2.2 Review Template

About

As part of our efforts to continuously improve STARS data quality and the reporting process, AASHE released a STARS Review Template in 2018, which has been improved and updated for the latest version, STARS 2.2. This template highlights common issues that AASHE staff have identified during standard post-submission reviews.

Institutions pursuing the Reporting Assurance credit (PA 4) under 2.2 can receive points in STARS for conducting either independent or internal review by completing this template. Assured reports are still subject to review by AASHE staff prior to publication, which may require additional revisions. In order to receive points for Reporting Assurance, the assurance process must have been successful in identifying and resolving inconsistencies and errors. *AASHE reserves the right to withhold points for this credit if it is determined that the assurance process was not successful in minimizing inconsistencies and errors outlined in this template.*

Benefits of Participating

Use of the template will help institutions identify potential data accuracy issues, which will result in higher quality content in current and future reports, fewer issues post-submission, and quicker turnaround time leading to report publication and rating.

Institutions completing independent or internal review can earn STARS points by completing the *PA 4: Reporting Assurance* credit.

Peer reviewers can help their institution earn points under the *EN 11: Inter-Campus Collaboration* credit.

Independent & Internal Review

For consistency, all reviewers must use the standard review template provided in this document. Reviews may be conducted by a single individual or a team.

External Review:

Conducted by individuals who are affiliated with other organizations (e.g., a peer institution, third-party contractor, or AASHE).

Internal Review:

Conducted by individuals who are affiliated with the organization for which a report is being submitted, and are not directly involved in the data collection process. At minimum, two institutional contacts must be involved in the internal review process (one individual conducting the review and another addressing the review results).

About the Template	1. This template includes information on common issues identified for each STARS credit. Common issues across all credits are also provided in a separate tab.
	2. The template is organized with separate tabs for each STARS Category:
	a. Report Preface (PRE)
	b. Academics (AC)
	c. Engagement (EN)
	d. Operations (OP)
	e. Planning & Administration (PA)
	f. Innovation & Leadership (IN)
	3. Reviewers should complete each Category Tab, and the Final Status column should be completed. A second round of reviews may be needed to ensure that issues identified by reviewers have been adequately addressed.
	4. Credits that have historically had high error rates under the current STARS version are highlighted in this template.
Instructions	1. Once reviewer(s) has/have been identified, they should receive an editable copy of this template.
	a. STARS Website includes a Google Sheets and Excel version available for download:
	Download the latest version of the review Template
	b. Reviewers can be given access to the Institution's report in the STARS Reporting Tool if they do not already have access. See "Users" tab under "My Summary" section of Reporting Tool. Reviewers can also be provided with a PDF copy of the report (Go to "My Submission" in Reporting Tool, select "Export".
	2. Reviewers should access and refer to the latest version of the STARS 2.2 Technical Manual
	a. STARS Help Center credit articles provide useful guidance for reviewers and institutions participating in STARS. Credit articles are linked in this template.
	3. Conducting Reviews:
	a. Reviewer information should be filled out below.
	b. Reviewer(s) should review each credit, mark any issues in the dropdown fields, and provide a "First Review Status" decision for each credit.
	c. Once the initial review is complete for all credits, a copy of the document should be saved and forwarded to the STARS liaison.
	d. The STARS liaison is responsible for addressing the reviewer questions through edits and clarifications in the STARS Reporting Tool. Reviewer should check that responses now satisfy credit criteria in any areas that were marked as requiring revision. This second review should be noted in subsequent columns of the Review template.
	e. Multiple rounds of review may be needed. While the current template includes two review rounds, additional columns may be added if needed.
	f. If Reviewers are unsure about a particular response, or if responses are not satisfactorily addressed, the STARS liaison and/or reviewer can request feedback from AASHE staff by emailing stars@aashe.org.

	g. Once all issues have been addressed, "Final Status" for each credit should be updated in the last column of each sheet to indicate that all issues have been addressed.
	h. The reviewer must submit an upload affirming that the reviewer responsibilities outlined in the Exemplary Practice credit criteria have been fully addressed.
	i. A final version of the completed STARS Review Template and copies of Reviewer Affirmations must be uploaded under the Pre-Submission Review exemplary practice credit.
Reviewer Information	*Primary reviewer information. See optional reviewer fields (below) if more than one individual has reviewed the report.*
Reviewer 1	
Name:	Alan Turnquist
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Director of Sustainability and Resilience, Michigan Technological University
Email (optional):	alturnqu@mtu.edu
Comments (optional):	
Other Reviewer(s) - Optional	Use these fields if multiple individuals collaborated on a single review (i.e., different reviewers by section but only one reviewer per credit). Use the comments space to indicate which credits or section each reviewer reviewed. If you have multiple reviewers each doing complete reviews (i.e., reviewing all credits), please upload a new completed template for each complete review.
Reviewer 2	
Name:	Clare Fidler
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Sustainability Coordinator, Michigan Technological University
Email (optional):	
Comments (optional):	
Reviewer 3	
Name:	Anne Greub
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Sustainability Coordinator, Michigan Technological University

Email (optional):	
Comments (optional):	
Reviewer 4	
Name:	
Type of Review:	
Title & Organization:	
Email (optional):	
Comments (optional):	

Common Issues

Supporting Affirmative Responses	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields, particularly in scoring fields that require a descriptive response following a Yes or similar affirmation.
Avoiding or Clarifying Data Outliers	Data outliers can be the result of exemplary performance, a change in operations, or quite frequently, a mistake or miscalculation. Outliers can have significant scoring impacts, so it's important to pay attention to them and make revisions if they are the result of an error or miscalculation. For outliers due to exemplary performance, please provide information about how this was achieved in the Notes fields.
Aligning Credit Timeframes	In general, STARS content must be current at the time of submission, or based on data from within the last three years prior to submitting. Care should be taken to ensure that information falls within the expected Timeframe (particularly when updating a report).
Data Consistency Across Credits	Some information in STARS is asked in multiple sections, and can be quickly duplicated using the Copy From feature. While consistency between credits is typical, there are circumstances where a discrepancy can be expected. We recommend clarifying the reason for any valid discrepancies in the Notes field. See related Help Center article on Sharing information between credits.
Valid and Working URLs	It is common for URLs to change over time. Be sure to check that they are working before submitting a credit as complete. Supporting information via URL is typically optional, though there are a few credits where a working URL is required.

Tips

Institutions that are part of a college/university system should compare data with rated reports from other system institutions.	A number of credits in STARS allow institutions to submit information based on institution OR system-wide standards and practices. This is particularly relevant for the Sustainable Purchasing and Participatory Governance credits. Before submitting, check to see what other institutions in the system are submitting.
Email stars@aashe.org if questions arise.	If a question comes up during the review process, or to settle a discrepancy in credit interpretation between reviewers and submitters, please email stars@aashe.org so our team can help resolve the question. Reviewers can use the "Unsure" option if there is any uncertainty. The submitter must ensure that the question is resolved before the report is submitted.

