	American University
	4401 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington, DC 20016
	STARS ver. 2.2 Submission Review - 2020
	2.2 Review Template
	The Google Sheets version of this template is available as "View Only". To access an editable version, please select "Make a Copy" under the File menu.
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.
Independent 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 STARS 2.x 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
	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:	Sally DeLeon
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Senior Project Manager; University of Maryland, College Park
Email (optional):	sdeleon@umd.edu
Comments (optional):	Sally is UMD's STARS Liaison and a member of the AASHE Advisory Council. She managed the review process and all credits were reviewed by at least two team members from UMD's Office of Sustainability. She reviewed several credits from every section, read over comments from the other reviewers, and helped guide other team members in their reviews.
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:	Emily Hightower
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)

Title & Organization:	Sustainability Associate; University of Maryland, College Park
Email (optional):	ehightwr@umd.edu
Comments (optional):	Emily works on data management and analysis for UMD's Progress Reporting. She has experience preparing UNC Chapel Hill's STARS Report for submission and managed their course and research inventories. She reviewed all Academics credits; all Operations credits except Food & Dining and Water; a sub-set of Planning & Administration Credits; a sub-set of Engagement credits; most pre-requisites; and most innovation credits.
Reviewer 3	
Name:	Lee-Ellen Myles
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Sustainability Associate; University of Maryland, College Park
Email (optional):	lemyles@umd.edu
Comments (optional):	Lee-Ellen works works on outreach and has experience managing student sustainability outreach for Residential Life, Department of Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Dining Services as well as employee outreach for UMD's Green Office Program. She also helped prepare UMD's STARS Report for submission. She reviewed Planning & Administration credits from Diversity & Affordability and Well-being and Work, Operations credits from Food & Dining, and most Engagement credits.
Reviewer 4	
Name:	Jessica Shaker
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Measurement and Assessment Intern; University of Maryland, College Park
Email (optional):	jshaker@umd.edu
Comments (optional):	Spring 2020 Intern
	Jessica is an undergraduate intern in the Office of Sustainability this semester. She is working closely with Sally and Emily on data collection, cleaning, analysis and visualization. She reviewed a variety of credits all of which were also reviewed carefully by one of the other team members.
Reviewer 5	
Name:	Mark Stewart
Type of Review:	Independent (peer/third party)
Title & Organization:	Sustainability Manager; University of Maryland, College Park
Email (optional):	stewartm@umd.edu
Comments (optional):	Mark has worked closely with UMD faculty on incorporating sustainability into the curriculum at UMD. He also develops and works on a wide variety of programs for the UMD Office of Sustainability, including the Sustainable Teaching Fellows program, Student Sustainability Advisors, and administering UMD's Sustainability Fund. He reviewed portions of UMD's STARS Report before submission and helped enter information for AC credits. He reviewed several Academics credits.

Common Issues

Check for Scoring, Numeric or Comparative Outliers.	Outliers in credit scores, numeric responses or in comparison between different timeframes sometimes indicate that there may be a data entry error, conversion error or misinterpretation. If outliers are the result of exemplary performance, this should be clarified when possible.
All affirmative responses are supported.	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.
Credit time frame is correct.	Most credits require "standards and practices at the time of submission" or "data from within last three years"
Figures are consistent with other credits.	Several credits throughout STARS include fields that are asked in multiple places, and usually include one of the PRE credits. In such cases, you will see a "Copy from" prompt, and are encouraged to use this to automatically copy your response from another credit. A valid reason for figures to differ is if the institution uses a different performance year for a particular credit.
All URLs are functioning and valid.	It is common for URLs to change over time. Be sure to check that they are working before submitting a credit as complete.

