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Goals & Agenda

Goals

- Provide an overview of the Reporting Assurance process
- Prepare institutions and reviewers for review
- Clarify expectations

Agenda

- Reporting Assurance overview
- STARS Review Template
- Data quality resources
- Reviewer/Reviewee Expectations & Timeframes
- Peer review matching opportunity
- Conversation and Q&A
What sections of STARS recognize report review and reporting assurance?

- **PA 4: Reporting Assurance**
  - Current report has undergone a comprehensive review, as guided by and documented in the STARS Review Template
  - Reviewers can be internal or external to the institution, but they must be unaffiliated with the data collection process
  - 1 standard point

- **IN 11: External Reporting Assurance**
  - Current report has undergone the above review process, using an external reviewer
  - 1/2 bonus point

- **EN 11: Inter-campus Collaboration**
  - Institutions’ employees and/or students have served as peer reviewers of another institution’s STARS report.
  - 1/2 standard point

Help Center article:
- PRE 4: Reporting Assurance
● **STARS Help Center**
  ○ Credit articles have been **added/updated** for **EVERY** credit.
  ○ Access to:
    ■ Credit language
    ■ FAQs
    ■ Reporting examples
    ■ Common issues
    ■ Data quality videos

● **STARS Benchmarking Tool**
  ○ Comparative tool for scores & numeric fields
  ○ Identifying outliers and expected performance

● ** Archived Professional Learning Offerings**

● ** STARS Review Template**
  ○ Updated for 2022 with fewer line items!
  ○ Required for successfully completing PA 4/IN 11
Review Template Walk-through

- AC 2: Learning Outcomes
- OP 2: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Reviewer Notations: Tips & Best Practices

Notations should reference:

1. The issue(s) identified in a clear and concise manner
2. Suggested edit or desired outcome (e.g., “please clarify...”, “please revise to No or clarify...”)

Provide detail where it may be helpful to the institution or for your follow-up review

- Notations that reference a specific amount or score (e.g., “Score outlier: 8/8 points earned”)
- If the credit has two or more parts, begin notations with “Part 1:” or “Part 2:”
- Copy and paste the exact text of the field or section you are referencing
- Ask for the institution to “Provide clarification in the Notes field” where appropriate
General Expectations

Institution Seeking Review
- Decide if you want an internal or external review
- Identify a reviewer early
- Allow 30 days of extra time for the review
- Communicate your expectations:
  - Time commitment
  - Intended deadline: Initial review
  - Intended deadline: Resolving all issues and getting reviewer confirmation
- Do a final check
  - Credits completed
  - Spelling and grammar
- Don’t expect a perfect report

Reviewer
- Time commitment - Expect to spend 12-40 hours on the entire process
- Time commitment is variable and dependent on:
  - Reviewer’s knowledge
  - Quality of the report
  - Provisional rating
- Complete the review in 30 days (including follow-ups)
  - Start right away
- Be prepared for (but don’t expect) potential conflict or disagreement

**TIP:** Staggered review is an option
Getting Started & Conducting the Review

Institution Seeking Review

- Ensure that the report is finalized
- Grant Reviewer Access via AASHE account
  - Observer status
- Be available, responsive, and receptive to feedback
- If multiple reviewers: Be clear on who reviews what

Reviewer

Getting Started

- Create an AASHE account
- Obtain a copy of the review template to complete for initial review

Conducting the Review

- Provide clear and concise notations in the template; use details where it is helpful
- Complete the review, fill out the template, complete a sign-off letter, and submit before the mutually agreed upon deadline
- Required revisions versus suggestions
- Reference reporting examples in the Help Center; Platinum rated institutions
Addressing Review Results

**Institution Seeking Review**

- Address reviewer recommendations in a timely fashion
  - Fill out the “institution response” section for any credit(s) where issues were identified
  - Keep record of reviewer comments
- Avoid making additional changes (or let reviewer know if other changes were made)
- If there is a difference of perspective between reviewer and reviewee, it is up to the institution seeking review to find a resolution.
  - stars@aashe.org
- When all issues are addressed, collect the finalized review template with mark-ups and sign-off letter(s) from reviewers

**Reviewer**

- Check to see that issues you identified are indeed addressed
  - Document 2nd review status in template
  - Communicate any disagreements with the main institutional contact
  - Another review round may be needed.
- When all issues are addressed, forward to your institutional contact:
  - Letter signing off on the process
  - A copy of the finalized review template
Peer Review Matching Interest Form

● Goal: Help institutions identify potential STARS peer review matches

● Designed for:
  ○ Those looking for a reviewer for an upcoming report
  ○ Potential peer reviewers
  ○ Ideally, you are both!

● Form link:
  ○ https://forms.gle/SpC1FpqgXzBrN4L87
Conversation and Q&A

Thank you!
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