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PRE 1: Executive Letter	File is from a top ranking executive (President, Chancellor, Vice President, or Provost)	Requires revision	You'll need this eventually. per help center article linked in **A2**: A finalized letter from a high ranking executive is required before a scored report can be formally published and a rating awarded.					
PRE 2: Points of Distinction	*No known issues.*	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PRE 3: Institutional Boundary	Institution Type - US institutions should match Carnegie Data, with the exception of Tribal and Special Focus Institutions, which should fall under one of the other options. Non-US institutions should report the most appropriate UNESCO level, as identified in the credit language.	Meets criteria						
PRE 4: Operational Characteristics	Timeframe: Response references most recent operational characteristics for which data are available at the time of submission.	Requires rev	**B5 -** I don't see a timeframe in which data was collected or any documentation of data	I don't see a metric for "timeframe." I				
PRE 5: Academics & Demographics*	Data Consistency: Fulltime equivalent fields for students and academic staff should be lower than headcount fields for most institutions. Identical amounts are generally only valid if the institution has no part-time employees/students. Lower student headcount amounts are only valid if a significant number of students enroll in more courses than the standard full-time load.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
AC 1: Academic Courses*	Score outlier: Uncommon for institutions to earn full points or very close to it. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Low response under "Total number of academic departments that offer courses" (below 10) is unlikely and should be reviewed closely (particularly for medium-sized or larger institutions). Academic departments are devoted to a particular academic discipline (e.g., Economics, Environmental Science, Sociology). Valid discrepancies or clarifications should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Inventory is complete - For each course, the inventory should include, at minimum, the title, department (or equivalent), and level of each course (i.e., undergraduate or graduate), as well as a brief course description (or rationale for why the course is being included). The course description or rationale must clarify how the course references sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a sustainability challenge.	Meets criteria						
	The count of courses reported under the credit should be consistent with the count included in the inventory. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Unsure						
	Definitions for "sustainability-focused courses" and "sustainbility-inclusive courses" are followed. To count, the course title or description must include the term "sustainability"; focus on ecological and social/economic systems; OR focus or a major sustainability challenge. A common mistake is identifying courses as sustainability-focused that only address the social component (e.g. Social Work, International Relations) without referencing ecological dimensions or a sustainability challenge.	Meets criteria	B5 - a spreadsheet format for the inventory list would be helpful to easily count how many courses are included. additionally, the inventory list includes independent studies, etc. that notes say were excluded from the count. potential discrepancy between the count and inventory list B7 - PRE5 (122 departments) not consistent with the 172 listed in this section					
	Data Consistency: Number of academic departments should be consistent between PRE 5 and AC 1 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies must be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision		Fixed the # of departments to match F				
AC 2: Learning Outcomes*	Score Outlier - Uncommon for institutions to earn full points or very close to it. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric Outlier - Part 2: A high amount (70%+) under "Percentage of students who graduate from programs that have adopted at least one sustainability learning outcome" may indicate misclassification of sustainability-focused courses, programs and/or learning outcomes. If a high amount is reported, check closely for the issues below.	Meets criteria						
	Part 1 and Part 2: Sustainability-focused learning outcomes include the term "sustainability" OR have an explicit focus on the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems. A common mistake is listing an outcome as sustainability-focused when it does not cover ecological dimensions of sustainability.	Unsure						
	Part 2: Response must reference completion of academic programs and should not reflect student participation in general education as recognized in Part 1. To Count, programs must meet one of three criteria: 1. Programs are Identified as sustainability-FOCUSED under AC 3: Undergraduate Program or AC 4: Graduate Program. 2. Programs have adopted one or more sustainability-FOCUSED learning outcomes that reference the interdependence of ecological systems AND social/economic systems. 3. Programs REQUIRE successful completion of a sustainability-FOCUSED course as identified in AC 1: Academic Courses.	Requires revision	B10 - proof of sustainability-focused learning goals for listed programs. provide link to how ENV links to sus. learning goal. B11 - graduate level data well done. undergraduate data unclear on learning goals proof.					
AC 3: Undergraduate Program	Sustainability-focused programs have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability or the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems. The sustainability focus of such a program should be explicit in the program title or description.	Meets criteria						
	Valid URLs are required for each program.	Meets criteria						
AC 4: Graduate Program	Sustainability-focused programs have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability or the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems. The sustainability focus of such a program should be explicit in the program title or description.	Meets criteria						
	Valid URLs are required for each program.	Meets criteria						
	To count, the immersive program must have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, and/or a major sustainability challenge.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
AC 5: Immersive Experience	Immersive programs must be one week or longer in duration. Sustainability-focused immersive programs that are shorter in duration may be claimed under *AC 8: Campus as a Living Laboratory* if criteria for that credit are met.	Meets criteria						
AC 6: Sustainability Literacy Assessment*	Assessment must cover sustainability literacy rather than sustainability-related values, behaviors or beliefs. An institution may use a single instrument that addresses literacy AND culture/engagement if a substantive portion of the assessment (e.g., at least 10 questions or a third of the assessment) focuses on student knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges. Literacy questions typically include right/wrong answers, whereas culture/behavior/engagement questions do not.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If "The entire student body or, at minimum, to the institution's predominant student body" is selected, descriptive information must explain how a representative sample was achieved. If there is indication that a non-representative sample was assessed (e.g., only one class participated), response should be changed to "A subset of students..."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If "Pre- and post-assessment to the same cohort of students or to representative samples..." is selected, there must be some mention of a follow-up assessment (A scheduled post assessment that has not yet occurred may count.) If the support isn't there, response should be changed to "Standalone evaluation without a follow-up assessment..."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
AC 7: Incentives for Developing Courses	Any programs or initiatives must specifically incentivize sustainability in the curriculum. General or interdisciplinary faculty development or course development programs do not count, unless the program is clearly focused on sustainability or has a sustainability component.	Meets criteria						
AC 8: Campus as a Living Laboratory	Living laboratory or experiential learning projects must have a clear curricular or learning component. Supervised student internships, co-curricular activities and non-credit work may count only if there is a formal learning component that is outlined in the descriptive response (i.e., there are opportunities to document and assess what students are learning).	Meets criteria						
AC 9: Research & Scholarship	Numeric outlier: Response for "Total number of academic departments (or the equivalent) that include at least one faculty or staff member that conducts research" should be comprehensive. Amounts below 10 should be reviewed closely (particularly for medium-sized or larger institutions). Academic departments are devoted to a particular academic discipline (e.g., Economics, Environmental Science, Sociology).	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Responses for "Total number of the institution's faculty and/or staff that are engaged in research" should be comprehensive. Avoid counting only a fraction of research faculty. This amount must include, at minimum, all faculty members for whom research is considered in promotion and/or tenure decisions.	Meets criteria						
	The research inventory must include, at minimum: Name of researcher, Department affiliation, AND Research interests/topics or a brief description justifying the individual's inclusion. The inventory must be a comprehensive list rather than a sample.	Meets criteria						
	The count of researchers reported under the credit should be consistent with the count included in the research inventory. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision						
	To count, sustainability research must explicitly address the concept of sustainability, reference ecological and social/economic systems, or focus on a major sustainability challenge. This should be clear in the research description or justification in the inventory.	Meets criteria	**B2**6 - 253 in count but 357 in inventory.	Switched the count to 357 to match in				
AC 10: Support for Sustainability Research	Student and faculty support - In order to count, sustainability research programs must specifically aim to increase student/faculty sustainability research. General or interdisciplinary support programs do not count, unless the program is clearly focused on sustainability or has a sustainability component.	Unsure						
	Interdisciplinary, Transdisciplinary, and/or Multidisciplinary Research - Response must affirm published promotion and tenure guidelines that give explicit positive recognition to interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and/or multidisciplinary research.	Meets criteria	**B28** - UROP program seems like more general research support than specifically sustainability. link to prove sustainability component?	I agree, UROP seems broad, no ment				
	"Yes" responses must be supported in the descriptive and URL fields.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
AC 11: Open Access to Research*	To support a Yes response under "Does the institution have a published policy that requires its employees to publish scholarly works open access..." - a policy requiring employees to publish scholarly works open access is required. The policy may allow for publisher embargoes and/or provide a waiver option, but this must be clarified in the descriptive text or policy upload.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 1: Student Educators Program*	Score outlier - Reporting full points indicates that all students are served (i.e. directly targeted) by a student peer-to-peer program, and there is a high ratio of the number of hours worked by trained educators to the number of students served. Over-counting should be avoided (e.g., counting all students but only listing programs in residence halls, or counting hours spent on administrative, non-sustainability-focused tasks rather than sustainability peer education).	Unsure	B2: For 'Part 1, Percentage of students served by a peer-to-peer, sustainability educators program' A title page is given, yet no reporting of a score, details, etc are listed.					
	All programs must have a clearly defined peer-to-peer component. To count, peer-to-peer-focused education programs should train students to become "experts" in a certain sustainability-focused topic in a coordinated, ongoing fashion. These individuals then become peer educators who share what they have learned with other members of the same group to catalyze change.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Number of students enrolled for credit should be consistent across PRE 5 and EN 1 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision	B4: EN1 states 46,579 students enrolled for credit, PRE5 states 51,327. Review the academic year these ststistics were reported and revise.	Fixed # of students enrolled for credit				
EN 2: Student Orientation	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If transfer and/or entering graduate students is checked, then the description should back this up.	Requires revision	Criteria for meeting this requirement is as stated, "...incorporating sustainability strategies into event planning (e.g., making recycling bins accessible or not serving bottled water) is not, in and of itself, sufficient for this credit." Please review and reconsider your reported Welcome Week sustainability efforts listed under, "A brief description of how sustainability is included prominently in new student orientation." Reported efforts such as "use of an electronic app" in this context is simply a strategy for event planning and would not count towards points in this category.	Added more detail about Sust Action				