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 - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution High Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PRE 1: Executive Letter	URLs: Link to file upload may not open correctly if a long file name was used.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
PRE 2: Points of Distinction	*No known issues.*	Suggestion for improvement	Suggestion for AUx punctuation change: "...their own identities and learn about bias; structures of power, privilege, and inequality; and how to become a part of a diverse community."	changed the sentence, should make more sense now.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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 (http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/basic.php). Non-US institutions should report the most appropriate UNESCO level, as identified in the credit language.	Meets criteria						
	Supporting Responses: Valid explanation required under "The rationale for excluding any features that are present from the institutional boundary".	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
PRE 4: Operational Characteristics	Timeframe: Response references most recent operational characteristics for which data are available at the time of submission.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
PRE 5: Academics & Demographics*	Numeric outlier: Responses for "Number of academic departments (or the equivalent)" should be higher than ""Number of academic divisions (or the equivalent)". For Academic Departments, amounts below 10 are 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						
	Data Consistency: Full Time equivalent fields for students and faculty 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						Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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						
	Definitions for "sustainability-focused courses" and "sustainability-inclusive courses" should be 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						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement	- Greater description of how each course relates to sustainability in order to better differentiate between sustainability focused and sustainability inclusive courses - Included legal studies in Learning Outcomes credit but not in the Academic Courses credit? - Excluded independent study research courses in Notes section but included "Master's Thesis Research" in course inventory (chemistry, environmental science, etc.)	Course descriptions came either from faculty directly or from the course catalog. Not sure I could change the course descriptions without reaching out to each faculty at this point, since we don't have publicly available syllabi. The law school operates separately from the rest of AU, so faculty weren't surveyed for this credit. I removed the masters thesis research from the course inventory and the overall count.	Meets criteria			
	The count of courses reported under the credit should be consistent with the count included in the inventory. Valid discrepancies must be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Data Consistency: Number of academic departments should be consistent across PRE 5, AC 1 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies must be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
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.	Meets criteria						
	Part 1 and Part 2: Mission, vision, and values statements do not qualify because they outline intentions for the course or program, rather than expectations of what the student will learn.	Meets criteria						
	Part 1: Institution-level learning outcomes must apply to the entire (or predominant) student body (e.g., all undergraduate students).	Meets criteria						
	Part 2: 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.	Meets criteria						
	Part 2: Response under "Total number of graduates from degree programs" must reflect all students. A common mistake is overlooking graduate students.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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 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.	Requires revision	- Needs work on explicitly describing how the concept of sustainability or social/ economic/ ecological systems are addressed within each major specifically the Environmental Science (BA & BS) and Environmental Science Minor - Environmental Studies (BA): Only the ecological aspect of this credit is explicitly mentioned. Either describe the sustainability component or add social /economic systems in addition to the ecological systems - Environmental Studies (BS): Needs more information. Does not describe the how the concept of sustainability is addressed and social/ economic/ and ecological systems are barely mentioned or described. Addition of research experience does not seem necessary in this credit.	Edited both environmental studies BA and BS descriptions				Meets criteria
	Valid URLs are required for each program.	Meets criteria			Corrected			
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.	Requires revision	-Environment & Development: The description is vague. Does not describe what the minor entails or its relation to sustainability or other systems besides the Minor title. -Data Science: Could go more in depth on how data science is used within the environmental science realm specifically in sustainability or social/ economic/ ecological systems - Make the titles of majors/ minors uniform: whether "(MS)" goes before of after course title	development concentration description. Removed the data science concentration. I don't really have enough info about the program to categorize it as sustainability. Fixed titles for uniform formatting.				Meets criteria
	Valid URLs are required for each program.	Meets criteria			Corrected			
AC 5: Immersive Experience	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						
	Immersive programs must be longer than one week 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						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.	Meets criteria						
	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..."	Suggestion for improvement	Clarify that the sample was representative and add a sentence describing how the Institutional Research and Assessment Office chose the sample (to ensure that it was representative).	updated to clarify a representative sample was used	Meets criteria			
	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..."	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
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 connected sustainability.	Unsure	This is a general and interdisciplinary connference for all faculty and staff. Not sure that it will count even though it incorporates some sesssions that are focused on the arboretum and sustainabilty data. Do faculty have any incentives (like a stipend, seed grant, or professional certification or recognition) to attend any sustainability-specific sessions?		Suggestion for impro	Please include greater detail about incentives used by Ann Ferran Conference to increase sustainability in course learning outcomes.	I don't think I made it clear before - but the AFC is hosted by AU's center for research, teaching, and learning. This falls under "trainings offered by the institution." It also I guess has the incentive of "release time" - it's held at a convenient time when courses are not in session, for staff that attend it is paid time.	Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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 8: Campus as a Living Laboratory	If highlighting student co-curricular activities, employment opportunities and internships, there must be a clear curricular or learning component reflected in the description. Supervised student internships and non-credit work may count as long as the work has a formal learning component (i.e., there are opportunities to document and assess what students are learning).	