Research Paper

EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review-Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume - 14, Issue - 2, February 2026 | e-ISSN: 2347 - 9671| p- ISSN: 2349 – 0187

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.885 || ISI Value: 1.433 || Journal DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2012

CAMPUS SUSTAINABILITY AND REAL ESTATE VALUE: THE ESG IMPERATIVE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Delfor Tito Aquino[1] | Hannan V. Zubizarreta[2] | Américo Juan Tito Aliaga[3]

[1] School of Architecture, University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain.
[2] School of Architecture, University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain.
[3] Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture – Professional School of Architecture and Urban Planning, National University of the Altiplano – Puno, Peru.

ABSTRACT DOI No: 10.36713/epra26287 Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra26287

This study examines the intersection of campus sustainability, real estate value, and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles within higher education institutions (HEIs). Drawing on empirical evidence from university sustainability frameworks and real estate valuation literature, we develop an integrated model that demonstrates how sustainable campus practices enhance both institutional reputation and property asset values. Our analysis reveals that universities implementing comprehensive ESG strategies experience significant improvements in their campus real estate valuations, with sustainability-certified buildings commanding premium values of up to 15% compared to conventional structures.

The findings indicate that higher education agglomeration positively influences firm ESG performance through human capital development, while campus sustainability initiatives create tangible financial returns through energy efficiency, reduced operational costs, and enhanced stakeholder engagement. This research contributes to the emerging literature on sustainable university management by establishing quantitative linkages between ESG implementation and real estate value creation, providing a roadmap for institutional decision-makers seeking to align sustainability objectives with financial performance.

KEYWORDS: ***Campus Sustainability, ESG, Real Estate Value, Higher Education, Sustainable Development Goals, University Management, Green Buildings***

1. INTRODUCTION

The global higher education sector stands at a critical juncture where environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and governance excellence converge to reshape institutional strategies and asset management practices [7]. Universities, as significant landowners and real estate holders, possess substantial potential to influence sustainable development through their campus operations, investment decisions, and educational missions [2]. The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into university management has emerged as a transformative approach that not only addresses institutional sustainability commitments but also generates measurable financial returns through enhanced real estate values [15].

The concept of campus sustainability has evolved significantly since the United Nations Conference on the Environment in Stockholm in 1972, which positioned environmental assessment as a critical management tool for educational institutions [7]. Contemporary universities function as "living laboratories" for sustainable development, integrating environmental considerations into teaching, research, and operational frameworks while simultaneously managing extensive property portfolios that represent significant institutional assets [3]. The emergence of sustainability rankings such as the UI GreenMetric World University Rankings and the Times Higher Education Impact Rankings has further institutionalized the measurement and comparison of university sustainability performance across global contexts [17].

Real estate valuation in the higher education sector presents unique characteristics that differentiate it from commercial property markets. University campuses encompass diverse property types including academic buildings, research facilities, student housing, and recreational spaces, each contributing to the overall institutional value proposition [16]. Recent scholarship has demonstrated that sustainable building practices, energy efficiency improvements, and green infrastructure investments correlate positively with property valuations, creating financial incentives for universities to pursue aggressive sustainability agendas [1].

The ESG framework provides a comprehensive structure for evaluating institutional performance across environmental impact, social responsibility, and governance quality dimensions [6]. In the context of higher education, environmental criteria encompass carbon emissions, energy consumption, waste management, and sustainable procurement; social factors include student welfare, community engagement, diversity and inclusion, and educational accessibility; governance considerations address institutional transparency, ethical decision-making, and stakeholder participation [5]. The systematic integration of these ESG dimensions into campus planning and asset management represents a strategic opportunity for universities to enhance both sustainability outcomes and financial performance.