EN 3: Student Life	Student-Run Enterprises - Response must affirm that the effort is student-run, and that the business or enterprise includes sustainability as part of its mission or stated purpose.	Requires revision	sustainable ingenuity in their program. Their "mission" is as stated, "Design U is a student-led pro bono consulting club at the University of Minnesota that strives to design for impact." It is not clear what "impact" the enterprise is having. While they claim to be inclusive in their membership, this alone does not validate a claim of being sustainability oriented, nor does, and I quote, their "kickass results" that emerge from the "design, engineering, and business" activities of this organization.					
	Sustainable Investment and Finance - Response must reference an investment funds through which students can develop socially, environmentally and fiscally responsible investment and financial skills. Student membership in an institution-wide Committee for Socially Responsible Investment does not meet the criteria here (but is recognized under PA 8).	Unsure						
	Wilderness and Outdoors Programs - Response should affirm that the wilderness/outdoor program follows Leave No Trace Principles.	Meets criteria						
	Sustainability-Focused Themes - Response must affirm that sustainability-related themes were chosen for themed semesters, years, or first-year experiences (e.g. choosing a sustainability-related book for common reading). Basic outreach campaigns are not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	C7: The opportunities for student investment experiance, both the Carlson Schools Fund Enterprise and Sappire Consultig, are unclear whether they are sustainability goal oriented. No mention of sustainability (or related) practices are stated.	I agree that Design U isn't sust focuse				
	Graduation Pledge - Response must reference a graduation pledge through which students pledge to consider social and environmental responsibility in future job and other decisions. Resources for students to find socially/environmentally responsible employers are not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable		Added detail to Carlson School Fund Agree that Sapphire Consulting isn't s				
EN 4: Outreach Materials & Publications	This credit is focused on ongoing outreach efforts. Materials and publications designed to promote a specific event or time-limited campaign are excluded and covered by other credits in Campus Engagement.	Meets criteria						
	Green Living Guide - Response must reference a guide that targets students living on or around campus, focusing on comprehensive sustainability issues (e.g. dorm recycling and energy conservation, etc.). Information and tips on a website is generally not sufficient if it is not marketed as a "green living guide".	Unsure	C12: "Tips on a website is generally NOT sufficient..." Please reconsider your submission here.	Do we want to reconsider our respons				
EN 5: Outreach Campaign	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If a "Yes" response is provided for faculty and/or students, the descriptive response must clarify how the campaign targets each group.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 6: Assessing Sustainability Culture	Assessment must cover sustainability-related values, behaviors or beliefs on multiple sustainability-related topics, rather than sustainability literacy. An institution may use a single instrument that addresses sustainability literacy, culture, and/or engagement to meet the criteria for this credit if at least 10 questions or a third of the assessment focuses on culture, behavior, and engagement. Culture/behavior/engagement questions typically do not include right/wrong answers, whereas literacy questions do.	Not Pursuing						
	If "The entire campus community (students, staff and faculty), directly or by representative sample..." is selected, descriptive information must explain how each of the three groups was targeted. If there is indication that certain groups were not assessed (e.g., the assessment is sent to students only), response should be changed to "A subset of the campus community...".	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If "Longitudinally to measure change over time..." was selected, there must be some mention of a follow-up assessment. (A scheduled post assessment that has not yet occurred may count.) If the response doesn't include information about a follow-up assessment, response should be changed to "Without a follow-up assessment of the same cohort or representative samples."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
EN 7: Employee Educators Program*	Score outlier - Reporting full points indicates that all employees (academic and non-academic staff) are served (i.e. directly targeted) by an employee peer-to-peer program, and there is a high ratio of the number of hours worked by trained educators to the number of employees served. Over-counting should be avoided (e.g., counting all staff but listing programs that do not target all staff, or counting hours spent on administrative, non-sustainability-focused tasks rather than sustainability peer education).	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	All programs must have a clearly defined peer-to-peer component. To count, peer-to-peer-focused education programs should train employees to become "experts" in a certain sustainability-focused topic in a coordinated, ongoing fashion. These individuals then become peer educators who share what they have learned with other members of the same group to catalyze change.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Data consistency: Employee headcount should be consistent between EN 7 and PRE 5 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
EN 8: Employee Orientation	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If 100 percent of employees are covered, then the description should back this up.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
EN 9: Staff Professional Development & Training	This credit focuses on formal professional development and training opportunities, for example as delivered by trainers, managers, sustainability staff, the Human Resources office or external contractors. Informal programs are not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	This credit focuses on formal professional development and training opportunities, for example as delivered by trainers, managers, sustainability staff, and external organizations. Peer-to-peer educator programs and employee outreach campaigns are recognized in the *Employee Educators Program* and *Outreach Campaign* credits respectively, and should only be reported in this credit if such programs are formally recognized by the institution as professional development and training.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Intent of the credit is to highlight formal partnerships with community organizations, rather than institutional initiatives that benefit the community. Partnerships between individuals affiliated with an institution, or with student/faculty groups, are not sufficient in the absence of an institution-level partnership.	Unsure						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 10: Community Partnerships	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields for each of the following: a) Institution supports the partnership materially or financially; b) Partnership is multi-year or ongoing, rather than a short-term project or event; c) Partnership is sustainability-focused (focus is on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a major sustainability challenge); d) Partnership is inclusive and participatory, i.e., underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations are engaged as equal partners.	Meets criteria	C23: Unsure if University District Alliance and the UofM's Resilient Communities project would count here, as they are both *institutional innitiatives* that benefit the community rather than direct partnerships with a third party organization.	Univesity District Alliance - added list Unsure if Resilient Communities is a g				
EN 11: Inter-Campus Collaboration	Intent of this credit is to recognize institutions that "collaborate with other colleges or universities to help build campus sustainability broadly." Therefore, ALL responses should focus on collaboration with other campuses or higher education-focused groups/initiatives (or list one valid example).	Meets criteria						
	Submitted a case study - In order to count, a case study (or equivalent) must have been submitted to an external higher education sustainability resource center (e.g., AASHE's Campus Sustainability Hub or EAUC's Sustainability Exchange) or awards program. Referencing publications or journal articles is not sufficient.	Requires revision	C26: No case study was submitter/listed in report under this category. C27: No relationship stated in report under this category.					
	Has an ongoing mentoring relationship with another institution - Response must reference an ongoing mentorship relationship with another sustainability officer at another institution. Providing informal one-off support through listservs or regional networks is not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable		Responded "No" to question about ca				
EN 12: Continuing Education	Part 1 should reference sustainability-focused continuing education **courses**, whereas Part 2 should reference sustainability-focused **programs** in continuing education. While definitions may vary, responses should generally align with common definitions of courses and programs.	Meets criteria						
	Courses and programs must be offered for continuing education specifically (i.e. offered through a continuing education or extension department). Courses or programs designed for degree seeking students should not be included (they are recognized under the Curriculum section).	Unsure	C29: It is not clearly stated whether the courses listed in the report are offered to degree seeking students or strictly for continuing education purposes.					
	Part 1, Course inventory - For each course, the inventory must include the course title and department, as well as a brief course description or rationale explaining why the course is included that references sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a sustainability challenge.	Meets criteria						
	Part 1, Course inventory - The count of courses reported under the credit should be consistent with the count included in the inventory. Valid inconsistencies must be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision	C31: Course count provided is 15, course names with descriptions provided is 11.	Courses listed are only for continuing Edited # of courses offered. Looks like				
EN 13: Community Service	Data consistency: Number of students enrolled for credit should be equal to or lower than what is reported in PRE 5. Institutions may exclude non-credit, continuing education, and/or part-time students from EN 13. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision	C32: EN1 states 46,579 students enrolled for credit, PRE5 states 51,327. Review the academic year these ststistics were reported and revise					
	Part 3: To earn points in this section, a formal program to support employee volunteering during regular work hours must be in place (e.g., offering paid time off for volunteering or by sponsoring an organized service event for which employees are compensated). Informal events that don't result in time off or compensation are not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable		Fixed				
	In order to count, the policy advocacy must have the implicit or explicit support of the institution's top administrators and/or governing bodies.	Meets criteria						
	Responses must reference sustainability-focused policy advocacy by the institution. Examples of advocacy efforts include supporting or endorsing legislation, ordinances, and public policies that advance sustainability; active participation in campaigns aiming to change public policy; and discussions with legislators in regard to the above. Community partnerships, research efforts, or outreach campaigns are covered in other credits and should not be referenced here unless there is an explicit policy advocacy focus.	Meets criteria						
	Responses must relate to policy advocacy at the Municipal/local, State/provincial/regional, National, and/or International levels, and should only be duplicated if there is clear advocacy at multiple government levels.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 14: Participation in Public Policy*	Responses must align with the credit timeframe standard of within three years from the expected date of submission. If policy advocacy was initiated more than three years ago, there must be evidence of ongoing advocacy to still qualify.	Meets criteria						
EN 15: Trademark Licensing	Institution must be certified by Fair Labor Association (FLA) or Workers Rights Consortium (WRC) to earn FULL points. Partial points are awarded for adopting a labor rights code of conduct in licensing agreements with licensees who produce logo apparel. Working with a supplier or contractor that is certified or purchasing FLA- or WRC-certified products is not is not sufficient to earn points.	Meets criteria						
	If membership in WRC or FLA is indicated, there should be some documentation. Check to see if institution is a current member. WRC: http://www.workersrights.org/about/as.asp FLA: http://www.fairlabor.org/affiliates/colleges-universities	Unsure	Institution claimed to be a member of the WRC, please make sure to include documentation of this membership in your report.	According to https://www.workersright				