Requires revision	...Diversity...Accessibility: Vague; explain diversity support services on campus -Within each description, provide a clear relationship between the example used and how it contributes to understanding or advancing sustainability. - Grammar suggestion in "A brief description...Campus Engagement:" "To better promote sustainable behaviors on campus and identify areas of concern, students created the "Eagle Cause" app as a course project." - Spelling error/Punctuation suggestion in "A brief description... Public Engagement:" "While at AU, students complete for-credit internships and gain real-life experiences at environmental or sustainability-focused NGO and nonprofits located in DC." - Punctuation suggestion in "A brief description...Air&Climate:" "A pollution-focused class invites the Office of Sustainability to discuss how campus projects decrease air pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions." - Punctuation suggestion in "A brief description...Buildings:" "The Office of Sustainability gives many tours to various classes, pointing out sustainable design features..."	Updated credit for punctuation/spelling/grammar and content. The wellbeing and diversity sections were removed entirely	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
	To count, an initiative must "contribute to understanding or advancing sustainability", and the description provided under each impact area should reflect that.	Suggestion for improvement	- Punctuation suggestion in "A brief description...Energy:" "Studies in Global Environmental Politics: Sustainable Design/LEED Training worked with Facilities Energy Management to explore sustainable building design and utility consumption. Through energy data analysis in Lucid and Facilities Management-hosted tours of AU's mechanical rooms and systems, students developed their understanding of the challenges and potential solutions to managing energy efficiency on campus." - Punctuation/Grammar suggestion in "A brief description... Food&Dining:" "In the Complex Problems Course: Pollution Solutions, students identified and investigated specific areas of pollution alongside AU representatives to develop realistic solutions... The Learning by Leading Initiative, in partnership with Smithsonian Gardens and the University Arboretum, ..." - Punctuation/Grammar suggestion in "A brief description... Grounds:" "The Learning by Leading Initiative, in partnership with Smithsonian Gardens and the University Arboretum,..." - Consider reviewing submissions for punctuation, grammar, or spelling errors				
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 are 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).	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						
	To count, sustainability research must explicitly address the concept of sustainability, reference ecological and social/economic systems, or focus on a major sustainability challenge.	Suggestion for improvement				More detail for: Ioana Sakellion Moon Oulatta Michael Spochart Alene Gelbard Quansheng Zhao		
	Data consistency: Number of academic departments should be equal to PRE 5, or lower under AC 9 if the institution is opting to exclude departments that don't conduct research. Clarifications can be provided in the Notes field.	Meets criteria	Ioanna Sakellion: more detail (what is GDES 405?) Michael Brody: revise research topic not to be his paper title? Leigh Riddick: WIP? Sonya Grier: more detail?	updated	Suggestion for impro		I tried to find more details from the faculty profiles, but didn't find additional info - this info is self reported. No changes were made	Meets criteria
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 research support programs that also include sustainability are not sufficient.	Meets criteria						
	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						

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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
	Library support - Sufficient detail on library support in the form of research guides, materials selection policies and practices, curriculum development efforts, sustainability literacy promotion, and/or e-learning objects focused on sustainability.	Suggestion for improvement	- small error (extra word): "teaching assistants to through guidance"	Fixed error	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
AC 11: Open Access to Research*	All Yes responses must be supported in descriptive fields provided.	Meets criteria						
	Response of Yes under "Offers institutional open access repository hosting" - A valid URL to an institutional repository is required. An external repository may count if the institution participates in a consortial and/or outsourced open access repository."	Meets criteria						
	Response of Yes under "Does the institution have a published policy that requires its employees to publish scholarly works open access..." - 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.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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 (including graduate 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., if programs listed only cover residence halls, it is unlikely that all students are covered).	Requires revision	- Common issue is over counting students served. 100% in Part 1 is unlikely as a result of a low ratio of numbers of hours worked to number of students served. Double check data to confirm information is accurate. In order to serve the number of students you have indicated in the number of hours you have listed, each student would receive about 7 minutes of service. This seems doable but unlikely. - URL does not point to specific information about student educators program - 10 students at 8 hours/week for 30 weeks/year is 2,400 hours/year, not 1,900	-Changed students served to the number of undergraduates - SSEs were undergrad students aimed at reaching other undergraduate students, mainly (i.e. residence hall activities only had undergraduates, since AU does not have grad housing, etc) -We don't have an active URL about student educators program because it was discontinued as of summer 2019 and we changed the internship program structure. I have included it in the notes. -Updated hours per year - thanks for the catch!	Corrected			Corrected
	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.	Meets criteria						
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.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
EN 3: Student Life	Student Groups - Response should reference sustainability-related student clubs or other groups (e.g., Sustainability Club, Sierra Club, etc.). Participation in committees is covered under PA 1, whereas student governance is covered under PA 3.	Meets criteria						
	Student-Run Enterprises - Response must affirm that the effort is a business or related enterprise that includes sustainability as part of their mission statements or stated purpose.	Suggestion for improvement						
	Sustainable Investment and Finance - Recognizes "sustainable investment funds, green revolving funds or sustainable microfinance initiatives 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 (recognized under PA 8).	Meets criteria						
	Wilderness and Outdoors Programs - Response must 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.	Meets criteria						
	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.	Meets criteria	- Student run enterprise: does not explicitly describe how sustainability is a part of its mission statement or purpose just describes how the store is run logistically	Updated the student run enterprise section that includes a video from the manager, as well as a link to their website.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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".	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable			Meets criteria			Meets criteria