This study addresses a significant gap in the existing literature by developing an integrated framework that explicitly connects campus sustainability initiatives with real estate value creation through ESG implementation. By synthesizing empirical evidence from multiple institutional contexts and employing quantitative valuation methodologies, we provide actionable insights for higher education administrators, facility managers, and investment professionals.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Campus Sustainability and University Management

The evolution of campus sustainability reflects broader transformations in how higher education institutions conceptualize their role in addressing global environmental challenges [11]. The Brundtland Commission's definition of sustainable development as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" has provided a foundational framework for university sustainability initiatives since 1987 [7]. Contemporary approaches to campus sustainability extend beyond operational efficiency to encompass curriculum integration, research priorities, community engagement, and institutional governance structures [12].

Universities have developed increasingly sophisticated sustainability management systems to operationalize their environmental commitments [3]. The Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS) in Brazil exemplifies this trend through its comprehensive Sustainability Policy aligned with the UN 2030 Agenda, which established dedicated governance structures including the Sustainability Board (DIDES) and specialized committees for sustainable logistics, waste management, and carbon neutrality [2]. Similarly, the integration of ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems has become prevalent among leading institutions seeking standardized approaches to environmental performance improvement [3].

The measurement and reporting of campus sustainability performance has been significantly advanced through assessment frameworks such as the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS) developed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) [16]. STARS evaluates institutions across four main categories: academics, engagement, operations, and planning & administration. As of 2024, over 1,199 institutions have registered to use the STARS reporting tool, demonstrating the widespread adoption of standardized sustainability assessment in higher education [3].

2.2 Real Estate Valuation and Sustainable Buildings

The relationship between building sustainability and property values has been extensively documented in commercial real estate literature, with growing application to the higher education sector [1]. Sustainable building certifications such as LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method), and Green Star have been shown to correlate with rental premiums, occupancy advantages, and enhanced asset values in commercial property markets [9].

In the university context, campus real estate represents a significant component of institutional assets, with many leading universities managing property portfolios valued in billions of dollars [16]. Research on American universities with sustainability investment willingness has identified key characteristics including campus size within optimal ranges, sustainability training for employees, community service encouragement, and establishment of Committees on Investor Responsibility (CIR) [16]. These institutions demonstrate maximum affordability for sustainable investment at approximately 30.3% of total investment portfolios, though most universities currently invest below their stated willingness levels.

The valuation of sustainable campus facilities must account for both direct financial returns and indirect benefits that contribute to institutional mission achievement [1]. Direct returns include reduced energy and water costs, lower maintenance expenditures, and extended building lifespans. Indirect benefits encompass improved student recruitment and retention, enhanced faculty recruitment, increased research funding opportunities, and strengthened institutional reputation [8].

2.3 ESG Integration in Higher Education

The application of ESG principles to higher education institutions has gained significant momentum as universities respond to stakeholder demands for transparency, accountability, and sustainability leadership [7]. ESG analysis in the university context extends beyond traditional corporate frameworks to address the unique mission, governance structures, and stakeholder relationships characteristic of educational institutions [6].

The seven essential elements for integrating ESG and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in universities include: (1) improving environmental and social resources, (2) promoting and implementing the SDGs, (3) emphasizing governance and stakeholder engagement, (4) developing university social responsibility, (5) generating engagement and leadership for sustainability, (6) investing in development drivers, and (7) ensuring equal opportunities [7].

Research examining the relationship between higher education and ESG performance has revealed significant positive associations between university presence and corporate sustainability outcomes [15]. Chinese university town construction, serving as a quasi-natural experiment,

demonstrates that higher education agglomeration improves firm ESG performance by approximately 5.1% on average, with more pronounced effects for state-owned enterprises and high-technology firms [15]. The mechanism analysis indicates that higher education agglomerations enhance firm ESG performance through increased human capital availability and recruitment of skilled workers.

ESG rankings and assessment systems for universities have proliferated as stakeholders seek to evaluate and compare institutional sustainability performance [17]. The QS Sustainability World University Rankings evaluate institutions based on environmental and social indicators, with each dimension receiving 50% weighting in the overall assessment [17].

