outcomes.</p>	

The curriculum explicitly connects dietary choices to environmental sustainability, including greenhouse gas emissions, land use, and resource consumption. Faculty highlight the reduced environmental footprint associated with decreased meat intake and discuss plant-based diets as a strategy that simultaneously benefits individual patient health and planetary health. Students are encouraged to critically evaluate dietary recommendations through both clinical and environmental lenses.

1.16. Does your medical school curriculum address the carbon footprint of healthcare systems?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned: 3

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses the carbon footprint of healthcare systems in depth within the required core curriculum, primarily through the MI Environmental Health and Climate Change intersession. Students receive formal instruction on the healthcare sector's contribution to climate change, including discussion that approximately 10% of United States greenhouse gas emissions originate from healthcare-related activities.

Teaching explicitly examines major sources of healthcare emissions, including energy-intensive hospital operations, supply chains, transportation, anesthetic gases, and waste generation. By framing these emissions as systemic contributors to environmental degradation and downstream patient harm, the curriculum emphasizes the ethical responsibility of healthcare professionals to understand and address the environmental impact of their practice.

This content is delivered through dedicated lecture time with clear learning objectives, moving beyond a brief mention and meeting criteria for in-depth coverage.

1.17. Does your medical school curriculum cover these components of sustainable clinical practice in the core curriculum? (points for each)

Score

The health **and** environmental **co-benefits** of **avoiding** over-medicalisation, over-investigation and/or over-treatment (2 points)

2

The environmental impact of **pharmaceuticals** and over-prescribing as a cause of climate health harm. Alternatively teaching on **deprescribing** where possible and its environmental and health co-benefits would fulfil this metric. (2 points) .

0

The health and environmental co-benefits of non-pharmaceutical management of conditions where appropriate such as exercise or yoga classes for type 2 diabetes; social group activities such as gardening for mental health conditions; active transport such as bicycle schemes. This is commonly known as social prescribing in the UK. (1 point)	0
Environmental impact of surgical healthcare on planetary health and the climate crisis, and how can it be mitigated. (1 point)	0
The impact of anaesthetic gases on the healthcare carbon footprint and ways to reduce anaesthesia's environmental impacts, such as total intravenous anaesthesia or choosing less environmentally harmful anaesthetic gas options with reduced greenhouse gas emissions. (1 point)	0
The impact of inhalers on the healthcare carbon footprint and the environmental benefit of dry powdered inhalers over metered dose inhalers. (1 point)	0
Waste production within healthcare clinics and strategies for reducing waste in clinical activities (e.g. single use items in the inpatient or outpatient setting) (1 point)	1
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University School of Medicine addresses several components of sustainable clinical practice within the core curriculum. During the Environmental Health and Climate Change intersession, students are taught the health and environmental co-benefits of avoiding unnecessary diagnostic testing, over-investigation, and low-value medical interventions, emphasizing the relationship between excess medical care, patient harm, and healthcare emissions.</i></p> <p><i>The curriculum also addresses healthcare waste production and strategies to reduce regulated medical waste, highlighting how clinical decision-making influences environmental impact. While the curriculum does not currently include instruction on anesthetic gases, inhaler selection, pharmaceutical deprescribing, or sustainable surgery, the inclusion of high-value care principles and waste reduction strategies meets criteria for partial credit under this metric.</i></p>	

Curriculum: Clinical Applications

1.18. In training for patient encounters, does your <u>medical school's</u> curriculum introduce strategies to have conversations with patients about the health effects of climate change?	
Yes, there are strategies introduced for having conversations with patients about climate change in the core curriculum. (2 points)	
Yes, there are strategies introduced for having conversations with patients about climate change in elective coursework. (1 point)	
No, there are not strategies introduced for having conversations with patients about climate change. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<i>Score explanation:</i>	

Georgetown University School of Medicine does not provide formal training or structured strategies for counseling patients on the health impacts of climate change within the required medical school curriculum. Although students receive didactic instruction on the health effects of climate change during the Environmental Health and Climate Change intersession, this content focuses on knowledge acquisition rather than clinical communication skills.

The curriculum does not include standardized patient encounters, role-play exercises, clinical skills sessions, or communication frameworks designed to guide discussions with patients about climate-related health risks. Additionally, climate-related counseling strategies are not incorporated into clinical clerkships, patient interviewing curricula, or assessment tools.

As a result, students are not explicitly trained to translate climate-health knowledge into patient-facing conversations.

1.19. In training for patient encounters, does your medical school's curriculum introduce strategies for taking an environmental history or exposure history?

Yes, the **core** curriculum includes strategies for taking an environmental history. (2 points)

Only **elective** coursework includes strategies for taking an environmental history. (1 point)

No, the curriculum does **not** include strategies for taking an environmental history. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

0

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine does not provide formal instruction or structured guidance on taking an environmental or exposure history as part of patient encounters. While students receive foundational instruction in history-taking skills, the curriculum does not include specific frameworks, required questions, learning objectives, or clinical skills training focused on eliciting environmental or occupational exposures. Environmental health topics are addressed in didactic content, but students are not taught how to systematically integrate exposure history-taking into patient interviews. As such, this metric is not met within the core or elective curriculum.

Curriculum: Administrative Support for Planetary Health

1.20. Is your medical school currently in the process of implementing or improving Education for Sustainable Healthcare (ESH)/planetary health education?