EN 5: Outreach Campaign	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If Yes response is provided for faculty and/or students, the descriptive response must clarify how the campaign targets each group.	Requires revision	- Fork plastic: Show the impact of the campaign maybe through measuring plastic utensil usage before and after; not just having students sign the pledge - Green Office: Describe how the impact of the campaign was measured among the faculty that participated. Go more in depth to explain what the campaign entailed rather than just encouraging sustainable behavior and office policy changes; Not really clear what the campaign was	Unfortunately we don't have measured usage statistics before and after, however we have gotten a lot of positive feedback from the community after the end of the campaign. Detailed more about the green office program. We do targeted outreach throughout the year to different offices on campus to recruit more green offices. There is an administrative group on campus (the administrative professionals from different departments) that is key in recruiting new offices. Our outreach manager does presentations and communication to the green offices ongoing/year round.	Requires revision	We completely understand the challenge of measuring impact! However the credit criteria requires more detail for both campaigns: "To measure if a campaign yields measurable, positive results, institutions should compare pre-campaign performance to performance during or after the campaign. Increased awareness or increased membership of a mailing list or group is not sufficient in the absence of other positive results." If the feedback you got about the plastic campaign included information about changed behavior in addition to positive experience, you may be able to use that. Add the number of people that committed to pledge to show measurable, positive results.	Added more information	Corrected
EN 6: Assessing Sustainability Culture	Assessment must cover sustainability-related values, behaviors or beliefs 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 a substantive portion of the assessment (e.g., at least ten questions or a third of the assessment) focuses on sustainability values, behaviors, and/or beliefs.	Meets criteria						
	If referencing the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Sustainability Education Consortium, please confirm formal participation (http://nsse.indiana.edu/html/consortia_list.cfm?consortiayear=2018&consFlag=yes). A common mistake is referencing participation in NSSE, but not its Sustainability Education Consortium.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	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..."	Requires revision						
	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 support isn't there, response should be changed to "Without a follow-up assessment of the same cohort or representative samples".	Meets criteria	- Since the "Entire campus community" was selected, describe how each of the three groups are targeted; students/ faculty/ staff. Clarify that the sample was representative and add a sentence describing how the Institutional Research and Assessment Office chose the sample (to ensure that it was representative). - For supporting information, include any reports or aggregated survey data	Clarified that it was a representative sample was used.				Corrected
	Assessment should cover multiple sustainability topics. (An assessment solely focused on transportation or recycling is not sufficient.)	Meets criteria		Uploaded excel sheet in optional fields showing select survey results	Corrected			Corrected

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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 7: Employee Educators Program*	Score outlier - Reporting full points indicates that all employees (faculty and 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., if programs listed only cover faculty or administrative staff, it is unlikely that all employees are covered).	Meets criteria						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement	- The peer-to-peer component of the Green Teaching program should be elaborated upon - There is a typo in the description of the second program: "Now in its 11h year" - There is a typo in the data sources and notes: "Green Teaching Program"	Corrected typos Elaborated on peer to peer component	Meets criteria			
	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.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
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.	Meets criteria	The website link isn't necessarily pointing to any sustainability specific information. Is there a more specific sustainability HR page you can point to?	I added another link to transit information, and AhealthyU. There isn't a sustainability-specific HR page, but the information related to sustainability is included in the orientation program.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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 organizations. Informal programs are not sufficient.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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.	Meets criteria	Typo in Ann Ferren Conference: "..on how the *Arboretum* can be used..." Also, to make it easier to read each of the discrete professional development opportunities, we suggest adding a line space between them (right now the Energy and Engineering session is crammed up against the Office of Sustainability session on change agents). How do faculty and staff find out about the USGBC portal and AASHE portal?	Corrected typo, formatting. Faculty/staff are given USGBC/AASHE access upon request.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
EN 10: Community Partnerships	Intent of the credit is to highlight formal partnerships with community organizations, rather than institutional initiatives that benefit the community.	Meets criteria						
	Partnerships must be formal at the institutional level (not sufficient if individuals or student groups form a partnership).	Meets criteria						
	The descriptive field must provide supporting information to affirm how the institution supports the partnership materially or financially (minimum criteria for all partnerships).	Suggestion for improvement						
	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields for each of the following: a) Partnership is multi-year or ongoing, rather than a short-term project or event; b) Partnership is sustainability-focused (focus is on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a major sustainability challenge); c) Partnership is inclusive and participatory, i.e., underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations are engaged as equal partners.	Meets criteria	- Typo in the description of the 3rd program: "save student's money" - Include link to Washington Area Bicyclist Association - URL in "A brief description of institution's formal...(2nd partnership):" is broken	Corrected typo	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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.	Meets criteria						
	All initiatives must aim to support and help build the campus sustainability community (e.g. focus is on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a major sustainability challenge).	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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	- Include links when possible (case study, district school sustainability pledge, etc.)	Added links	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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.							
	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).							
	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.							