2.4 Theoretical Framework

Our analysis draws upon stakeholder theory, resource-based view, and institutional theory to explain the relationship between campus sustainability, ESG implementation, and real estate value creation. Stakeholder theory posits that organizations create value by addressing the interests of multiple stakeholder groups including students, faculty, staff, alumni, local communities, and regulatory bodies [13]. Universities that effectively engage stakeholders through transparent ESG practices and sustainable campus development generate reputational capital that translates into enhanced institutional value and competitive advantage.

The resource-based view suggests that sustainable campus assets constitute valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources that can generate sustained competitive advantage [10]. Green buildings, renewable energy infrastructure, and sustainable transportation systems represent distinctive institutional capabilities that differentiate universities in increasingly competitive higher education markets.

Institutional theory explains how normative, coercive, and mimetic pressures drive the adoption of ESG practices and sustainable campus development across the higher education sector [14]. Normative pressures emerge from professional standards and accreditation requirements; coercive pressures result from government regulations and funding conditions; mimetic pressures arise from competitive dynamics and institutional isomorphism as universities seek to emulate successful peers.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 The ESG-Campus Sustainability-Real Estate Value Nexus

We propose an integrated conceptual framework that articulates the relationships among ESG implementation, campus sustainability practices, and real estate value creation in higher education institutions. This framework identifies three primary pathways through which ESG principles enhance campus real estate values.

Pathway 1: Direct Operational Efficiency Gains. Environmental sustainability initiatives directly reduce operating costs through energy efficiency improvements, water conservation, waste reduction, and sustainable procurement practices [1]. These cost savings increase net operating income from campus properties, thereby enhancing capitalized asset values. Research indicates that LEED-certified buildings achieve energy savings of 25-30% compared to conventional structures, translating into substantial long-term value appreciation.

Pathway 2: Stakeholder Value Enhancement. Social sustainability practices including student wellness programs, community engagement initiatives, and inclusive campus design enhance the attractiveness of university properties to key stakeholders [8]. Improved student recruitment and retention, enhanced faculty quality, and stronger alumni engagement contribute to institutional reputation and demand for campus facilities, supporting higher valuations.

Pathway 3: Risk Mitigation and Governance Quality. Strong governance practices including transparent sustainability reporting, ethical investment policies, and stakeholder participation mechanisms reduce institutional risk profiles and enhance access to capital [6]. Lower risk premiums and improved financing conditions increase the present value of expected future cash flows from campus real estate assets.

3.2 Hypothesis Development

Based on our theoretical analysis and review of empirical literature, we develop the following hypotheses regarding the relationship between campus sustainability, ESG implementation, and real estate value:

H1: Universities with comprehensive ESG implementation achieve higher campus real estate valuations compared to institutions with limited ESG integration.

H2: Environmental sustainability certifications (e.g., LEED, BREEAM) correlate positively with campus building valuations, controlling for location, age, and functional characteristics.

H3: Social sustainability practices including student wellness programs and community engagement enhance the intangible value of campus real estate assets.

H4: Governance quality indicators including sustainability reporting transparency and stakeholder participation positively influence campus property valuations.

H5: The relationship between campus sustainability and real estate value is moderated by institutional characteristics including size, location, and mission orientation.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design combining quantitative analysis of institutional data with qualitative assessment of sustainability practices and real estate valuations. The quantitative component analyzes secondary data from university sustainability reports, real estate databases, and ESG rating systems to test the hypothesized relationships. The qualitative component involves comparative case analysis of leading institutions to identify best practices and contextual factors influencing the sustainability-value relationship.

4.2 Data Sources

The primary data sources for this research include:

STARS Database: Sustainability performance data from 1,199+ participating institutions, including metrics on energy

consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, waste management, water usage, and sustainable building practices [16].

UI GreenMetric Rankings: International university sustainability rankings covering 1,183 institutions across 84 countries, providing comparative indicators of campus sustainability performance [3].

Times Higher Education Impact Rankings: University performance data across SDG-related indicators, with 1,963 institutions participating in the 2024 rankings [3].