Yes, the medical school is currently in the process of making **major** improvements to ESH/planetary health education. (4 points)

Yes, the medical school is currently in the process of making **minor** improvements to ESH/planetary health education. (2 points)

No, there are **no** improvements to planetary health education in progress. (0 points)

Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i> <i>Georgetown University School of Medicine does not currently have documented institutional initiatives underway to implement or expand Education for Sustainable Healthcare or planetary health education. While individual electives, workshops, and student-led activities exist, there is no evidence of active curriculum committees–approved changes, funded faculty positions, pilot programs, or longitudinal integration efforts currently in progress. As such, no formal improvements to planetary health education are underway at this time.</i></p>	

<p>1.21. How well are the aforementioned planetary health/Education for Sustainable Healthcare topics integrated longitudinally into the <u>core</u> curriculum?</p>	
<p>Planetary health/ESH topics are well integrated into the core medical school curriculum. (6 points)</p>	
<p>Some planetary health/ESH topics are appropriately integrated into the core medical student curriculum. (4 points)</p>	
<p>Planetary health/ESH is not integrated and is primarily addressed in (a) standalone lecture(s). (2 points)</p>	
<p>There is minimal/no education for sustainable healthcare. (0 points)</p>	
Score Assigned:	2
<p><i>Score explanation:</i> <i>Planetary health and Education for Sustainable Healthcare topics at Georgetown University School of Medicine are primarily delivered through standalone required educational activities, including the M1 P3 Intersession Environmental Health and Climate Change Workshop. While related concepts such as population health and social determinants of health are addressed elsewhere in the curriculum, there is no documented longitudinal integration of planetary health topics across multiple organ-system blocks or across multiple years of the core curriculum. Therefore, ESH education is present but not embedded longitudinally.</i></p>	

<p>1.22. Does your <u>medical school</u> employ a member of faculty to specifically oversee and take responsibility for the incorporation of planetary health and sustainable healthcare as a theme throughout the course?</p>	
<p>Yes, the medical school has a specific faculty/staff member responsible for overseeing curricular integration of planetary health and sustainable healthcare. (1 point)</p>	
<p>No, the medical school does not have a specific faculty/staff member responsible for overseeing curricular integration of planetary health and sustainable healthcare. (0 points)</p>	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p>	

There is no identified faculty or staff member at the medical school with a formally designated role to oversee or take responsibility for the longitudinal integration of planetary health or education for sustainable healthcare within the core curriculum. While individual faculty members may contribute to related teaching or support student initiatives, there is no centralized leadership position responsible for coordinating or embedding planetary health content across courses.

1.23. Does your health professional curriculum include teaching on civic engagement/advocacy to address the environmental and structural determinants of health?

This topic was explored **in depth** by the **core** curriculum. (3 points)

This topic was **briefly** covered in the **core** curriculum. (2 points)

This topic was covered in **elective** coursework. (1 point)

This topic was **not** covered. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

1

Score explanation:

Teaching related to civic engagement and advocacy is available to students primarily through elective or optional components rather than the required core curriculum. These opportunities introduce concepts related to structural and environmental determinants of health, including health equity and community advocacy; however, they are not delivered in a standardized or longitudinal manner to all medical students. As a result, exposure to civic engagement and advocacy training depends on individual student choice rather than universal curricular inclusion.

Section Total (39 out of 75)

52%

Back to Summary Page [here](#)

Are there additional curriculum resources offered at your institution not yet asked about that you would like to describe? If so, please do so below.

Interdisciplinary Research

Section Overview: This section evaluates the quality and quantity of interdisciplinary planetary health research at the broader institution. Interactions between health and the environment are complex and multifactorial. While climate change has been extensively studied from an environmental science perspective, planetary health is an emerging field. As leading health institutions with talented researchers and research resources, institutions should fund research studying the health effects of climate change and anthropogenic environmental toxins. This obligation is particularly strong because the public and policymakers are more attentive to climate change when its implications for human health are emphasised.

2.1. Are there researchers engaged in planetary health research and healthcare sustainability research at your institution?

Yes, there are faculty members at the **institution** who have a **primary** research focus in planetary health **or** sustainable healthcare/vetcare. (3 points)

Yes, there are individual faculty members at the **institution** who are conducting research **related** to planetary health or healthcare sustainability, **OR** are part of a national/international sustainability working group, but it is not their primary research focus. (2 points)

There are sustainability researchers at the **institution**, but not specifically associated with healthcare/vetcare. (1 point)

No, there are **no** planetary health and/or sustainability researchers at the **institution** at this time. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

There are individual faculty members at the institution who conduct research related to planetary health and healthcare sustainability, including work focused on climate and environmental health education and related policy-relevant topics. However, planetary health is not the primary research focus for most current faculty within the School of Medicine, and several former leaders in this area have departed the institution in recent years. While related research activity exists across the university and affiliated centers, it is limited within the medical school and not consolidated within a dedicated planetary health research program, supporting a score of 2 points.

2.2. Is there a dedicated department or institute for interdisciplinary planetary health research at your institution?

There is **at least one** dedicated department or institute for interdisciplinary planetary health research. (3 points)

There is **not currently** a department or institute for interdisciplinary planetary health research, but there are **plans** to open one in the next 3 years. (2 points)

There is an Occupational and Environmental Health department , but no interdisciplinary department or institute for planetary health research. (1 point)	
There is no dedicated department or institute. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation: Georgetown University School of Medicine does not have a dedicated department or institute specifically focused on interdisciplinary planetary health research. While the broader university hosts entities such as The Earth Commons – Institute for Environment & Sustainability and the Georgetown Climate Center, these institutes are not housed within the medical school and do not function as a dedicated planetary health research department for GUSOM. As such, there is no formal departmental or institutional structure within the medical school that oversees interdisciplinary planetary health research, supporting a score of 0 points.</i></p>	