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
OP 1: Emissions Inventory & Disclosure*	Part 1: Uploaded inventory should provide clear indication of Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. If indicating that certain Scope 3 emissions are included, then the inventory must reflect this. Otherwise, Scope 3 responses should be updated to "None" as appropriate.	Meets criteria						
	If indicating that the inventory has been verified by an independent, external third party or validated internally by independent personnel, descriptive response and/or upload must support verification of the inventory by an external party.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
OP 2: Greenhouse Gas Emissions*	Score outlier: Uncommon for institutions to earn 6 out of 8 points or above. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below. Exemplary performance can be clarified in the descriptive fields.	Meets criteria	**B5** - significant changes in both Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions (especially imported electricity) should have a brief explanation in a descriptive or notes section. **B8** - response required for all areas w/ number above 0 (baseline year composting carbon storage) **B9** - data is not consistent with PRE 5 for various numbers under figures needed to determine weighted campus users. Please provide reason for this in notes field. **B10** - data is not consisten with PRE 4. Please provide reason for this in notes field.	Fixed all descrepancies between data here and PRE 4 data				
	Comparative outlier: Gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions between Performance Year and Baseline Year. Any significant outliers that are valid should be clarified in the descriptive fields or Notes section.	Requires revision						
	Comparative outlier: Gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions between OP 1 and OP 2 should be consistent. Any significant outliers that are valid should be clarified in the descriptive fields or Notes section.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outliers: Response of zero under either Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from stationary combustion or Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from purchased electricity is uncommon. A zero response for purchased electricity may qualify if institutions purchase RECs to cover 100 percent of purchased electricity. Any valid outliers or exemplary performance should be clarified in the descriptive fields or Notes section.	Meets criteria						
	Carbon Sinks - Response under "A brief description of the offsets in each category reported above, including vendor, project source, verification program and contract timeframes" should include the necessary detail and support all areas where a number above 0 is entered.	Requires revision						
	Data consistency: Weighted campus user (WCU) figures should be consistent across PRE 5 and OP 2 if the same performance year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified under the Notes field.	Requires revision						
	Data consistency: Gross floor area and energy intensive building space should be consistent across PRE 4 and OP 2 if the same or similar performance year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified under the Notes field.	Requires revision						
OP 3: Building Design & Construction	Data outlier: Amount reported under "Total floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space (include projects completed within the previous five years)" should reflect only space that was "constructed or underwent major renovations in the previous five years". Data outliers, such as reporting a number that is consistent with OP 3 or PRE 4 gross square footage should be avoided or clarified.	Meets criteria						
	If claiming any square footage under Certified Projects, response under "A list or inventory of new construction and major renovation projects..." should include detail on the buildings, rating systems and dates of project completion. Detail on any reported uncertified space (multi-attribute or single attribute rating systems) should be included in this descriptive field. See 2-page guide on Examples of multi-attribute and single attribute ratings.	Meets criteria						
	Score outlier: Uncommon for institutions to earn more than 2 points unless buildings are LEED O+M certified. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below (incorrectly counting LEED BD+C is often the issue).	Meets criteria	**B16** - please provide explanation as to why total/gross floor area of building space is not the same as in PRE 4	Fixed descrepancy for gross floor area to match PRE 4				
	LEED O+M Certification - This credit recognizes LEED O+M certification rather than the more common LEED BD+C standard, which is recognized in OP 3. Response under "A brief description of the green building rating system(s) used and/or a list or sample of certified buildings and ratings" should clarify the rating system and level for each certified building.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If claiming any square footage under O+M Certified Space, response under "A brief description of the sustainable operations and maintenance policy/program and/or O+M rating system(s)" should include detail on the buildings, rating systems and dates of project completion. Detail on any reported uncertified space (multi-attribute or single attribute rating systems) should be included in this descriptive field. See 2-page guide on Examples of multi-attribute and single attribute ratings.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
OP 4: Buildings Operations & Maintenance*	Data consistency: Gross floor area and energy intensive building space should be consistent with PRE 4 or lower, if a similar performance year is used. A lower number may be reported under OP 4 if the institution excluded certain types of occupied space (parking garages, stairwells, etc.) from this credit but not others. Likewise, buildings for which certification is pending may be excluded for up to 2 years following registration with LEED or another rating system.	Requires revision						
OP 5: Building Energy Consumption*	Score outlier: Uncommon for institutions to earn full points or very close to it. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below (particularly numeric outliers).	Meets criteria	B22 - please provide an explanation for why the data is inconsistent for gross floor area/ energy intensive building spaces between this section and PRE4.	Fixed discrepancy for foor area				
	Numeric outlier: Zero or very low response under "Imported electricity" or "Stationary fuels and other energy products used on-site" is highly unlikely. Most institutions purchase electricity or use natural gas, fuel oil, diesel, or coal for heating or other non-transportation purposes. A response of zero or other very low response should include clarification in the Notes field, including affirmation that the institution uses no/very little fuels for heating.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Low responses under Heating degree days and Cooling degree days. Typical responses in both figures are in the thousands, but responses for institutions in very mild, warm or cool climates may be in the hundreds or even zero if heating/cooling isn't needed.	Meets criteria						
	Site-source ratio: U.S. and Canadian institutions must use the ratios reported in the Technical Manual (3.0 and 2.0 respectively). Institutions in other countries can report their own national/regional figures if they differ from what is recommended in the Technical Manual.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Total energy consumption figures between OP 5 and OP 6 should match. Valid discrepancies must be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Gross floor area and Energy-intensive building space figures between OP 5 and PRE 4 should be equal. Figures in OP 5 can be slightly lower if outdoor energy from parking garages/stadiums, etc is metered separately and excluded under OP 5. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision						
OP 6: Clean & Renewable Energy	Score outlier: Uncommon for institutions to earn more than one point for this credit. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below.	Meets criteria	B25&26 - a link to university information the Renewable Connect program from Xcel energy and the on-site solar could be useful					
	Data consistency: Response under "Total energy consumption, performance year (electric and non-electric)" should be consistent with what is reported under OP 5 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	In order to count, the institution must retain or own the rights to the renewable energy reported. Grid mix reported by a utility does not count toward the credit (grid mix may be reported in optional fields under this credit).	Meets criteria						
	Responses should align with the correct options: 1 - Purchasing clean and renewable electricity (e.g., PPAs) 2 - Generating clean and renewable electricity (e.g., rooftop solar) 3 - Using clean and renewable stationary fuels to generate thermal energy (e.g., biomass for heat) 4 - Purchasing or importing steam, hot water or chilled water from verified clean and renewable sources (e.g, municipal geothermal facility) 5 - Purchasing Renewable Energy Credits (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), or equivalent	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier - Reporting a sustainably or ethically produced percentage of 20% or more. If a higher percentage is reported, check closely for the issues below (particularly counting items that do not meet the Version 2.2 guidelines).	Meets criteria	B29 & B30 - Not sure what the inventory is accounting for: sustainable/ethical, plant-based, or institution-affirmed exemptions. Each of these categories should have their own section. Sustainable/ethical need to have a recognized sustainability standard met. Institution affirmed exemptions need to show food chain	I agree...the inventory has no information about each product, just labels the entire list "sustainable				
	Numeric outlier - Reporting a plant-based foods percentage of 80% or more. If a higher percentage is reported, this may indicate misinterpretation in how plant-based foods are defined and/or calculated.	Meets criteria						
	For transparency and to help ensure comparability, a completed STARS Food and Beverage Purchasing Inventory template or equivalent inventory must be provided to document purchases that qualify as sustainably or ethically produced. The inventory must justify each product's inclusion and include, at minimum: Product name, label, or brand; Product description/type; Recognized sustainability standard met (e.g., third party certification or ecolabel).	Requires revision						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
OP 7: Food & Beverage Purchasing*	If claiming products under the institution-affirmed exemption, ALL of the following criteria must be met: - The product is single-ingredient; - The product is sourced through a short food supply change that provides full traceability; - Affirmation that the production methods used are consistent with the IFOAM Principles of Organic Agriculture, the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, OR the WTO 10 Principles of Fair Trade. Products that do not meet ALL of these criteria should be excluded.	Requires revision	exemptions need to show food chain traceability and affirmation of ethical/sustainable production methods. Overall inventory needs better labeling and corresponding information to be clear. The link for Real Food Calculator results does not lead to any published results.	labels the entire list "sustainable inventory"				
	Sampling - Institutions must track food and beverage purchases for a 12-month consecutive period or use a representative sample that includes data from a full academic term or similar period. When using samples, institutions must accommodate for seasonal and other variations in food and beverage availability and purchasing.	Meets criteria						
OP 8: Sustainable Dining	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Meets criteria	B33 - Unsure if Bistro West is sustainability-themed. Sounds like it just has some sustainable options. A link that shows the dining concept or menu would be useful.	I agree...I don't think Bistro West is necesarily sutainbility themed.				
	Sustainability-Themed Outlet - Response should reference a sustainability-themed food outlet. Conventional food outlets that also offer sustainable options are not sufficient.	Requires revision						
OP 9: Landscape Management	Responses under the table, "Figures required to calculate the total area of managed grounds" should avoid double-counting. Land managed under an IPM program that is also organic should be reported at the higher tier (organic).	Meets criteria						
	Organic Program - Response must affirm that no inorganic fertilizers or chemical pesticides, fungicides and herbicides are applied to the space identified (with the exception of rescue treatments).	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Total campus area should be consistent across PRE 4, OP 9 if the same or similar Performance Year is used. Please note that scoring is based on "Total area of managed grounds" not "Total campus area". Valid discrepancies should be clarified under the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
OP 10: Biodiversity	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Meets criteria						
OP 11: Sustainable Procurement*	Part 1: There must be a general purchasing policy across multiple commodity categories, institution-wide. Commodity-specific policies are covered under Part 3 and should not be referenced under Part 1.	Unsure	B38, 39, and 40 - linked documents and text may not qualify as a policy - do you have anything better?	I don't think we have anything better... Removed broken link under part 1				
	Part 2: If claiming that "Institution employs LCCA as a matter of policy and standard practice when evaluating all energy- and water-using products, systems and building components", the supporting info must back it up. This credit covers LCCA, but not LCA.	Unsure						
	Part 3: Descriptions must reference actual policies for the purchase of products/services, rather than practices, which are recognized elsewhere in STARS.	Unsure						
OP 12: Electronics Purchasing	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it indicates that a very high rate of electronic purchases that are certified under a high level. High scores and exemplary performance should be affirmed in descriptive text.	Meets criteria						
	Timeframe: Response under "A brief description of the time period" should confirm that the information provided is based on data from within the last three years.	Meets criteria						
OP 13: Cleaning & Janitorial Purchasing	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it indicates that a very high rate of green cleaning product purchases that are certified under a high level. High scores and exemplary performance should be affirmed in descriptive text.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Timeframe: Response under "A brief description of the time period" should confirm that the information provided is based on data from within the last three years.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
OP 14: Office Paper Purchasing	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it indicates that a very high rate of paper purchases that are certified or have a high post-consumer recycle rate. High scores and exemplary performance should be affirmed in descriptive text.	Meets criteria						
	Timeframe: Response under "A brief description of the time period" should confirm that the information provided is based on data from within the last three years.	Meets criteria						
OP 15: Campus Fleet	Score and/or Numeric outliers: Earning full points or close to it may be an indication that conventionally fueled vehicles were underreported. Data outliers or exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.	Meets criteria						
	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it is unlikely. Exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.	Meets criteria						
	Timeframe: There should be some indication that the modal split assessment was completed within the last three years.	Requires revision						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
OP 16: Commute Modal Split	Survey must reach a representative sample (e.g., assessing students in a single class or employees in a single office/department isn't sufficient)	Meets criteria	B49 - assessment was not completed in the past three years	True...do we want to replace this with anything?				
	Data consistency: Figures for Total full-time equivalent student enrollment and Full-time equivalent of employees should be consistent across PRE 5 and OP 16 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
OP 17: Support for Sustainable Transportation	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Meets criteria						