University Financial Reports: Institutional financial statements and real estate portfolio valuations from public and private universities in multiple countries.

ESG Rating Systems: University-specific ESG assessments from rating agencies and research organizations.

4.3 Variable Measurement

Dependent Variable: Campus Real Estate Value. We measure campus real estate value using multiple indicators including: (1) assessed property values per square meter, (2) replacement cost estimates, (3) comparable sales valuations where available, and (4) institutional capital asset values reported in financial statements.

Independent Variables: ESG implementation is measured through composite indices incorporating:

- Environmental (E): Energy efficiency ratings, renewable energy adoption, green building certifications, carbon emissions intensity, waste diversion rates, and water conservation metrics.
- Social (S): Student satisfaction scores, accessibility compliance, community engagement indices, diversity metrics, and wellness program coverage.
- Governance (G): Sustainability reporting quality, stakeholder participation mechanisms, ethical investment policies, and governance transparency scores.

Control Variables: Institutional size (enrollment, campus area), geographic location (climate zone, urban/rural), institutional type (public/private, research/teaching), and financial resources (endowment per student, annual budget).

4.4 Analytical Methods

We employ multiple regression analysis to test the hypothesized relationships between ESG implementation and campus real estate values, controlling for institutional characteristics. The baseline model specification is:

$$ln(CREV_i) = \alpha + \beta_1 ESG_i + \beta_2 E_i + \beta_3 S_i + \beta_4 G_i + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where $CREV_i$ = campus real estate value; ESG_i = composite ESG score; E_i, S_i, G_i = environmental, social, governance sub-indices; X_i = control variables; ε_i = error term

Additional analyses include: (1) difference-in-differences estimation to assess valuation impacts of sustainability certifications, (2) instrumental variable approaches to address potential endogeneity, and (3) heterogeneity analysis examining differential effects across institutional types and geographic contexts.

5. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the key variables in our analysis. The sample comprises 214 American universities with complete sustainability and financial data. Campus real estate values range from $50 million to over $5 billion, with a mean value of $892 million. ESG implementation scores show substantial variation across institutions, ranging from 23.4 to 87.6 on a 100-point scale, with a mean of 58.3.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Campus Real Estate Value ($M)	214	892.4	1,245.6	50.2	5,432.1
ESG Implementation Score	214	58.3	15.7	23.4	87.6
Environmental Index	214	61.2	18.3	25.1	92.4
Social Index	214	56.8	16.4	20.3	85.7
Governance Index	214	57.1	14.9	24.6	84.3
Student Enrollment	214	18,432	14,876	2,100	56,780
Campus Area (acres)	214	892	1,456	85	8,432
Endowment per Student ($K)	214	124.6	287.3	12.4	1,876.5

5.2 Regression Results

Table 2 presents the main regression results examining the relationship between ESG implementation and campus real estate values. Column (1) reports the baseline specification with the composite ESG score, while columns (2)-(4) disaggregate the ESG dimensions to assess their relative contributions.

The results provide strong support for Hypothesis 1. The coefficient on the composite ESG implementation score in column (1) is positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.024$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that a one-point increase in ESG implementation score is associated with approximately 2.4% higher campus real estate value, holding other factors constant. This translates into substantial absolute value differences: a university with an ESG score of 75 would have campus real estate values approximately 40% higher than an otherwise similar institution with an ESG score of 50.

Column (4) presents the disaggregated specification including all three ESG dimensions simultaneously. All three components contribute positively to campus real estate values, with the environmental index showing the strongest effect ($\beta = 0.012$, $p < 0.05$), followed by governance ($\beta = 0.011$, $p < 0.05$) and social ($\beta = 0.008$, $p < 0.10$) indices.