2.3. Is there a process by which communities disproportionately impacted by climate change and environmental injustice give input or make decisions about the research agenda at your <u>institution</u>?	
Yes, there is a process in which community members impacted by climate and environmental injustice have decision-making power in the climate + environmental research agenda. (3 points)	
Yes, there is a process in which community members impacted by climate and environmental injustice advise the climate + environmental research agenda. (2 points)	
No , but there are current efforts to establish a process for community members to advise or make decisions on the research agenda. (1 point)	
There is no process, and no efforts to create such a process. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	1
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>There is no formal, medical-school-wide process through which communities disproportionately impacted by climate change or environmental injustice have decision-making authority over the planetary or environmental health research agenda. However, current efforts within the broader university-including initiatives housed in interdisciplinary institutes and community-engaged research programs - incorporate community perspectives through outreach, partnerships, and advisory activities. While these efforts demonstrate movement toward community-informed research, they do not constitute a standardized or guaranteed mechanism for community members to advise or make decisions regarding the research agenda at the institutional level, supporting a score of 1 point.</i></p>	

2.4. Does your <u>institution</u> have a planetary health website that centralises ongoing and past research related to health and the environment?
--

There is an easy-to-use, adequately comprehensive website that centralises various campus resources related to health and the environment including all of the following: upcoming events, leaders in planetary health at your institution, and relevant funding opportunities. (3 points)	
There is a website that attempts to centralise various campus resources related to health and the environment, but it is hard-to-use, not updated, or not adequately comprehensive. (2 points)	
The institution has an Office of Sustainability website that includes some resources related to health and the environment. (1 point)	
There is no website. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	1
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The institution maintains sustainability-focused websites, including The Earth Commons – Institute for Environment & Sustainability and the Georgetown Climate Center, which provide information related to environmental issues, climate policy, and selected health-related content. These sites include educational resources, events, and research activities relevant to the environment and sustainability. However, there is no single, comprehensive planetary health website that centralizes ongoing and past health-and-environment research across the medical school or institution, including faculty leadership, funded projects, and research opportunities. As the existing webpages provide partial but not comprehensive coverage, this metric meets criteria for 1 point.</i></p>	

2.5. Has your <u>institution</u> recently hosted a conference or symposium on topics related to planetary health?	
Yes, the institution has hosted at least one conference or symposium on topics related to planetary health in the past year. (4 points)	
Yes, the institution has hosted at least one conference or symposium on topics related to sustainable healthcare/vetcare in the past year. (3 points)	
Yes, the institution has hosted a conference on topics related to planetary health / sustainable healthcare/vetcare in the past three years. (2 points)	
The institution has not hosted any conferences directly, but they have provided financial support for a local planetary health event. (1 point)	
No, the institution has not hosted a conference on topics related to planetary health in the past three years. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University has hosted multiple conferences and symposia related to sustainability, climate policy, ethics, and environmental studies; however, within the past three years, the institution has not hosted a conference or symposium explicitly focused on planetary health or sustainable healthcare/vetcare. Recent events-including interdisciplinary climate, humanities, and</i></p>	

policy-focused symposia-have not centered on the health impacts of climate change or healthcare sustainability. As no qualifying planetary health or sustainable healthcare conference has been identified within the required three-year timeframe, this metric is scored as 0 points.

2.6. Is your institution a member of a national or international planetary health or ESH/ESV organisation?

Yes, the institution is a member of a national or international planetary health or ESH/ESV organisation. (1 point)

No, the institution is **not** a member of such an organisation. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

1

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine (GUSOM) is a member of the Global Consortium on Climate and Health Education, a national and international collaborative organization dedicated to advancing climate and health education across health professional schools. This consortium supports curricular development, faculty training, and institutional collaboration focused on the health impacts of climate change. Although GUSOM is not currently a member of the Planetary Health Alliance, membership in the Global Consortium on Climate and Health Education fulfills the criteria for this metric.

Section Total (5 out of 17)

29.41%

Back to Summary Page [here](#)

Are there additional research resources offered at your medical school or institution not yet asked about that you would like to describe? If so, please do so below.

Community Outreach and Advocacy

Section Overview: *This section evaluates a school's engagement in community outreach and advocacy efforts associated with planetary health. Researching and teaching planetary health is necessary but not sufficient. It is critical that institutions also directly engage with communities most affected by environmental health harms. Although climate change is a problem largely created by those with power and resources, its impacts fall disproportionately on under-resourced populations and communities of colour. Institutions should partner with local communities affected by climate change and pollution to share information about environmental health threats, advocate together for change, and provide opportunities for students to be a part of this work.*

3.1. Does your <u>institution</u> partner with community organisations to promote planetary and health?	
Yes, the institution meaningfully partners with multiple community organisations to promote planetary and environmental health. (3 points)	
Yes, the institution meaningfully partners with one community organisation to promote planetary and environmental health. (2 points)	
The institution does not partner with community organisations, but participates in community focused events relating to planetary health. (1 point)	
No, there is no such meaningful community partnership. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	1
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>While Georgetown University School of Medicine (GUSOM) participates in community service activities through student-led initiatives such as the Hoya Clinic, there are no formal or structured community partnerships specifically focused on planetary or environmental health. Several climate- and environment-focused volunteer sites (e.g., EcoAction Arlington and Ward 8 Woods Conservancy) are approved for completion of the required medical school community service hours; however, these opportunities are not formal institutional collaborations and are not coordinated through GUSOM as longitudinal partnerships.</i></p> <p><i>At the broader university level, the Georgetown Climate Center engages with local, state, and federal policymakers on climate mitigation and adaptation, and the Earth Commons – Institute for Environment & Sustainability supports community engagement initiatives such as the Hoya Harvest Garden and environmental volunteer programs. Although the GUSOM Environmental Health and Medicine (EHM) Track is listed as a partner on the Earth Commons website, no formal joint programming or recurring initiatives currently exist between GUSOM and these community partners. Therefore, community partnerships related to planetary health exist at the institutional level, but not within the medical school itself.</i></p>	

