



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.

External Review:

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

Internal Review:

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

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

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

Common Issues	
Supporting Affirmative Responses	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields, particularly in scoring fields that require a descriptive response following a Yes or similar affirmation.
Avoiding or Clarifying Data Outliers	Data outliers can be the result of exemplary performance, a change in operations, or quite frequently, a mistake or miscalculation. Outliers can have significant scoring impacts, so it's important to pay attention to them and make revisions if they are the result of an error or miscalculation. For outliers due to exemplary performance, please provide information about how this was achieved in the Notes fields.
Aligning Credit Timeframes	In general, STARS content must be current at the time of submission, or based on data from within the last three years prior to submitting. Care should be taken to ensure that information falls within the expected Timeframe (particularly when updating a report).
Data Consistency Across Credits	Some information in STARS is asked in multiple sections, and can be quickly duplicated using the Copy From feature. While consistency between credits is typical, there are circumstances where a discrepancy can be expected. We recommend clarifying the reason for any valid discrepancies in the Notes field. See related Help Center article on Sharing information between credits .
Valid and Working URLs	It is common for URLs to change over time. Be sure to check that they are working before submitting a credit as complete. Supporting information via URL is typically optional, though there are a few credits where a working URL is required.
Tips	
Institutions that are part of a college/university system should compare data with rated reports from other system institutions.	A number of credits in STARS allow institutions to submit information based on institution OR system-wide standards and practices. This is particularly relevant for the Sustainable Purchasing and Participatory Governance credits. Before submitting, check to see what other institutions in the system are submitting.
Email stars@aaashe.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@aaashe.org so our team can help resolve the question. Reviewers can use the "Unsure" option if there is any uncertainty. The submitter must ensure that the question is resolved before the report is submitted.

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
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.	Suggestion for improvement	Using the SDGs as criteria for defining Sustainability focused and sustainability inclusive courses is a fascinating approach to identifying these courses and addressing this credit. While I tend to agree with your approach, I'm not sure if it meets the intent of the STARS credit. Based on the first pass of the inventory, the following courses might not count towards "sustainability-focused" courses based on AASHE's criteria and Standards and Terms: Global Humanitarians, Forced from Home, Introduction to History Reformers & Radicals US History, Special Topic: Second and Third Reichs, Modern Germany 1848-1945, and African Independence and Liberation. You can submit your credit as is and see if it is approved or you can play it safe and move these courses to sustainability inclusive.	We submitted this credit last year and it was approved. AASHE just required that our classes address social and environmental sustainability	Meets criteria			
	Numeric outlier: Low response under "Total number of academic departments that offer courses" (below 10) is unlikely and should be reviewed closely (particularly for medium-sized or larger institutions). Academic departments are devoted to a particular academic discipline (e.g., Economics, Environmental Science, Sociology). Valid discrepancies or clarifications should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Inventory is complete - For each course, the inventory should include, at minimum, the title, department (or equivalent), and level of each course (i.e., undergraduate or graduate), as well as a brief course description (or rationale for why the course is being included). The course description or rationale must clarify how the course references sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a sustainability challenge.	Meets criteria						
	The count of courses reported under the credit should be consistent with the count included in the inventory. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Definitions for "sustainability-focused courses" and "sustainability-inclusive courses" are followed. To count, the course title or description must include the term "sustainability", focus on ecological and social/economic systems; OR focus on 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.	Unsure						
	Data Consistency: Number of academic departments should be consistent between PRE 5 and AC 1 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies must be clarified in the Notes field.	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			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 2: Response must reference completion of academic programs and should not reflect student participation in general education as recognized in Part 1. To Count, programs must meet one of three criteria: 1. Programs are Identified as sustainability-FOCUSED under AC 3: Undergraduate Program or AC 4: Graduate Program. 2. Programs have adopted one or more sustainability-FOCUSED learning outcomes that reference the interdependence of ecological systems AND social/economic systems. 3. Programs REQUIRE successful completion of a sustainability-FOCUSED course as identified in AC 1: Academic Courses.	Meets criteria						
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.	Suggestion for improvement	Excellent. It is somewhat unclear what is meant by the last sentence of the first paragraph stating: "A program with the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Duke University is available."	Students interested in Environmental Science or Forestry may enter the 3-2 year or 4-2 year combined degree program between Muhlenberg College and the School of the Environment at Duke University.	Meets criteria	Looks great! That adds excellent data		
	Valid URLs are required for each program.	Meets criteria						
AC 4: Graduate Program	Sustainability-focused programs have a primary and explicit focus on the concept of sustainability or the interdependence of ecological systems and social/economic systems. The sustainability focus of such a program should be explicit in the program title or description.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	NA					
	Valid URLs are required for each program.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
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	In the listings of "Data sources and notes about submission," there are many outside programs listed (SIT, SFS, etc.). Although wonderful programs, outside programs cannot be counted towards this credit per the criteria. It may bolster the existing parts of the submission to remove these courses from the list.	I added a clarification note " While these outside programs do not directly contribute to this credit since the programs are off campus, we do encourage students to participate in them when choosing to study abroad"	Meets criteria	Looks great!		
	Immersive programs must be one week or longer in duration. Sustainability-focused immersive programs that are shorter in duration may be claimed under AC 8: Campus as a Living Laboratory if criteria for that credit are met.	Suggestion for improvement						