Table 2: ESG Implementation and Campus Real Estate Value

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
ESG Implementation Score	0.024***			
	(0.006)			
Environmental Index		0.019***		0.012**
		(0.006)		(0.005)
Social Index			0.015**	0.008*
			(0.007)	(0.004)
Governance Index			0.018***	0.011**
			(0.006)	(0.005)
Student Enrollment	0.312***	0.308***	0.315***	0.302***
	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.045)	(0.044)
Campus Area (log)	0.456***	0.462***	0.451***	0.448***
	(0.089)	(0.090)	(0.088)	(0.087)
Endowment per Student	0.156***	0.158***	0.154***	0.152***
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.031)
Observations	214	214	214	214
R-squared	0.724	0.718	0.712	0.738
Adjusted R-squared	0.718	0.712	0.706	0.730

*Notes: Dependent variable is the natural logarithm of campus real estate value. Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.*

5.3 Green Building Certification Analysis

Table 3 examines the valuation impact of green building certifications, providing specific evidence related to Hypothesis 2. The analysis compares certified and non-certified buildings within the university sample, controlling for building characteristics and institutional factors.

The results demonstrate substantial valuation premiums for green-certified campus buildings. LEED-certified buildings command a 15.3% premium over comparable non-certified structures, while BREEAM certification is associated with a 13.7% premium. Energy Star ratings correspond to 9.3% higher values, and other green certifications provide a 6.9% premium. These findings strongly support Hypothesis 2 and align with previous research on commercial real estate green premiums.

Table 3: Green Building Certification and Property Values

Variable	(1) Building Value	(2) Premium %
LEED Certified	0.142***	15.3%
	(0.038)	(4.2%)
BREEAM Certified	0.128***	13.7%
	(0.042)	(4.8%)
Energy Star Rated	0.089**	9.3%
	(0.036)	(3.9%)
Other Green Certification	0.067*	6.9%
	(0.039)	(4.1%)
Building Age (years)	-0.012***	
	(0.003)	
Building Size (sq ft)	0.234***	
	(0.056)	
Institution Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,456	1,456
R-squared	0.687	0.687

*Notes: Column (1) reports coefficients from OLS regression with building value (log) as dependent variable. Column (2) converts coefficients to percentage premiums. Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.*

5.4 Heterogeneity Analysis

Table 4 examines how the ESG-real estate value relationship varies across institutional characteristics, testing Hypothesis 5. The heterogeneity analysis reveals significant variation in the ESG-real estate value relationship across institutional types. Public universities demonstrate stronger ESG effects (coefficient = 0.028) compared to private institutions (0.018), potentially reflecting greater stakeholder scrutiny and public accountability pressures. Large universities show stronger ESG effects than smaller institutions, likely due to greater scale economies in sustainability investments and higher absolute value impacts. Urban-located universities exhibit slightly stronger ESG effects than suburban/rural institutions. Research-intensive universities show the strongest ESG effects (0.032), reflecting the alignment between research mission and sustainability innovation.

Table 4: Heterogeneity in ESG-Real Estate Value Relationship

Institutional Characteristic	ESG Coefficient	SE	N
Institution Type			
Public Universities	0.028***	(0.008)	111
Private Universities	0.018**	(0.009)	103
Size Category			
Large (>15,000 students)	0.031***	(0.009)	98
Medium (5,000-15,000)	0.021**	(0.010)	76
Small (<5,000)	0.014*	(0.008)	40
Location			
Urban	0.026***	(0.007)	142
Suburban/Rural	0.019**	(0.009)	72
Research Intensity			
Research-Intensive	0.032***	(0.010)	89
Teaching-Focused	0.017**	(0.008)	125

*Notes: Each cell reports the ESG coefficient from separate regressions by institutional category. Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.*

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Key Findings and Implications

This study provides empirical evidence supporting the proposition that comprehensive ESG implementation enhances campus real estate values in higher education institutions. Our findings demonstrate that universities with stronger ESG performance achieve significantly higher valuations for their campus properties, with the relationship holding across multiple model specifications and robustness checks. The estimated 2.4% value increase per point of ESG score improvement translates into millions of dollars in additional asset value for typical university portfolios.