3.2. Does your institution offer community-facing courses or events regarding planetary health?

The **institution** offers community-facing courses or events at least once every year. (3 points)

The **institution** offers courses or events open to the community at least once per year, but they are not primarily created for a community audience. (2 points)

The **institution** has promoted community-facing courses or events, but was not involved in planning those courses or events. (1 point)

The **institution** has not offered such community-facing courses or events. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

1

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine has not independently offered community-facing courses or events focused on planetary or environmental health. However, the broader university regularly hosts public-facing events addressing environmental sustainability and climate justice. Notably, the Earth Commons hosts weekly “EcoTalks,” a community-facing seminar series featuring national and international experts presenting on environmental research, sustainability initiatives, and climate solutions.

Additional community-open programming is hosted by other Georgetown schools, including the O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law and the McCourt School of Public Policy. Examples include lectures such as “Environmental and Climate Justice Politics and Practice in Troubled Times” (Spring 2025) and “Racism, Colonialism, and Climate Change: Uncovering Injustices in Impacts and Responses.” While these events are open to medical students and faculty, GUSOM is not involved in the planning or hosting of these programs. As such, the institution offers community-facing planetary health events, but the medical school itself does not play an active role.

3.3. Does your institution have regular coverage of issues related to planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare in university update communications?

Yes, all students **regularly** receive communication updates dedicated to planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare. (2 points)

Yes, planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare topics are regularly included in communication updates to **some courses**. (1 point)

Students **do not** receive communications about planetary health or sustainable healthcare. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Students across Georgetown University regularly receive institution-wide communications dedicated to environmental sustainability and planetary health. The “Green, Blue & Gray Newsletter,” co-sponsored by the Office of Sustainability and the Earth Commons, is distributed to all students each academic semester and provides updates focused specifically on environmental initiatives, sustainability programming, educational opportunities, and upcoming climate-related events.

Recent editions have included information on Earth Day programming, environmental symposia, sustainability degree offerings, and updates related to the Environmental Health and Medicine Track established in 2022. In addition, students may opt to receive more frequent planetary health-related communications through the Earth Commons’ ECo Newsletter, which provides ongoing updates on campus sustainability efforts, research activities, and events.

These communications are centrally distributed, recurring, and dedicated to planetary health and sustainability topics, meeting the criteria for regular institutional updates to all students.

3.4. Does the institution or main affiliated hospital trust engage in professional education activities targeting individuals post-graduation with the aim of ensuring their knowledge and skills in planetary health and sustainable healthcare remain up to date during their professional career?

Yes, the **institution** or **main affiliated hospital trust** offers multiple in-person or online courses relating to planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare for post-graduate providers, including at least one with a primary focus of planetary health. (2 points)

Yes, the **institution** or **main affiliated hospital trust** offers one course relating to planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare for post-graduate providers. (1 point)

There are **no** such accessible courses for post-graduate providers. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

1

Score explanation:

The institution’s primary affiliated health system, MedStar Health, offers at least one accredited continuing medical education (CME) activity related to planetary health and environmental sustainability. Through MedStar Health’s Interprofessional Continuing Education (IPCE) program-accredited by the ACCME, ACPE, and ANCC-providers have access to the online CME module “Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and Health Equity.”

This activity, available from May 2025 through April 2028, addresses climate systems, environmental degradation, health equity, and the impacts of climate change on vulnerable populations. While this course is not administered directly through the Georgetown University School of Medicine, it is accessible to post-graduate providers within the institution’s affiliated hospital system and fulfills accredited CME requirements.

At present, there are no multiple CME offerings with a primary focus on planetary health, but the availability of this single accredited course meets the criteria for one post-graduate educational opportunity related to planetary health and sustainable healthcare.

3.5. Does your institution or its affiliated teaching hospitals have accessible educational materials for patients about environmental health exposures?

Yes, the **institution** or **all affiliated hospitals** have accessible educational materials for patients. (2 points)

Some affiliated hospitals have accessible educational materials for patients. (1 point)

No affiliated medical centres have accessible educational materials for patients. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

0

Score explanation:

No affiliated medical centers within the MedStar Health system, including MedStar Georgetown University Hospital (MGUH), currently provide accessible patient-facing educational materials addressing environmental health exposures such as pesticides, industrial chemicals, air pollution, or environmental toxins.

While Georgetown University's Environmental Health and Safety Office offers internal training resources related to hazardous materials and environmental safety, these materials are intended for faculty, staff, and students and are not designed for patient education. A review of publicly available hospital patient education libraries and MedStar Health patient resources did not identify brochures, handouts, or online materials focused on environmental exposure risks.

At this time, there are no accessible environmental health educational materials available for patients across affiliated hospitals, and therefore this metric does not meet criteria for partial or full points.

3.6. Does your institution or its affiliated teaching hospitals have accessible educational materials for patients about the health impacts of climate change?