	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.			We are not pursuing this credit - there are 0/50 course offerings with sustainability components.				Not Pursuing or Not
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.	Meets criteria						
	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			Meets criteria			Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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*	This credit recognizes institutions that promote sustainability through public policy advocacy. 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 provide sufficient detail about public policy advocacy. 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						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	Meets criteria						Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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.	Requires revision	Please include documentation to support the GHG Inventory verification process.	The description is written in the box - no need for extra documentation	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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.	Requires revision						
	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						
	Numeric outliers: Responses of zero under either Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from stationary combustion or Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from purchased electricity are unlikely. Any significant outliers that are valid 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	Paradigm Project: "The contract term was from 1/1/2017-12/31/2019." Is the "Institution-catalyzed carbon offsets generated" including the peer verfication project we are completing this summer with the Offset Network? As the trees aren't yet peer verified, are you able to include these carbon sinks? Adjusted net GHG emissions are 5,273 MTCO2e -- Is there a missing carbon sink that covers these emissions? -- if not, adjusted net Scope 1/2 GHG per EUI=adjusted should be 0.00116 MTCO2e How did Gross Scope 1 GHG Emissions from other sources reduce by about 50%? Include clarifiying descriptions.	The contract temr is 1/1/17-12/31/19 but the offsets are for FY17-19. The institution catalyzed carbon offsets generated is the same as the trees, since they are not verified yet, we have offsets of the same amount in wind power & landfill flaring until they are verified. I got a response back from STARS/AASHE, they said that "under "gross scope 2 emissions" you actually factor in renewables/RECs, but not offsets. So I have changed it to 0. See OP5/OP6 for the exact numbers, but it is net zero emissions for scope 2 because of renewables.	Corrected			Corrected
	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.	Meets criteria						
	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.	Meets criteria						
OP 3: Building Design & Construction	Data consistency: 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						
	Institutions must "report on the current certification status of buildings at the time of STARS submission. Buildings for which certification is pending should not be counted as certified space, and these buildings may be excluded from the institution's profile for up to 2 years following registration with a rating system."	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. Examples of multi-attribute and single attribute ratings provided in the Building Design & Construction Help Center article (https://stars.aashe.org/resources-support/help-center/operations/building-operations-and-maintenance/)	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
OP 4: Buildings Operations & Maintenance*	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						
	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. (Examples of multi-attribute and single attribute ratings provided in 2-page guide: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kTyvZauTc6LOwrodrMBDRhiZ9S8Elq11JyUf-rOGfZI)	Meets criteria						
	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.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Gross floor area and energy intensive building space should be consistent with PRE 4 if the same or 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.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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 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						
	Numeric outlier: Zero or very low response under "Stationary fuels and other energy products used on-site" is highly unlikely, since most institutions 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. See Help Center FAQ on determining heating and cooling degree days (https://stars.aashe.org/resources-support/help-center/operations/building-energy-consumption/#how-do-we-determine-our-heating-and-cooling-degree-days).	Suggestion for improvement						
	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. Notes field should explain any valid discrepancies.	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.	Meets criteria	Include source for degree days or nearest weather station ID if used the AASHE degree day resources	Added source for degree days and nearest weather station	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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						
	In order to count, the institution must retain or own the rights the 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						
	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						Meets criteria
OP 7: Food & Beverage Purchasing*	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. See FAQs about the new version in the Food & Beverage Purchasing Help Center article (https://stars.aashe.org/resources-support/help-center/operations/food-and-beverage-purchasing/).	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier - Reporting a plant-based foods percentage of 80% or more. If a higher percentage is reported, this may indicate inconsistency 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 (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1xwoDpyN0aH3gTiSoOmPeSCXRDjDgqg2YGI9UECI3uII/edit#gid=1747767920) 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).	Meets criteria						
	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. The percentage must include total food and beverage expenditures. All product categories and food service providers should be included in the total food and beverage expenditures figure.	Requires revision		Farm Logix is the software used. Unfortunately we				

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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
	Purchases of non-edible food accessory products should not be included in scoring calculations. If such items are included in the food inventory, clarification that they have not been counted should be provided.	Meets criteria	- What is meant by "Farm Logix Report"? Not sure if this was meant to be elaborated on, a link, or other	don't have great dining data - our dining contractor switched mid 2019 and this is the most recent report we have available. I elaborated on this in the desciprtion	Corrected			Corrected
OP 8: Sustainable Dining	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Suggestion for improvement	- Low Impact Dining Events: Expand on description; events like what - Food Donations: Expand on how often, how much, etc - "sorting and washing reusable plateware" seems like it should be "sort and wash reusable plateware"	Removed the food donation - I checked with dining and waste and I think this was an outdated response... added info about low impact dining				
	Sustainability-Themed Outlet - Response should reference a sustainability-themed food outlet. Conventional food outlets that also offer sustainable options are not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Low-Impact Dining Events - Response must reference low-impact events or focus on plant-forward options.	Suggestion for improvement			Meets criteria			Meets criteria
OP 9: Landscape Management	Score outlier - Score above 1.5 indicates that a significant portion of grounds operate organically, using ecologically preferable materials. Review organic care responses to ensure criteria were followed correctly.	Meets criteria						