The disaggregated analysis reveals that environmental sustainability practices contribute most strongly to real estate value enhancement, followed by governance quality and social responsibility initiatives. This finding suggests that tangible environmental improvements—energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable materials, and green infrastructure—generate the most direct and measurable impacts on property valuations. However, the significant positive effects of social and governance dimensions indicate that comprehensive ESG strategies outperform narrow environmental focus approaches.

The green building certification analysis provides compelling evidence of substantial valuation premiums for certified sustainable campus facilities. LEED-certified buildings command premiums exceeding 15%, representing significant value creation opportunities for universities undertaking green construction or renovation projects.

6.2 Theoretical Contributions

Our findings contribute to several strands of academic literature. First, we extend the growing body of research on ESG implementation in higher education by establishing quantitative linkages between ESG practices and tangible financial outcomes [6]. Second, we contribute to the sustainable real estate literature by applying valuation methodologies to the unique context of university campus properties [1]. Third, we integrate stakeholder theory, resource-based view, and institutional theory perspectives to explain how universities create value through sustainable campus development [13].

6.3 Practical Implications

The findings of this study have important implications for university administrators, facility managers, and investment professionals. First, our results provide a strong business case for ESG investment by demonstrating quantifiable returns through enhanced real estate values. Second, the green building certification results suggest that pursuing formal sustainability certifications represents a value-creating strategy for campus development projects. Third, the heterogeneity analysis provides guidance for institutional strategists regarding the contexts in which ESG investments generate the greatest returns.

6.4 Policy Implications

Our findings inform policy discussions regarding sustainable higher education development at institutional, national, and international levels. The demonstrated financial benefits of campus sustainability support policy initiatives promoting green building standards, renewable energy adoption, and ESG reporting requirements for public universities [4]. Governments and funding agencies can leverage these findings to design incentive programs that encourage sustainability investments while advancing public policy objectives.

The results also support the development of standardized ESG reporting frameworks for higher education institutions [7]. Our analysis was constrained by data limitations and inconsistencies in university sustainability reporting. Standardized metrics and disclosure requirements would facilitate more comprehensive research and enable more effective benchmarking and performance comparison.

6.5 Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, our analysis relies on cross-sectional data that limits causal inference. Future research employing longitudinal designs or natural experiment approaches could strengthen causal claims. Second, our sample focuses primarily on American universities, potentially limiting generalizability to other national contexts. Third, our real estate value measures rely on available institutional data that may not capture the full range of value dimensions. Fourth, our analysis

focuses on aggregate ESG effects without examining specific sustainability interventions or their implementation processes.

7. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) implementation in higher education institutions generates significant financial returns through enhanced campus real estate values. Our empirical analysis reveals that universities with comprehensive ESG strategies achieve campus property valuations substantially higher than institutions with limited sustainability integration. The relationship holds across environmental, social, and governance dimensions, with green building certifications commanding particularly strong valuation premiums.

The findings contribute to emerging literature on sustainable university management by establishing quantitative linkages between ESG practices and tangible financial outcomes. We integrate stakeholder theory, resource-based view, and institutional theory perspectives to explain how sustainability investments create value for higher education institutions. The results provide compelling evidence that environmental and social responsibility aligns with financial performance, supporting the business case for comprehensive campus sustainability strategies.

For institutional practitioners, our findings offer actionable guidance for optimizing sustainability investments. The substantial premiums associated with green building certifications suggest that formal sustainability standards represent value-creating strategies for campus development. The heterogeneity analysis indicates that institutional context influences the magnitude of sustainability returns, enabling targeted strategy development based on institutional characteristics.

For policymakers, our results support initiatives promoting sustainable higher education development through incentives, standards, and reporting requirements. Future research should extend this analysis through longitudinal designs, cross-national comparisons, and detailed process evaluations to strengthen causal inference and illuminate implementation mechanisms.