OP 18: Waste Minimization & Diversion*	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it is unlikely. If high scores are reported, check for issues below. Exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive fields.	Meets criteria	B52 - large differences between performance and baseline year require explanation. B57 - data is not consistent with PRE5. explain why in notes section.	Fixed discrepancies with data from PRE 5				
	Comparative outlier: Large differences in the table for "Figures needed to determine total waste generated (and diverted)" between Performance Year and Baseline Year should be checked for data outliers. Any outliers should be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision						
	Numeric outlier: Zero (or very low amounts) reported for responses under the table for Total Waste Generated (particularly for recycling, composting and disposal in landfill/incinerator). If figures are unknown, conservative estimates should be provided, a different performance or baseline year selected, or the credit should be updated to Not Pursuing.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Part 3, Waste Diversion - High amount (e.g., 90% or above) for "Percentage of materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator by recycling, composting, donating or re-selling, performance year" may indicate data entry error. Check closely for issues below. Exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Weighted campus user (WCU) figures should be consistenty across PRE 5 and OP 18 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Requires revision						
OP 19: Construction & Demolition Waste Diversion	Numeric outlier: A response of zero tons of construction and demolition materials landfilled or incinerated (or 100% under Percentage of construction and demolition materials diverted...) is unlikely, and is probably provided when the institution does not know the exact amount. If exact amount cannot be determined and a conservative estimate is not available, the credit should be updated to Not Pursuing.	Meets criteria						
OP 20: Hazardous Waste Management	Part 1 - Descriptive responses should be relevant to each question. (1: steps taken to reduce hazardous waste, 2: how the institution safely disposes of hazardous waste, 3: description of any significant hazardous material release incidents, 4: description of any inventory system employed by the institution to facilitate the reuse or redistribution of laboratory chemicals.	Meets criteria	B60 - description is not detailed enough to showcase a student e-waste recycling program. Link provided suggests there is a program for students but an additional sentence would make it clear that there is a program specifically for students' personal e-waste.	Cant find any info about student specific e waste disposal				
	Part 2 - Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields: 1: electronic waste generated by the institution; and/or 2: electronic waste generated by students. It is common to overlook referencing how e-waste generated by students is managed.	Requires revision						
OP 21: Water Use*	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to may be the result of data entry or unit conversion errors. If a high score is reported, please review closely for the issues listed below.	Meets criteria	B63 - potable water per unit of floor area is far under 1 gallon. Are all gallons of potable water use reported? Need to show evidence or source of this data and computations. B64 - way under expected. needs source/explanation. website URL later on does not work. need source and explanation on these outliers	Need to look into potable water use per unit of floor area. Too low. Vegetated grounds number seems way low. I don't recall if we figured out why?				
	Numeric and Comparative outliers: Large differences between baseline year and performance year, or very high/low amounts under Total and Potable water use should be clarified under the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Potable water use per unit of floor area below 1 gallon or over 100 gallons may indicate data entry or unit conversion error. Please review closely.	Requires revision						
	Numeric outlier: Total water use per unit of vegetated grounds below 10,000 gallons/acre or over 5 million gallons/acre may indicate data entry or unit conversion error. Please review closely.	Requires revision						
	Data consistency: Weighted campus user (WCU) figures should be consistent across PRE 5, and OP 21 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Gross floor area should be consistent across PRE 4 and OP 21 if the same or similar Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
OP 22: Rainwater Management	If pursuing points for having a green infrastructure and low impact development policy, there must be information about a policy that covers green infrastructure and low impact development.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 1: Sustainability Coordination	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Suggestion for improvement	Probably a good idea to list at least one other sustainability officer, since Shane Stennes covers the whole system and may not qualify as a full time position for the Twin Cities campus.					
PA 2: Sustainability Planning*	Part 1: Institutions should reference measurable objectives in "current and formal plans to advance sustainability", such as published and final strategic plans, campus master plans, sustainability plans, etc. At least one measurable objective should be listed, and the plan should be cited in each area with a Yes response.	Requires revision	B3 - MPact 2025 looks like it sets sustainability plans in motion, but I cannot find sufficient detail on targets/metrics for the individual STARS categories to justify affirmative responses here. For operations, you could probably reference and link to your climate action plan as you do in Part 2. Otherwise, I think you'll need to show more than a generalized "STARS Gold" goal to earn the credits for Part 1. Is there something beyond the MPact progress card? https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/228186/university_of_minnesota_progress-card-2022.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y	Should we link old CAP here? Or a more up to date master plan?				
	Part 2: Response must reference the institution's highest guiding document (institution-wide strategic plan or the equivalent). Lower-level guiding documents are not sufficient.	Meets criteria						
	Part 2: If indicating that sustainability is included as a major theme in the highest guiding document, there must be evidence that the plan includes a section on sustainability, references sustainability as a major institutional goal, or includes multiple sustainability-focused objectives.	Meets criteria						
PA 3: Inclusive & Participatory Governance*	Part 1: Affirmative responses for Students/Academic staff/Non-academic staff must be supported in the descriptive field. To qualify, institutions should reference student governments, faculty councils, staff councils, collective bargaining units, or similar.	Meets criteria	B7 - Link to board of regents shows 12 members and (seemingly) no students. Can you provide a link that shows the 20 members with student and women representatives as indicated in your submission?	We refrenced the Senate rather than the Regents.				
	Parts 2/3: Response must reference the institution's highest governing body, which has ultimate decision-making authority over the institution (board of trustees, board of governors, board of overseers, board of visitors, etc.). For institutions that are part of larger systems, the highest governing body is typically the system-wide board.	Requires revision						
	Part 4: A Yes response under this section must be supported by information provided in the subsequent descriptive field. The intent is to highlight institutional programs that give typical community members a voice in institutional decisions that affect them. Examples that count include campus-community councils, "town and gown" committees, community advisory panels, and regular multi-stakeholder forums that are convened at least once a year and open to any community member.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 4: Reporting Assurance*	To count, the institution must have had a finalized version of its current STARS submission reviewed by one or more individuals not affiliated with the data entry process for the sections they review. Completion of this template is required, and any	Requires revision	B9 - you should claim 1/2 point here! - you currently claim 0, otherwise looks good.					
PA 5: Diversity & Equity Coordination	Part 1: Response must reference a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer.	Meets criteria	B-11 - Please provide tracking info (or evidence that it is "required") to support the "all" response for student training. See "common issues" near the bottom of the help center article linked at left. Staff answer of "some" looks well supported.					
	Part 2: Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided. If "All" is selected, response must show indication that the training is required or that tracking indicates that all individuals of a particular group have completed an optional training.	Requires revision						
PA 6: Assessing Diversity & Equity	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. An employee satisfaction or engagement survey does not qualify, unless diversity, equity and inclusion criteria have also been incorporated.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 7: Support for Underrepresented Groups*	Bias Response Team: To count, the response must clarify how the institution responds to and supports those who have experienced or witnessed a bias incident, act of discrimination or hate crime. Responses that cover judicial actions for the accused or adherance with federal guidelines are not sufficient.	Meets criteria	B15 - I suggest adding a link to the NCFDD at UMN, as it's the only program that clearly fits the bill for supporting students interested in academic careers https://faculty.umn.edu/professional-development/faculty/national-center-faculty-development-diversity					
	Recruiting & Mentoring, counseling and support: Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If students, academic staff and non-academic staff are all checked, the response under the descriptive field must reference clarify recruitment/support for all three. Recruitment should cover prospective students, academic staff and non-academic staff while Mentoring/support should cover existing students, academic staff and non-academic staff.	Meets criteria						
	Support for Future Academic Staff - Intent of this section is to recognize programs that specifically aim to support and prepare students from underrepresented groups for academic careers as faculty members (sometimes known as pipeline programs). Response should reference programs to help underrepresented students attain doctoral degrees or otherwise obtain careers in academia. Responses on employee recruitment or other types of support for underrepresented students that is not specific to earning a terminal degree should be omitted from this section, but could probably fit under one of the preceding sections.	Suggestion for improvement						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 8: Affordability & Access	Numeric outliers: Institutions should report figures based on the largest admissions group or student cohort (all students or all undergraduate students). Very low or very high outliers should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
PA 9: Committee on Investor Responsibility	A credit status of "Not Applicable" is only allowed if the institution does not have an endowment, or the institution's endowment is less than US $1 million.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Efforts to improve investor responsibility should be reported under PA 9: Sustainable Investment, and are not sufficient here in the absence of a formal committee on investor responsibility.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Descriptive response should affirm Yes responses for committee representation of staff, faculty and student representation. Any areas not clarified should be updated to No.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 10: Sustainable Investment*	A credit status of "Not Applicable" is only allowed if the institution does not have an endowment, or the institution's endowment is less than US $1 million.	Suggestion for improvement	**B22** - unclear link between the funds listed in the "brief description...." and the value categories above. Maybe just make it explicit that all three listed funds fit the "socially responsible" category. For divestment effort/policy: seems like you have to provde more here, either on evidence of public effort or a specific policy that indicates a clear intent, to support the claim that fossil fuel investments will be "substantially liquidated" **B23** -For specific policy: providing a link to the Regents' policy would support your claim. The Help Center for this credit notes " A published investment policy with sustainability language must be referenced." When I look at your investments page, I don't see anything: https://oib.umn.edu/investments					
	Score outlier: Earning full points (or close to) may be the result of data entry errors such as double-counting, or credit misinterpretation. If a high score is reported, please review closely for the issues listed below.	Meets criteria						
	Part 1 - Response under "A brief description..." must reference each category of sustainable investment. The intent is to count each sustainable investment dollar one time, and listing it under the one category that is most appropriate. Double-counting must be avoided.	Suggestion for improvement						
	Part 2 - Sustainable Investment Policy - The intent of this section is to reference a policy that includes specific sustainability or ESG language to be used to select investments and guide investment managers (i.e., positive screens). A published investment policy with sustainability language must be referenced.	Unsure						
	Data consistency: Total value of the investment pool should be equal to or higher than what is reported under PRE 4 for Endowment Size (endowment is a part of total investment pool). Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
PA 11: Investment Disclosure*	A credit status of "Not Applicable" is only allowed if the institution does not have an endowment, or the institution's endowment is less than US $1 million.	Meets criteria						
	The investment disclosure must provide the amount invested in each fund and/or company on at least an annual basis. It is not sufficient to provide a financial summary that provides aggregated investment information. It is not sufficient to do a one-time disclosure that is not annually updated.	Meets criteria						
PA 12: Employee Compensation*	Numeric Outlier: Part 1 - Low amount under "The local living wage" may indicate that a standard other than (2 Adults, 2 Children) was incorrectly applied. Low responses should be double-checked. U.S. institutions: MIT Living Wage Calculator; Canadian institutions: Living Wage Canada; Other institutions: a local equivalent or the local poverty indicator for a family of four.	Requires revision	**B27** - MIT Living wage for Ramsey county is $40.40 - please explain where your benchmark of $23.19 comes from or recalculate % based on the MIT figure. https://livingwage.mit.edu/counties/27053					
	Part 3 - Descriptive response should support that the assessment is based on TOTAL compensation (including benefits) of the institution's lowest paid regular (i.e., permanent) employee. If the lowest paid employee does not receive benefits, then benefits must be excluded from the total. Regular part-time workers should not be excluded.	Meets criteria						
PA 13: Assessing Employee Satisfaction	Responses should reference evaluation of employee job satisfaction, learning and advancement opportunities, work culture, and work-life balance. A diversity, equity and inclusion or campus climate survey is not sufficient to meet the criteria for this credit, unless employee satisfaction criteria have also been incorporated.	Meets criteria	Very well done					
PA 14: Wellness Programs	Part 1: Response for a "A brief description of the institution's wellness and/or employee assistance program(s)" should reference wellness opportunities for all stakeholders identified (students, academic staff, non-academic staff).	Meets criteria						
	Part 2: If pursuing points for prohibiting or restricting smoking, an indication of a smoke-free policy must be provided.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 15: Workplace Health & Safety	Numeric outliers: Response of .1 or higher under "Number of injuries and cases per FTE employee" or 10 or higher under "Number of workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per 100 FTE employees" may indicate a data entry error.	Meets criteria						
	Part 1: Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If indicating that the occupational health andsafety management system uses a nationally or internationally recognized standard or guideline, supporting documentation must be provided.	Meets criteria						