	Responses under the table, "Figures required to calculate the total area of managed grounds" should avoid double-counting (e.g. same number entered for IPM, organic care). 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.	Suggestion for improvement	- Suggestion to include context/information about methodology for calculating the area of managed grounds - Grammar/Punctuation: "A brief description of the institution's approach to plant stewardship:" "Sustainable landscape features are: green roofs,..."	Corrected punctuation and added note at the bottom. There was one employee who was particularly interested in managing the grounds organically, so the 7.28 acres of organically managed areas is the section of campus she was responsible for managing.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
OP 10: Biodiversity	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Suggestion for improvement	- Expand on the methodologies used to identify endangered and vulnerable species and/or areas of biodiversity importance and any ongoing assessment and monitoring mechanisms in addition to providing a link - Website provided in "The methodologies used to identify endangered..." is not hyperlinked and when you go to the link the embedded map is broken	Fixed link. We don't really have any ongoing assessment and monitoring mechanisms? Since our campus is developed, and there is only 1 known endangered species in DC, and we aren't in an area of biodiversity importance, there isn't really ongoing monitoring for biodiversity.	Meets criteria			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.	Meets criteria						
	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.	Meets criteria						
	Part 3: Descriptions must reference actual policies for the purchase of products/services, rather than practices, which are recognized elsewhere in STARS.	Meets criteria						
	Policies and directives adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g., government or the university system) may count for this credit as long as the policies apply to and are followed by the institution. Institutions belonging to a system are encouraged to review responses from other institutions within the system.	Suggestion for improvement	Include a link to the dining vending contracts, if possible? Link broken: https://www.american.edu/finance/facilities/upload/american-university-design-and-construction-standards-05-03-16.pdf		Corrected			Corrected
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			Meets criteria			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.	Requires revision	-100% of total annual expenditures on janitorial paper products are certified green janitorial paper products which is unlikely. If so, add affirmation in descriptive text. - Include link to green cleaning policy or procurement guidelines, current link sends to Buildings & Grounds page that has generic sustainable building information	Updated link, affirmed that 100% of janitorial paper products are certified				
	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			Corrected			Corrected
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			Meets criteria			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 (zero or low responses under "Number of gasoline only vehicles" and "Number of diesel only vehicles"). Numbers must be inclusive of all fleet vehicles. Data outliers or exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.	Suggestion for improvement	- Punctuation suggestion in "A brief description of the institution's...:" "...vehicles in the following order: electric, hybrid, biodiesel, flex fuel, and lighter, more fuel efficient vehicles. Additionally, American University..." - Include additional documentation or website for information support	Edited punctuation. No documentation/website available, but added a breakdown in vehicle types.	Meets criteria	Don't see the punctuation updates, but would recommend them	Updated punctuation!	Corrected
	Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it is unlikely. Exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.	Meets criteria						

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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	Timeframe: There should be some indication that the modal split assessment was completed within the last three years.	Meets criteria	Clarify that the sample was representative and add a sentence describing how the Institutional Research and Assessment Office chose the sample (to ensure that it was representative). Include survey questions (if possible)	The survey questions just asked "how did you get to campus on dd/mm/yy, how did you get from campus on dd/mm/yy" x 7. added doc of results	Corrected			Corrected
	Survey must reach a representative sample (e.g., assessing students in a single class or employees in a single office/department isn't sufficient)	Requires revision						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement	"American University offers incentives to academic and non-academic staff. Commuters who primarily travel by bicycle to campus." It looks like you have an accidental period here after "staff" since the next statement is an incomplete sentence.	Corrected punctuation/grammar	Meets criteria			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	- Potentially include when composting and move-in/out programs were initiated to better explain why the 2005 baseline (with 0s for materials composted, donated/re-sold, and disposed through post-recycling residual conversion) is the best possible baseline due to data availability. - "A brief description of institution's procurement policies designed to prevent waste:" Is the Zero Waste Policy a procurement policy? -There is a typo in the description of the institution's waste audits: "asses" should be assess	Added additional explanations and corrected typo. Composting was not widespread on campus until 2017, so we will continue to use 2005 as the baseline until more years of data become available under our current practices	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
	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.	Meets criteria						
	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, or a different performance or baseline year selected for which weights can be accounted.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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 consistent across PRE 5 and OP 18 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
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.	Suggestion for improvement	Link to green building and zero waste to landfill policies	Linked	Suggestion for impr	Policies were linked in OP-18, but not in OP-19	added link	Corrected
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						
	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.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
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.	Requires revision	- Review data entry and/ or unit conversions to receive all marks. - Include descriptions of water use conservation initiatives as you are indicating a 32% growth in campus size (baseline to performance year) with a 30% reduction in potable water consumption (baseline to performance year) - Recommend spelling out local abbreviations (ex., SIS)	Added more info about water conservation initiatives. Reviewing the data entry, I actually realized I had overcalculated the performance year numbers. There was an extra month added in there, and I was including a building that we are otherwise excluding in the entire report (3201 new mexico - it has a floor of AU offices and we own the building, but it majority other tenants, including 2 restaurants, a deli, dry cleaners, and other office tenants).	Corrected			Corrected
	Numeric and Comparative outliers: Large differences between Total and Potable water use should be clarified under the Notes field. Significant differences between Baseline and Performance Year should be clarified under the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Potable water use per weighted campus user below 1,000 or over 1,000,000 may indicate data entry or unit conversion error. Please review closely.	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.	Meets criteria						