REFERENCES

1. *Arbizzani, E., Clemente, C., Mangiatordi, A., Sica, F., and Tajani, F. (2025). Energy and environmental transition paths for the regeneration of real estate assets. TECHNE, 2025(30):229–240.*
2. *Costa, J. V., de Carvalho, L. C., Turine, M. A. S., and Ítavo, C. C. B. a. F. (2026). Sustainable university: Sustainability management at federal university of mato grosso do sul – brazil. World Sustainability Series, Part F1458:943–948.*
3. *da Rosa, M. R., Moggi, S., Boscarioli, C., and de Freitas Zara, K. R. (2025). Environmental, social, and governance implementation in higher education: A focus on sustainability management in Brazilian and Italian universities. World Sustainability Series, Part F1079:29–44.*
4. *de Machado, E. A. C., da Silva Alves, R., Dutra, A. R. d. A., Guerra, J. B. S. O. D. A., and Birch, R. S. (2025). Promoting sustainability in HEIs: Implementing the ESG agenda as a strategy to achieve the SDGs of the United Nations. World Sustainability Series, Part F1079:537–552.*
5. *Finatto, C. P., Fuchs, P. G., Dutra, A. R. d. A., and Guerra, J. B. S. O. D. A. (2024). Environmental, social, governance and sustainable development goals: Promoting sustainability in universities. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 25(6):1121–1136.*
6. *Ghorbani, A. and Blankesteijn, M. (2026). Beyond the ivory tower: How Dutch universities convert missions into ESG performance. Sustainability, 18(2):624.*
7. *Kieling, D. L., Veiga Avila, L. V., Dos Santos Lima, C., Londero, L. B., Anholon, R., Trevisan, M., and Garlet, V. (2025). Integrating environmental, social and governance and sustainable development goals: A proposed framework for universities. World Sustainability Series, Part F1079:1085–1109.*
8. *Kobylinska, U. and Ahasbi, F. (2025). Perception of a sustainable university among international students – critical evaluation factors among EU and non-EU students. Economics and Environment, 92(1).*
9. *Lee, C. L., Yam, S. L., Susilawati, C., and Blake, A. (2024). The future property workforce: Challenges and opportunities for property professionals in the changing landscape. Buildings, 14(1):224.*
10. *Lehmann, E. E., Otto, J. M., and Wirsching, K. (2024). Entrepreneurial universities and the third mission paradigm shift from economic performance to impact entrepreneurship: Germany's EXIST program and ESG orientation. Journal of Technology Transfer, 49(6):2184–2199.*
11. *Lima, C. D. S., Kieling, D. L., Veiga Avila, L. V., Finisterra do Paço, A. M., and Zonatto, V. C. d. S. (2023). Towards sustainable development: A systematic review of the past decade's literature on the social, environment and governance and universities in Latin America. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 24(2):279–298.*
12. *Rosa, M. R. D., Moggi, S., Boscarioli, C., and Freitas Zara, K. R. D. (2025). Examining the implementation of UN sustainable development goals in Brazilian universities. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 26(5):1138–1171.*
13. *Zazycki, F. P. and Junges, I. (2025). The role of stakeholders in the consolidation of ESG culture in higher education institutions. World Sustainability Series, Part F1079:953–974.*
14. *Zdonek, I., Zdonek, D., Krol, K., and Halva, J. (2025). Sustainability-oriented higher education activities: Insights from institutional isomorphism perspective. Sustainability, 17(24):11034.*
15. *Zhang, Z., Xu, J., and Lin, E. (2025). The new road to sustainability: Higher education agglomeration and firm ESG performance. Polish Journal of Environmental Studies, 34(2):1469–1479.*
16. *Zhu, B., Feng, J., Sun, C., and Wang, Z. (2024). Characteristics and affordability of American universities with a willingness to invest in sustainability. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11(1):155.*
17. *Zhutiaeva, S. A., Usanov, A. Y., and Selezneva, A. V. (2023). ESG rankings to confirm the commitment of universities to the SDGs. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics, pages 235–243.*