Credit Title w/ link to Help Center article * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
Academy & Industry Connections (Research)*	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	for this and all other credit titles that we labeled as "not pursuing" in the innovation section - please let us know if we missed something!					
Anchor Institution Network (Public Engagement)	To count, institutions must demonstrate participation in the Higher Education Anchor Mission Initiative or an equivalent network approved by AASHE. Affirmative responses must be supported.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Bicycle Friendly University (Transportation)	Institutions must provide support for each certification with an affirmative response, either through URL or description.	Meets criteria						
Campus Pride Index (Diversity & Affordability)	To count, institutions must currently be rated at above mid-level by the Campus Pride Index or an equivalent third party recognition program for LGBTQ+ friendly practices approved by AASHE. Documentation affirming the certification is required.	Meets criteria						
Carbon Mitigation Project Development (Air & Climate)	Timeline - In order to count, the institution must have actively participated in carbon mitigation efforts beyond its campus boundary during the previous three years. Affirmative responses must be supported.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Center for Sustainability Across the Curriculum (Curriculum)	To count, the institution must have served as an AASHE Center for Sustainability Across the Curriculum, OR offered one or more professional development opportunities (e.g., a workshop) on sustainability in the curriculum for academic staff from multiple institutions. Supporting documentation must be included.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Community Garden (Public Engagement)	To count, institutions must host a community garden on institution-owned land that allows local community members to grow their own food. Affirmative responses must be supported.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Dining Services Certification (Food & Dining)*	Institution and/or its primary dining services contractor must have achieved formal certification from one of the approved programs on the list. Purchase of foods from third party certified producers is not sufficient (this is recognized under the Food & Beverage Purchasing credit.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Diversity and Equity Recognition (Diversity & Affordability)	To count, the institution has been formally recognized for leadership in diversity, equity, and/or inclusion during the previous three years. Documentation affirming the recognition is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Energy System Certification (Energy)	To count, the institution must have an energy management system (EMS) or electricity delivery system (e.g., microgrid) that is currently certified under ISO 50001, PEER, or an equivalent standard approved by AASHE. Affirmative responses must be supported.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
External Reporting Assurance (Coordination & Planning)	To count, the institution's STARS assurance process includes an external audit by one or more individuals affiliated with other organizations (e.g., a peer institution, third-party contractor, or AASHE). Documentation must be provided under this credit and/or the Reporting Assurance credit.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Fair Trade Campus (Public Engagement)	Documentation on formal Fair Trade designation should be provided.	Not Pursuing						
Fleet Certification (Transportation)	To count, the institution's motorized vehicle fleet must currently recognized as a NAFA Sustainable Accredited Fleet or by an equivalent third party certification program approved by AASHE. Documentation affirming the certification is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Food Bank (Wellbeing & Work)	To count, the institution must host a food bank, pantry, or equivalent resource focused on alleviating food insecurity, hunger and poverty among students. The food bank, pantry or equivalent may serve employees or local community members in addition to students. Documentation affirming the program is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Full-Time Faculty Employment (Wellbeing & Work)	Documentation to support the figure reported is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Green Athletics (Public Engagement)	An active green athletics program must be in place, and a valid website URL for the program is required. Simply referencing green athletics efforts is not sufficient in the absence of a formal program.	Requires revision	Link is good for LEED certification aspect, but please provide a link that validates the other affirmative responses like zero waste, transportation, community engagement, turf management- if not a policy, then a press release or something to verify.					