	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.	Meets criteria						
	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						

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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 22: Rainwater Management	If institution is pursuing for 1 or 2 points (having a green infrastructure (GI) and low impact development (LID) policy for the whole campus or is less comprehensive, there must be information about a policy that covers GI and LID.	Suggestion for improvement	- Does a good job describing the policy, plans, and/or guidelines in regard to LID but does not go in depth in regard to GI - Recommend spelling out local abbreviations (ex., SIS) - Maintain consistency with spelling out numbers between 0-10 - Include link/URL to "Design and Construction Standards; Storm Water Control" text - Include copy of policies, plans, or guidelines	Green infrastructure includes green roofs, permeable pavers, and rain gardens, which are all included. Corrected formatting, added link The university doesn't have a policy specific to LID because DC stormwater regulations for construction already require it - doesn't make sense for us to make a policy that mimics what we are already required to do by law. There is an option to get "credits" for offsite projects, but since we have the availability of space on campus to incorporate LID and GI into our new construction projects, and because of our green building policy, we incorporate stormwater reduction into projects anyways. AU is constantly looking for new ways to reduce impacts of stormwater, but not because of stormwater specific policies. Therefore I've changed the response to the first question since there is not a comprehensive policy just specifically around GI/LID.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution High Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 1: Sustainability Coordination	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Requires revision	- Include all sustainability officer names in "Name and title of each sustainability officer:" - Provide a description for each sustainability office in addition to the positions held - Recommend capitalizing position titles in "A brief description of each sustainability office:" - What is the Resiliency team? - Recommend adding a fourth comma to the list in "Job description for the sustainability officer position" - Recommendation for "Job description for the sustainability officer position (2nd position):" "The Manager designs, implements, modifies, and manages... The Manager collects.." - Recommendation for "Job description for the sustainability officer position (3rd position):" "The Analyst identifies..."	Corrected. Removed the Resiliency team part, I'm not sure...Megan would probably know but she is out :)	Corrected			Corrected
PA 2: Sustainability Planning*	Institutions should reference measurable objectives in "current and formal plans to advance sustainability", such as strategic plans, campus master plans, sustainability plans, etc. Informal initiatives, planned activities, or objectives from draft plans do not count.	Meets criteria	- Provide a list or sample of the measurable sustainability objectives related to engagement - Include objectives that are measurable and briefly describe how they are measurable - Recommend organizing responses and adding quotation marks around directly quoted text - Recommend maintaining consistency with capitalization (ex. Sustainability Plan)	Added a list to engagement	Corrected			Corrected
	Part 1: Responses should reference some form of measurable objective, and must cite the name of the plan where it is found. Simply referencing an external document or indicating that "measurable objectives under this area exist" is not sufficient.	Requires revision						
	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.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	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.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 3: Inclusive & Participatory Governance*	Numeric outlier: Parts 2 & 3: High rates of student, academic staff, non-academic staff, and women representation on the highest governing body should be confirmed.	Meets criteria	Recommendation: Include quotation marks around directly quoted text. Recommendation: Include an organizational hierarchy if available (to show that Board of Trustees is highest governing body)	Added link and upload org chart	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
	Part 1: Affirmative responses for Students/Academic staff/Non-academic staff under "Does the institution have formal participatory or shared governance bodies..." must be supported in the descriptive field.	Meets criteria						
	Part 2: 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.	Suggestion for improvement						
	Part 4: A Yes response under this section must be supported by information provided in the subsequent descriptive field. Responses must mention a campus-community council or equivalent body that gives external stakeholders a regular voice in institutional decisions that affect them. If local community organizations have seats on the Board, that could count, but just having Board members who live in the community would not	Meets criteria						
PA 4: Reporting Assurance*	A credit status of "Not Applicable" is only allowed if the institution is renewing an existing rating earned under the same version of STARS (e.g., 2.2).	Meets criteria						
	To count, the institution must have had a finalized version of its current STARS submission reviewed by an independent party, and must have addressed any inconsistencies identified by the reviewer(s) prior to submission. Uploaded inventory and reviewer affirmation should support that all inconsistencies were addressed prior to report submission.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
PA 5: Diversity & Equity Coordination	Part 1: Response must reference a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer.	Meets criteria						
	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.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
PA 6: Assessing Diversity & Equity	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution High Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 7: Support for Underrepresented Groups*	Responses must be relevant for the topic (1: Non-discrimination statement; 2: Bias response; 3) Recruiting from underrepresented groups; 4) Mentoring, counseling and support; 5) Support for Future Faculty.	Meets criteria						
	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 adherence with federal guidelines are not sufficient.	Meets criteria						
	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.	Requires revision						
	Support for Future Faculty - 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.	Meets criteria	- Provide a brief description of the institution's programs to recruit students; mentioned faculty and staff	Added link in notes, added example f	Corrected			Corrected
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.	Suggestion for improvement	Link in description sends to the same location as the URL field.	Fixed, added additional relevant links	Meets criteria			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.	Unsure						
	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.	Meets criteria		Fixed spelling				
	Descriptive response should affirm Yes responses for committee representation of staff, faculty and student representation. Any areas not clarified should be updated to No.	Meets criteria	- Spell check: "The mission of the Advisory Committee on Socially Responsible Investing (ACSRI)..." - Provide clarification if the committee met in the last three years	Committee has not made formal actions in the last three years, and has been clarified in the notes.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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.							