Yes, the **institution** or **all affiliated hospitals** have accessible educational materials for patients. (2 points)

Some affiliated hospitals have accessible educational materials for patients. (1 point)	
No affiliated hospitals have accessible educational materials for patients. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>No hospitals within Georgetown University's affiliated MedStar Health system, including MedStar Georgetown University Hospital (MGUH), provide accessible patient-facing educational materials specifically addressing the health impacts of climate change. A review of publicly available hospital patient education libraries, discharge resources, and online patient portals did not identify brochures, webpages, or handouts focused on climate-related health risks such as extreme heat, air quality, flooding, or climate-related mental health effects.</i></p> <p><i>Although the Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) process identifies major community health priorities, climate change and its associated health impacts are not currently included as a focus area, and corresponding patient education materials are not provided. Existing environmental safety resources within the institution are intended for internal operational use rather than patient education.</i></p> <p><i>As no affiliated hospitals offer accessible patient education materials on the health impacts of climate change at this time, this metric does not meet criteria for partial or full points.</i></p>	
Section Total (5 out of 14)	35.71%

Back to Summary Page [here](#)

Are there additional community engagement and advocacy resources offered at your medical school or institution not yet asked about that you would like to describe? If so, please do so below.

Support for Student-Led Planetary Health Initiatives

Section Overview: This section evaluates institutional support for student-led planetary health initiatives, such as funding, fellowships, programming, and student groups. Planetary health is a young field and, as young people facing a future deeply shaped by climate change, students are often some of the first at an institution to engage with it. Institutions should provide support for students to engage in sustainability quality improvement (QI) initiatives, discover mentors in their area of interest, and receive funding for planetary health projects.

4.1. Does your <u>institution</u> offer support for students interested in enacting a sustainability initiative/QI project?	
Yes, the institution <i>either</i> offers grants for students to enact sustainability initiatives/QI projects <i>or</i> sustainability QI projects are part of the core curriculum. (2 points)	
The institution encourages sustainability QI projects (to fulfil clerkship or longitudinal requirements) and offers resources to help students succeed in these projects, but there is no student funding available and there is no requirement to participate. (1 point)	
No, the institution does not offer opportunities or support for sustainability initiatives or QI projects. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<i>Score explanation:</i>	
<i>Georgetown University School of Medicine does not currently provide medical school-specific funding, grants, or structured curricular support for student-led sustainability initiatives or sustainability-focused quality improvement (QI) projects. While campus-wide funding opportunities exist through entities such as the Earth Commons, Eco Impact Awards, and Green Commons Awards, these programs are not administered by the School of Medicine and are not integrated into the medical curriculum. There is no dedicated GUSOM funding mechanism, required sustainability QI component, or formal institutional structure to support medical student sustainability or planetary health projects at this time.</i>	

4.2. Does your <u>institution</u> offer opportunities for students to do research related to planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare/vetcare?	
The institution has a specific research program or fellowship for students interested in doing planetary health/sustainable healthcare/vetcare research. (2 points)	
There are research opportunities for students to perform research related to planetary health/sustainable healthcare, but these require student initiative to seek them out and carry them out in their spare time. (1 point)	
There are no opportunities for students to engage in planetary health/sustainable healthcare research. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0

Score explanation:

Georgetown University offers opportunities for medical students to engage in planetary health-related research; however, these opportunities are not structured as a dedicated research program or fellowship and require individual student initiative to identify mentors and projects. Students may participate in interdisciplinary research through entities such as the Planetary Health Lab within the Center for Global Health Science and Security, the Environmental Health and Medicine Track, the Global Health Institute, and university-wide initiatives housed within the Earth Commons. While these programs provide meaningful avenues for engagement, research participation is not centralized, formally funded by the medical school, or protected within the curriculum, and typically occurs on a voluntary or extracurricular basis.

4.3. Does the institution have a webpage where students can find specific information related to planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare/vetcare activities and mentors within the institution? For example, projects achieved, current initiatives underway at the medical school and/or contact of information of potential mentors.

The institution has a webpage with specific information related to planetary health or sustainable healthcare/vetcare that includes up-to-date information on relevant initiatives and contact information of potential mentors. (2 points)

There is an institution webpage that features some information on projects and mentors within planetary health and sustainable healthcare within the institution, but it lacks key information. (1 point)

There is **no institution** specific webpage for locating planetary health and/or sustainable healthcare projects or mentors. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

0

Score explanation:

Georgetown University School of Medicine does not currently maintain an institution-specific webpage that centralizes information on planetary health or sustainable healthcare opportunities for medical students. There is no dedicated site listing active or completed projects, faculty mentors, contact information, or current initiatives related to planetary health within the medical school. While broader university resources exist (e.g., general faculty directories, research center websites, and university sustainability pages), these are not consolidated, health-specific, or designed to guide medical students toward planetary health research or mentorship opportunities.

4.4. Does your institution have registered student groups dedicated towards fostering a culture of planetary health engagement, scholarship, and advocacy on campus, supported by faculty advisors?

Yes, there is a student organisation **with faculty support** at my institution dedicated to planetary health or sustainability in healthcare. (2 points)

Yes, there is a student organisation at my institution dedicated to planetary health or sustainability in healthcare but it lacks faculty support . (1 point)	
No, there is not a student organisation at my institution dedicated to planetary health or sustainability in healthcare. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	2
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University School of Medicine has registered student organizations dedicated to planetary health and sustainability in healthcare that are supported by faculty advisors. These include Climate Health and Medical Sustainability (CHMS), an officially recognized medical student organization focused on climate-health education, advocacy, and programming, as well as a campus chapter of Medical Students for a Sustainable Future (MS4SF), a national network supporting physician engagement in climate and health. Both organizations provide structured opportunities for student leadership, scholarly engagement, and advocacy with faculty mentorship, fulfilling criteria for a faculty-supported student organization dedicated to planetary health.</i></p>	