Credit Title w/ link to Help Center article * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
Green Cleaning Certification (Buildings)	Formal certification of the cleaning program must have taken place. Adhering to green cleaning standards or purchase or use of certified green cleaning products is not sufficient. The institution OR its primary cleaning services contractor must be certified.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Green Event Certification (Public Engagement)	A green event certification program that has certified one or more events in the previous year must be in place, and a valid website URL for the program is required. Simply referencing initiatives to make events greener is not sufficient in the absence of a certification program.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Green Laboratory Program (Buildings)	Participation in a green laboratory program must have occurred, and a valid website URL for the program is required. Simply referencing green laboratory initiatives is not sufficient in the absence of a formal program. Descriptive response should support each affirmative response indicated at the top of the credit.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Grounds Certification (Grounds)	Institutions must provide support for each certification with an affirmative response, either through URL or description. Documentation affirming the certification is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Health and Safety Management Certification (Wellbeing & Work)	To count, the institution must have an occupational health and safety management system (OHSMS) that has been audited by an organization external to the institution within the previous three years. Documentation affirming the audit is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Hospital Network (Public Engagement)	Institutions may pursue this exemplary practice if they have "an affiliated healthcare facility within its STARS institutional boundary." Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in upload or URL fields.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Laboratory Animal Welfare (Research)	To count, A copy and/or brief description of the written policy explicitly prohibiting laboratory animals in the institution's care from being subjected to severe and unrelieved pain and distress must be included. Programs to minimize pain and distress, and compliance with U.S. Federal Programs, is not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Natural Wastewater Systems (Water)	Intent of this credit is to recognize institutions that use natural wastewater systems to treat and manage at least 10 percent of its wastewater through on-site infiltration and/or re-use. Appropriate strategies include constructed treatment wetlands, Living Machines, and other technologies that treat wastewater by mimicking the biological, chemical and physical processes occurring in natural wetlands. This credit is about treating wastewater, not stormwater filtration and treatment (stormwater initiatives are captured under OP 23).	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Network for Student Social Innovation (Campus Engagement)	Documentation for Ashoka U Changemaker Campus, CGI University Network, or an equivalent program must be provided. To qualify, an equivalent program must involve a formal institutional commitment to a social innovation program.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Nitrogen Footprint (Air & Climate)	Timeline - In order to count, the institution must have calculated and publicly reported on its nitrogen footprint within the previous three years. Affirmative responses must be supported.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Online Sustainability Course (Curriculum)	To count as sustainability-focused, the course title or description must indicate a primary and explicit focus on sustainability. The course title or description should: use the term "sustainability"; focus on the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems; OR focus on a major sustainability challenge.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Pay Scale Equity (Wellbeing & Work)	There must be documentation supporting the institution's reported pay scale ratio. Affirmation from the HR office is recommended if published documentation is not available.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Pest Management Certification (Grounds)	Formal certification of the institution's pest management program is required, and purchase of certified pest management products is not sufficient in the absence of formal certification. Documentation affirming the certification is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	extra points available here, if your IPM program is certified					
Sanctuary Institution (Diversity & Affordability)	To count, an Institution must be formally designated or officially self-declared as an institution of sanctuary (a.k.a. a sanctuary campus). Documentation affirming formal designation or self-declaration is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Serving Underrepresented Students (Diversity & Affordability)	Institutions must be on one or more official lists for minority-serving institutions, historically disadvantaged institutions, indigenous institutions, or the equivalent. See lists of minority-serving institutions by the U.S. Department of Education.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						

