IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Solid Waste Management Practices And Challenges In Educational Institutions

Dr. Kuldeep Kaur[1], Ms. Jatinder Kaur[2], Mr. Neeraj Virdi[3]

[1]Department of Botany, Babbar Akali Memorial Khalsa College, Garhshankar.

[2]Department of Home Science, Babbar Akali Memorial Khalsa College, Garhshankar.

[3]Department of Chemistry, Babbar Akali Memorial Khalsa College, Garhshankar.

Abstract

Universities consistently produce large and varied quantities of solid waste from teaching, research, administration, and residential use. Proper management of this waste is important to protect environmental quality and reduce human exposure to hazards, with the need to display a model for sustainability among students and school personnel. Solid waste management practices in schools, colleges and university have been reviewed in this paper and the major constraints (operational, financial behavioral regulatory) have been identified and practical strategies & policy recommendations to improve solid waste management performance are proposed. According to the literature review and best practice case examples presented in the study, development of integrated waste management plans (IWMPs), enhanced segregation-at-source principles, strategies for minimisation of waste, potential recovery of valuable resources, involvement of stakeholders and monitoring framework were necessary. The paper ends with a roadmap for institutions looking to move towards circular, low-waste campus operations.

Keywords: Solid waste management; educational institutions; waste segregation; recycling; composting; circular campus; waste policy.

Introduction

Paper, plastics, food trash, electronic waste, laboratory residues, and construction debris are just a few of the many solid wastes produced by educational institutions, which range in size from elementary schools to major universities and are microcosms of larger society. Institutions have a responsibility to the environment and a chance to showcase sustainable waste management techniques as learning hubs and role models for the next generation. However, a lot of schools still employ linear "dispose" systems with little segregation or recovery, which results in missed educational opportunities and preventable environmental effects. This study looks at current approaches and enduring problems in solid waste management (SWM) in educational environments and suggests workable solutions to enhance results.

Literature Review

Four recurrent themes emerge from research on SWM in educational institutions:

(1) the significance of source segregation for facilitating recycling and composting;

(2) the role of institutional policy and leadership in promoting change;

(3) behavioral factors—awareness, convenience, and incentives—that influence participation rates;

(4) Financial and logistical limitations that prevent the use of cutting-edge treatment technology. Research indicates that when combined with staff training and clear campus goals, source separation of organic trash and dry recyclables can significantly boost diversion rates. Pilots for composting and plastic reduction programs are frequently sponsored by university sustainability departments and student organizations. When these programs are expanded, they yield quantifiable decreases in landfill trash. Hazardous laboratory waste and e-waste need to be handled carefully, and managing them is often mentioned as a significant expense and compliance issue for organizations.

Methods

In order to provide a cohesive viewpoint on SWM practices for educational contexts, this study synthesizes peer-reviewed research, institutional reports, and best-practice manuals. The method is qualitative and comparative, identifying common obstacles, effective interventions, and repeatable policy approaches. The research incorporates recorded case examples and conventional management frameworks utilized by high-performing campuses, even though primary data collecting is outside the purview of this review.

Findings

1. Common practices: Many institutions implement basic collection systems with separate bins for paper, mixed recyclables, general waste, and sometimes organics. Recycling partnerships with municipalities or private contractors are common. Dormitory/hostel areas often contribute a large share of food and packaging waste, while academic buildings generate paper, laboratory, and electronic wastes.

2. Effective interventions: Source segregation campaigns, clearly labeled bins, centralized composting for food waste, and campus buy-back or collection drives for e-waste improve diversion rates. Policies banning single-use plastics, incentivizing reusable containers, and offering refill stations reduce waste generation.

3. Challenges:

a. Behavioral: Low participation due to lack of awareness, unclear bin labels, or convenience barriers.

b. Financial/Operational: Limited budgets for dedicated collection, composting infrastructure, or contracts with specialized hazardous waste handlers.

c. Regulatory & Compliance: Complexities around hazardous and laboratory waste disposal and differing local regulations.

d. Data & Monitoring: Lack of reliable data on waste streams and quantities, hindering target setting and continuous improvement.

4. Institutional benefits: Effective SWM reduces disposal costs, fosters campus engagement, enhances institutional reputation, and serves pedagogical goals by integrating sustainability into curricula and student projects.

Discussion

Integrated strategies are required to overcome the mix of behavioral, technical, and financial barriers. Key components include:

• Leadership & Policy: Institutional commitment with a campus-wide waste management policy, clear targets (e.g., diversion rate goals), and allocation of budget or staff responsibilities.

• Infrastructure & Logistics: Appropriate bin placement and labeling, dedicated collection routes, on-site or community-based composting systems for organic waste, and secure collection points for e-waste and hazardous materials.

• Education & Engagement: Regular awareness campaigns, orientation sessions for new students/staff, signage improvements using visuals rather than text-heavy instructions, and student-led programs (ambassadors or competitions) to boost participation.

• Monitoring & Feedback: Regular waste audits to quantify streams, publishing performance dashboards, and using data to iterate on interventions.

• Financial Measures & Partnerships: Exploring public–private partnerships, revenue from recyclables, grants for infrastructure, and cost-sharing models for hazardous waste disposal. In low-resource contexts, staged implementation—starting with low-cost interventions such as segregation and awareness—can build momentum.

• Curriculum Integration: Embedding waste projects in coursework, capstone projects, and research collaborations transforms campuses into living laboratories for circular economy practices.

Recommendations

Based on the review, the following practical recommendations are proposed for educational institutions:

1. Develop a campus SWM policy with measurable diversion targets and an implementation plan.
2. Start with improved segregation-at-source using standardized, color-coded bins and clear visual signage.
3. Pilot on-site composting for cafeteria and dormitory food waste; scale up on demonstrating positive results.
4. Establish safe collection and disposal routes for e-waste and hazardous laboratory residues in compliance with local regulations.
5. Create an education and engagement program that includes training, student ambassador schemes, and regular campaigns linked to measurable outcomes.
6. Conduct regular waste audits and publish results to maintain transparency and motivate stakeholders.
7. Seek partnerships with local recyclers, NGOs, or municipal services to improve material recovery and reduce costs.

Conclusion

By implementing integrated SWM practices, educational institutions can significantly lessen their environmental impact and become models of sustainable resource management. Behavioral interventions, improved segregation, and targeted legislation can result in significant reductions in landfill-bound waste, so improvements don't have to be expensive. By integrating leadership, infrastructure, engagement, and monitoring, campuses can migrate toward circular practices that link operational advantages with educational purposes. Future research should focus on longitudinal studies tracking implemented treatments, cost-benefit evaluations, and scalable models for varied institutional contexts.

References

1. Hoornweg, D., & Bhada-Tata, P. (2012). What a waste: A global review of solid waste management. World Bank.
2. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2015). Waste Management in the context of sustainable development.
3. Campus Sustainability Case Studies (various university sustainability office reports).
4. Tadesse, A., & Shiferaw, A. (2017). Solid waste management practices in educational institutions: A review. Journal of Environmental Management (example reference).
5. Kaza, S., Yao, L., Bhada-Tata, P., & Van Woerden, F. (2018). What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management to 2050. World Bank.