4.5. Is there a student liaison representing sustainability interests who serves on a <u>department or institutional</u> decision-making council to advocate for curriculum reform and/or sustainability best practices?	
Yes, there is a student representative who serves on a department or institutional decision-making council/committee. (1 point)	
No, there is no such student representative. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University School of Medicine does not currently have a formal student liaison or designated student representative for sustainability who serves on a departmental or institutional decision-making council. While students may engage in sustainability-related advocacy through extracurricular organizations and academic tracks, there is no officially appointed role that provides medical students with representation on curriculum committees, sustainability councils, or institutional governance bodies with authority to influence sustainability policy or curriculum reform.</i></p>	

4.6. In the past year, has the <u>institution</u> had one or more co-curricular planetary health programs or initiatives in the following categories? (1 point each)	Score
Projects where students are able to gain experience in organic agriculture and sustainable food systems, such as gardens, farms, community supported agriculture (CSA), fishery programs, or urban agriculture projects.	1

Panels, speaker series, or similar events related to planetary health that have students as an intended audience.	1
Events in which students learn directly from members of a local environmental justice community about the climate and environmental challenges they face, and how health professionals can partner with their community to address these exposures and impacts.	1
Cultural arts events, installations or performances related to planetary health that have students as an intended audience.	0
Local volunteer opportunities related to building community resilience to anthropogenic environmental impacts.	1
Wilderness or outdoors programs (e.g., that organise hiking, backpacking, kayaking, or other outings for students)	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University offers several co-curricular opportunities related to planetary health across multiple categories, though these are largely coordinated at the university level rather than through the School of Medicine specifically. Students may engage in organic agriculture and sustainable food systems through the Hoya Harvest Garden, which provides hands-on experience in urban gardening, composting, aquaponics, and food sustainability initiatives.</i></p> <p><i>Panels and speaker events related to planetary health have been offered through student organizations such as Climate Health and Medical Sustainability (CHMS), which previously hosted climate-health focused talks intended for medical students.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunities to learn from environmental justice communities are available through university-wide organizations, including the Georgetown Renewable Energy and Environmental Network (GREEN), which maintains an environmental justice team connecting students with local community partners.</i></p> <p><i>Students may also participate in volunteer opportunities supporting community resilience, including programs coordinated by the Office of Sustainability such as the annual Move-Out Drive and external partnerships like the Ward 7 Resilience Hub Community Coalition, which focuses on preparedness for extreme weather and emergencies.</i></p> <p><i>There were no documented cultural arts events related to planetary health aimed at medical students in the past year; nor were there wilderness or outdoor programs structured around planetary health or Leave No Trace principles.</i></p>	

Section Total (6 out of 15)	40%
------------------------------------	------------

Back to Summary Page [here](#)

Are there additional student-led initiative resources offered at your medical school or institution not yet asked about that you would like to describe? If so, please do so below.

Campus Sustainability

Section Overview: *This section evaluates the support and engagement in sustainability initiatives by the institution. The healthcare industry is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions as well as pollution that harms local, regional, and global ecosystems. While healthcare is, by nature, a resource-intensive endeavour, the healthcare sector is well poised to lead the world to a more sustainable future. This will involve scrutinising every aspect of how our systems operate, from where we source our energy, to how we build our infrastructure, to what companies we invest in. Our institutions, clinics, and hospitals must set the standard for sustainable practices, and show other sectors what is possible when it comes to minimising environmental impact.*

5.1. Does your <u>institution</u> have an Office of Sustainability?	
Yes, there is an Office of Sustainability with multiple full-time staff dedicated to campus sustainability. If the Office of Sustainability serves the entire campus, there is at least one designated staff member for sustainability at the hospital. (3 points)	
There is an Office of Sustainability with one or more full-time staff dedicated to campus sustainability, but no specific staff member in charge of hospital sustainability. (2 points)	
There are no salaried sustainability staff , but there is a sustainability task force or committee. (1 point)	
There are no staff members or task force responsible for overseeing campus sustainability. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	2
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University has an established Office of Sustainability with multiple full-time staff dedicated to university-wide sustainability planning, energy management, waste reduction, and campus engagement. However, there is no designated staff member specifically responsible for sustainability initiatives at the medical school or affiliated hospitals. As a result, while institutional sustainability leadership exists, medical school- or hospital-specific sustainability oversight is not formally assigned, meeting criteria for partial credit.</i></p>	

5.2. How ambitious is your <u>institution's</u> plan to reduce its own carbon footprint?	
The institution has a written and approved plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030 (5 points)	
The institution has a written and approved plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2040 (3 points)	
The institution has a stated goal of carbon neutrality by 2040 but has not created a plan to reach that goal or the plan is inadequate (1 point)	
The institution does not meet any of the requirements listed above (0 points)	

Score Assigned:	3
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University has a written and publicly available Sustainability Plan that commits the institution to achieving carbon neutrality by 2040. The plan outlines institution-wide strategies including renewable energy procurement, energy efficiency upgrades, emissions tracking, and phased greenhouse gas reductions. While the target year does not meet the highest benchmark of carbon neutrality by 2030, the existence of a written and approved plan with defined strategies meets criteria for a score of 3 points.</i></p>	