Credit Title w/ link to Help Center article * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
Single-Use Plastic Ban (Waste)	To count, the institution must have banned or eliminated the on-site sales and distribution of at least one type of single-use disposable plastic. Plastic reduction campaigns are not sufficient in the absence of a total ban. Partial bans do not count. Documentation affirming elimination is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Social Enterprise (Coordination & Planning)	To count, the institution must currently be a Certified B Corporation, OR be formally recognized as a social enterprise (as evidenced by membership in a social enterprise network or inclusion in a social enterprise directory). Affirmative responses must be supported.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Spend Analysis (Purchasing)	There must be indication that the institution has conducted a spend analysis to assess the sustainability impacts of its purchasing across commodity categories and has identified and prioritized opportunities for improvement. Documentation on the nature of the spend analysis must be provided.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Stakeholder Engagement Standard (Coordination & Planning)	To count, the institution must have made a formal, public commitment to the AccountAbility principles as defined in the AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard (SES). Indication of a formal, public commitment must be provided through upload or URL.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Stormwater Modeling (Water)	Response must affirm that the institution uses stormwater modeling to assess the impact of LID practices and green infrastructure on campus. Simply referencing LID practices is not sufficient. Institutions are required to describe the methodologies and tools used to calculate the percentile of local or regional rainfall events.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Student Living Wage (Wellbeing & Work)	To count, all of the institution's student employees (e.g., part-time student workers, work study students, graduate research assistants, graduate teaching assistants) must be paid a living wage for one adult. Information to support the living wage percentage must be provided. U.S. institutions: MIT Living Wage Calculator; Canadian institutions: Living Wage Canada; Other institutions: a local equivalent or the local poverty indicator for a family of four.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Sustainability Course Designation (Curriculum)*	Intent of this exemplary practice is to recognize institutions that go above and beyond the AC 1 criteria by designating sustainability courses across multiple departments. This generally involves identifying symbol or code to help students distinguish sustainability courses from other courses (e.g., a sustainability "filter" in an online catalog or a sustainability "tag" in a printed catalog). Providing a website that lists sustainability courses or identifying courses offered by a sustainability-focused academic unit is not sufficient in the absence of course-level designations that encompass courses offered by multiple departments.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Sustainability Office Diversity Program (Diversity & Affordability)	To count, the institution must have a sustainability office that is intentionally advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in its work, as indicated by three or more of the outlined options. Documentation affirming the outcomes is required.	Unsure						
Sustainability Projects Fund (Investment & Finance)	To count, the institution must have a dedicated fund (e.g., a green fund) to support campus sustainability projects, that is ongoing and includes a multi-stakeholder decision-making process. Documentation about the fund and the decision-making process is required.							
Textbook Affordability (Diversity & Affordability)	The first section recognizes projects to encourage textbook affordability among students, whereas the second section recognizes incentives for the adoption of open educational resources (OER). Documentation affirming the presence of either/both program(s) is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Voter Education and Support (Public Engagement)	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive, upload or URL fields.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Water Balance (Water)	To count, institutions must assess whether total water use is sustainable given average precipitation, potential evapotranspiration, the campus/watershed area and other factors. Response must indicate that this has taken place.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Wellbeing Certification (Wellbeing & Work)	To count, the institution has been recognized for leadership in health and wellness during the previous three years by a national or international certification program. Commitment or recognition programs are not sufficient in the absence of earning a certification based on specified standards. Documentation affirming the wellbeing certification or recognition is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						

Credit Title w/ link to Help Center article * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
Work College (Diversity & Affordability)	To count, the institution must be formally recognized as a work college by the U.S. Department of Education (or local equivalent for institutions outside the U.S.) The institution must require at least one-half of all students who are enrolled on a full-time basis to participate in a comprehensive work-learning-service program. Documentation affirming the recognition is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						Meets criteria
Zero Waste Certification (Waste)	To count, the institution must have at least one TRUE Zero Waste Certified project or portfolio, OR be Certified by an approved national affiliate of the Zero Waste International Alliance (ZWIA). Documentation affirming the certification is required.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
Innovation A - D	Innovation credits are open-ended and reserved for innovative solutions to sustainability challenges and demonstrating sustainability leadership in ways that are not otherwise captured in STARS.	Meets criteria						