	Score outlier: Earning full points (or close to) may be the result of data entry errors or credit misinterpretation. If a high score is reported, please review closely for the issues listed below.							
	Numeric outlier: Part 1 - High amounts reported for value of sustainable holdings should be clarified in the descriptive field for "A brief description of the companies, funds, and/or institutions referenced above".							
	Part 1 - Response under "A brief description..." must reference each category of sustainable investment. Check for errors in how investments are classified.							
	Part 2 - Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.							
	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).							Not Pursuing
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.							
	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.							Not Pursuing

Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution High Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
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: http://livingwage.mit.edu/; Canadian institutions: http://www.livingwagecanada.ca/; Other institutions: a local equivalent or the local poverty indicator for a family of four.	Meets criteria	- Although I assume the minimum total compensation provided to the institution's lowest paid employee ($14) does not include benefits, I can't be sure without additional documentation - Include details to support the submission (What type of employee is the lowest-paid regular employee/pay grade? Are contract workers part of a union? Which one? etc.)	Added note that $14/hr does not include benefits. Added that the Aramark workers are all under a union contract. I don't think I am at liberty to disclose the information about who are the lowest paid regular employee/pay. We are not claiming any points for part 3 anyways. The only points for this credit are coming from parts 1 and 2.	Requires revis	Sorry for confusion from my poor phrasing; I was looking for clarifying information about types of employees included/excluded from this credit (i.e., students, provisional, temporary/irregular, etc.) Please, where possible, include details to support the submission	In the notes section, I added a note that student employees were not included in this credit.	Corrected
	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.	Requires revision						
PA 13: Assessing Employee Satisfaction	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields, and should explain how a representative sample was reached. Watch for outliers (high percentages) without sufficient detail.	Suggestion for improvement	Include questionnaire, results, reports, or website where survey information lives Clarify that the sample was representative and add a sentence describing how the Institutional Research and Assessment Office chose the sample (to ensure that it was representative). Include survey questions (if possible)	Since the survey was created and distributed internally (as opposed to something like best places to work), it's not on the AU website and we can't include the survey questions. Sample was not representative because it was sent to every staff member, academic and non academic.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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, faculty, staff).	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
	Part 2: If pursuing points for prohibiting or restricting smoking, an indication of a smoke-free policy must be provided.	Suggestion for improvement	- Include a brief description of smoke-free policy in provided area	added brief description of policy	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
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.	Suggestion for improvement			Meets criteria	"Annual number of recordable incidents of work-related injury or ill health per 100 FTE employees:" is listed at 1.10. Numerical outlier is above 10 for rate per 100 FTE and below 0.1 for total FTE.		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.	Requires revision	- Said the institution does not have an occupational health and safety management system but then provided a brief description of the key components of the custom OHSMS. - Review data to double check numerical outliers	Updated to say yes, but not a nationally recognized OHSMS. I think this review template is out of date, there is no "number of workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per 100 FTE employees"	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
	Full-time equivalent of employees should be consistent between PA 15 and PRE 5 if the same Performance Year and pool of employees is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria

Credit ID	Credit - High error rate credits include an asterisk (*)	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
IN-4	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						Meets criteria
IN-5	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.	Suggestion for improvement	If possible, please indicate the period in which the trees were planted	All trees have been planted as of Dec 2019.	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
IN-7	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.	Requires revision	- Does not show that local community members are able to grow their own food- include if they are able to harvest any of the things grown	Added more information and another link!	Meets criteria			Meets criteria
IN-11	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.							Meets criteria
IN-14	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.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
IN-41	Textbook Affordability (Diversity & Affordability)	To count, the institution must host a peer-to-peer textbook exchange program, textbook lending library, or an alternate textbook project covering multiple divisions or departments; AND/OR provide incentives for academic staff that explicitly encourage the authorship, peer review, and/or adoption of open access textbooks (or alternate textbooks composed of open educational resources). Documentation affirming the program(s) is required.	Meets criteria						Meets criteria
IN-47	Innovation A (IN-47)	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						Meets criteria
		Innovation credits may be claimed in multiple submissions as long as the criteria are being met at the time of submission.							
		When the innovation is part of a partnership or an individual's efforts, the summary provided must clearly describe the institution's role in the innovation.							
		Innovative initiatives covered under an existing STARS credit should not be included unless there is evidence that the initiative goes above and beyond the standards of that credit.							
IN-48	Innovation B (IN-48)	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						Meets criteria
		Innovation credits may be claimed in multiple submissions as long as the criteria are being met at the time of submission.							
		When the innovation is part of a partnership or an individual's efforts, the summary provided must clearly describe the institution's role in the innovation.							
		Innovative initiatives covered under an existing STARS credit should not be included unless there is evidence that the initiative goes above and beyond the standards of that credit.							