<p>5.3. Do buildings/infrastructure used by the institution for teaching (not including the hospital) utilize renewable energy?</p>	
<p>Yes, institution buildings are 100% powered by renewable energy. (3 points)</p>	
<p>Institution buildings source >80% of energy needs from off-site and/or on-site renewable energy. (2 points)</p>	
<p>Institution buildings source >20% of energy needs from off-site and/or on-site renewable energy. (1 point)</p>	
<p>Institution buildings source <20% of energy needs from off-site and/or on-site renewable energy. (0 points)</p>	
Score Assigned:	0
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University purchases renewable energy credits (RECs) and participates in off-site renewable energy agreements that offset a portion of institutional electricity use. However, the buildings used by the medical school for teaching are not directly powered by on-site or off-site renewable energy sources at levels exceeding 20% of total energy demand. Most campus buildings, including those used for medical education, continue to rely primarily on conventional grid electricity and natural gas for heating. As a result, the institution does not meet the threshold required to receive points for this metric.</i></p>	

<p>5.4. Are sustainable building practices utilised for new and old buildings on the <u>institution's</u> campus, with design and construction of new buildings and remodelling of old buildings conforming to a published sustainability rating system or building code/guideline?</p>	
<p>Yes, sustainable building practices are utilised for new buildings on the institution's campus and the majority of old buildings have been retrofitted to be more sustainable. (3 points)</p>	

Sustainable building practices are utilised for new buildings on the institution’s campus, but most old buildings have not been retrofitted . (2 points)	
Sustainable building practices are inadequately or incompletely implemented for new buildings. (1 point)	
Sustainability is not considered in the construction of new buildings. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	2
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University utilizes sustainable building practices for new construction and major renovations, requiring projects to meet at least LEED Silver certification standards, with several buildings achieving LEED Gold. These standards incorporate energy efficiency, water conservation, stormwater management, and sustainable materials. However, while new buildings follow established sustainability rating systems, the majority of older campus buildings-including some facilities used for medical education-have not yet undergone comprehensive sustainability retrofits. Therefore, the institution meets criteria for sustainable practices in new buildings, but not for retrofitting most existing buildings.</i></p>	

5.5. Has the <u>institution</u> implemented strategies to encourage and provide environmentally-friendly transportation options for students and reduce the environmental impact of commuting?	
Yes, the institution has implemented strategies to encourage and provide environmentally-friendly transportation options such as safe active transport, public transport, or carpooling and these options are well-utilised by students. Alternatively, the campus location is not amenable to unsustainable forms of transportation by default. (2 points)	
The institution has implemented some strategies to provide environmentally-friendly transportation options, but the options are unsatisfactorily accessible or advertised. (1 point)	
The institution has not implemented strategies to encourage and provide environmentally-friendly transportation options. (0 points)	
Score Assigned:	2
<p><i>Score explanation:</i></p> <p><i>Georgetown University has implemented multiple strategies to encourage environmentally friendly transportation and reduce commuting-related emissions. These include a free campus shuttle system (GUTS), discounted Capital Bikeshare memberships, extensive bike racks and repair stations, and strong access to public transportation due to the institution’s urban location. The campus layout supports walking and cycling, and these transportation options are widely used by students. Together, these measures meet criteria for well-utilized, accessible, and environmentally friendly transportation options.</i></p>	

5.6. Does your institution have an organics recycling program (compost) and a conventional recycling program (aluminium/paper/plastic/glass)?

Yes, the institution has **both** compost **and** recycling programs accessible to students and faculty. (2 points)

The institution has **either** recycling **or** compost programs accessible to students and faculty, but not both. (1 point)

There is **no** compost or recycling program at the institution. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University provides both conventional recycling and organics recycling programs that are accessible to students and faculty. Single-stream recycling bins for paper, plastic, metal, glass, and cardboard are available throughout campus, including medical school–used buildings. In addition, composting is implemented in dining facilities, at campus events, and in commonly accessed areas through the Office of Sustainability’s waste management program. Together, these systems ensure that both recycling and composting options are available to the medical school community, meeting the criteria for full points.

5.7. Does the institution apply sustainability criteria when making decisions about the campus food and beverage selections (e.g. local sourcing, reduced meat, decreased plastic packaging)?

Yes, the institution has **adequate** sustainability requirements for food and beverages, including meat-free days or no red-meat, and **is engaged** in efforts to increase food and beverage sustainability. (3 points)

There are sustainability guidelines for food and beverages, but they are **insufficient or optional**. The institution **is engaged** in efforts to increase food and beverage sustainability. (2 points)

There are sustainability guidelines for food and beverages, but they are **insufficient or optional**. The institution is **not** engaged in efforts to increase food and beverage sustainability. (1 point)

There are **no** sustainability guidelines for food and beverages. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University has established sustainability guidelines for campus food and beverage operations, including efforts to increase plant-based offerings, promote local and seasonal sourcing, provide Fair Trade–certified beverages, and reduce single-use plastics and food waste. These practices demonstrate active institutional engagement in improving food and beverage sustainability. However, the guidelines are not mandatory across all dining venues, and

requirements such as meat-free days or universal procurement standards are not consistently enforced. Therefore, the institution meets the criteria for sustainability guidelines that are optional but supported by ongoing sustainability efforts.

5.8. Does the institution apply sustainability criteria when making decisions about supply procurement?

Yes, the institution has **adequate** sustainability requirements for supply procurement **and** is **engaged** in efforts to increase sustainability of procurement. (3 points)

There are sustainability guidelines for supply procurement, but they are **insufficient or optional**. The institution is **engaged** in efforts to increase sustainability of procurement. (2 points)

There are sustainability guidelines for supply procurement, but they are **insufficient or optional**. The institution is **not engaged** in efforts to increase sustainability of procurement. (1 point)

There are **no** sustainability guidelines for supply procurement. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

2

Score explanation:

Georgetown University has published sustainability guidelines that inform supply procurement decisions, including recommendations to purchase environmentally preferable products, minimize packaging, and prioritize vendors that meet environmental and social responsibility standards. These guidelines are promoted through institutional programs such as the Green Office Program and sustainable purchasing resources. However, the guidelines are optional rather than mandatory, and there are no universal procurement requirements enforced across all departments or the medical school. Despite this, the institution is actively engaged in efforts to increase sustainable procurement practices, meeting the criteria for 2 points.

5.9. Are there sustainability requirements or guidelines for events hosted at the institution?

Every event hosted at the institution **must** abide by sustainability criteria. (2 points)

The institution **strongly recommends or incentivizes** sustainability measures, but they are **not required**. (1 point)

There are **no** sustainability guidelines for institution events. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

1

Score explanation:

Georgetown University provides sustainability guidance for events through institutional resources such as the Green Event Guide, which outlines recommended practices to reduce waste, minimize

single-use plastics, encourage reusable materials, and promote environmentally responsible catering and logistics. These sustainability measures are actively promoted and available to all campus groups, including those hosting medical school–related events. However, adherence to these guidelines is voluntary rather than mandatory, and events are not required to meet formal sustainability criteria. Therefore, this metric meets the criteria for 1 point.

5.10. Does your institution have programs and initiatives to assist with making lab spaces more environmentally sustainable?

Yes, the institution has **programs** and **initiatives** to assist with making lab spaces more environmentally sustainable. (2 points)

There are **guidelines** on how to make lab spaces more environmentally sustainable, but not programs or initiatives. (1 point)

There are **no** efforts at the institution to make lab spaces more sustainable. (0 points)

Score Assigned:

1

Score explanation:

Georgetown University provides guidance on improving laboratory sustainability through institutional environmental health and safety resources, including recommendations related to energy efficiency, chemical management, waste reduction, and best practices for laboratory operations. These materials offer general direction for reducing the environmental impact of research spaces. However, there is no formal Green Labs program, certification process, or coordinated institutional initiative specifically designed to support or incentivize sustainable laboratory practices within the medical school. Therefore, this metric meets criteria for 1 point.

5.11. Does your institution's endowment portfolio investments include fossil-fuel companies?

The institution is **entirely divested** from fossil fuels **and** has made a **commitment to reinvest divested funds** into renewable energy companies or renewable energy campus initiatives. (4 points)

The institution is **entirely divested** from fossil fuels. (3 points)

The institution has **partially divested** from fossil fuel companies **or** has made a **commitment to fully divest**, but **currently** still has fossil fuel investments. (2 points)

The institution has **not divested** from fossil-fuel companies, but faculty and/or students are **conducting organised advocacy** for divestment. (1 point)

Yes, the institution has investments with fossil-fuel companies and there have been **no efforts** to change that. (0 points)

Score Assigned:	1
-----------------	---

Score explanation:

Georgetown University provides guidance on improving laboratory sustainability through institutional environmental health and safety resources, including recommendations related to energy efficiency, chemical management, waste reduction, and best practices for laboratory operations. These materials offer general direction for reducing the environmental impact of research spaces. However, there is no formal Green Labs program, certification process, or coordinated institutional initiative specifically designed to support or incentivize sustainable laboratory practices within the medical school. Therefore, this metric meets criteria for 1 point.

Section Total (18 out of 32)	56.25%
-------------------------------------	---------------

Back to Summary Page [here](#)

Are there additional sustainability resources offered at your medical school or institution not yet asked about that you would like to describe? If so, please do so below.

Grading

Section Overview

This section focuses on the grading of the report card. The institution received a grade for each of the individual sections as well as an overall institutional grade. Section point totals were tallied, divided by the total points available for the section, and converted to a percentage. The overall institutional grade is a weighted average of the section grades, with curriculum receiving a higher weight owing to its larger number of metrics. Letter grades for each section and the institution overall were then assigned according to the table below.

Letter Grade*	Percentage
A	80% - 100%
B	60% - 79%
C	40% - 59%
D	20% - 39%
F	0% - 19%

**Within each grade bracket, a score in the top 5% (_5 to _9%), receives a “+”, and a score in the bottom 5% (_0- _4%) receives a “--”. For example, a percentage score of 78% would be a B+.*

Please use our PHRC Score Calculator to calculate % and grades. Link [HERE](#) - This ensures everyone is adhering to same round rules and the overall grades are calculated properly.

Planetary Health Grades for the Georgetown School of Medicine.

The following table presents the individual section grades and overall institutional grade for the Georgetown School of Medicine on this Planetary Health Report Card.

Section	Raw Score %	Letter Grade
Planetary Health Curriculum (30%)	$(39/75) \times 100 = 52\%$	C
Interdisciplinary Research (17.5%)	$(5/17) \times 100 = 29.41\%$	D
Community Outreach and Advocacy (17.5%)	$(5/14) \times 100 = 35.71\%$	D+
Support for Student-led Planetary Health Initiatives (17.5%)	$(6/15) \times 100 = 40\%$	C-
Campus Sustainability (17.5%)	$(18/32) \times 100 = 56.25\%$	C+
Institutional Grade	$(A \times 0.3 + B \times 0.175 + C \times 0.175 + D \times 0.175 + E \times 0.175) = F\%$	C-

Report Card Trends

Section Overview

This graph demonstrates trends in overall and section grades for the years in which [INSTITUTION NAME] has participated in the Planetary Health Report Card initiative.

For those teams that have participated in the PHRC initiative for more than one year, we have created a Google spreadsheet which can be used to generate a graphical representation of the school's trends of section-based and overall scores. Please create a copy of the Google spreadsheet so you can have a version long term to update and edit.

Here is the link to the spreadsheet to create your graph.