Credit & Help Center Link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
AC 6: Sustainability Literacy Assessment	Assessment must cover sustainability literacy rather than sustainability-related values, behaviors or beliefs. An institution may use a single instrument that addresses literacy AND culture/engagement if a substantive portion of the assessment (e.g., at least 10 questions or a third of the assessment) focuses on student knowledge of sustainability topics and challenges. Literacy questions typically include right/wrong answers, whereas culture/behavior/engagement questions do not.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If "The entire student body or, at minimum, to the institution's predominant student body" is selected, descriptive information must explain how a representative sample was achieved. If there is indication that a non-representative sample was assessed (e.g., only one class participated), response should be changed to "A subset of students..."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If "Pre- and post-assessment to the same cohort of students or to representative samples..." is selected, there must be some mention of a follow-up assessment (A scheduled post assessment that has not yet occurred may count.) If the support isn't there, response should be changed to "Standalone evaluation without a follow-up assessment..."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	NA					Not Pursuing or Not Appl
AC 7: Incentives for Developing Courses	Any programs or initiatives must specifically incentivize sustainability in the curriculum. General or interdisciplinary faculty development or course development programs do not count, unless the program is clearly focused on sustainability or has a sustainability component.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	NA					Not Pursuing or Not Appl
AC 8: Campus as a Living Laboratory	Living laboratory or experiential learning projects must have a clear curricular or learning component. Supervised student internships, co-curricular activities and non-credit work may count only if there is a formal learning component that is outlined in the descriptive response (i.e., there are opportunities to document and assess what students are learning).	Suggestion for improvement	Waste: Could be helpful to name the course number related.	You all clearly demonstrate many areas where the campus is actively used as a living lab! If they are available, this section would benefit from additional links/reports/presentations related to the final work of the students in and outside the class. All other comments are minor suggestions for grammar or added info. Campus Engagement: The first linked article lists the enACT club as having the full names of 'Environmental Action Team.' It would be beneficial for this to be reflected in the same way. Public Engagment: Needs a space between "& construction in last sentence." Air & Climate: Capitalize LEED Certified. Buildings: Capitalize LEED Certified. (The Tree House sounds incredible!) Energy: Should the first sentence read "...to power phone charging station..." instead of "...to phone power charging station...?" Grounds: Could be helpful to name the course number of the related env. science course taking soil samples.	Meets criteria	Looks great!		Meets criteria
AC 9: Research & Scholarship	Numeric outlier: Response for "Total number of academic departments (or the equivalent) that include at least one faculty or staff member that conducts research" should be comprehensive. Amounts below 10 should be reviewed closely (particularly for medium-sized or larger institutions). Academic departments are devoted to a particular academic discipline (e.g., Economics, Environmental Science, Sociology).	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Responses for "Total number of the institution's faculty and/or staff that are engaged in research" should be comprehensive. Avoid counting only a fraction of research faculty. This amount must include, at minimum, all faculty members for whom research is considered in promotion and/or tenure decisions.	Meets criteria						
	The research inventory must include, at minimum: Name of researcher, Department affiliation, AND Research interests/topics or a brief description justifying the individual's inclusion. The inventory must be a comprehensive list rather than a sample.	Requires revision						
	The count of researchers reported under the credit should be consistent with the count included in the research inventory. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Unsure						
To count, sustainability research must explicitly address the concept of sustainability, reference ecological and social/economic systems, or focus on a major sustainability challenge. This should be clear in the research description or justification in the inventory.	Meets criteria		The methodology described could benefit from additional explanation. When searching faculty research interests, was it determined if those faculty listed have been conducting relevant research in the past 3 years? If so, it would be beneficial to list those faculty and areas of study. Alternatively, it could be combined in a more comprehensive list with the "Sustainability Research Responses." In that spreadsheet, removing the responses that stated they do NOT complete research related to sustainability would improve the documentation. For the inventory of the institution's sustainability research, criteria states that it must include the name of researcher. The one listed from 2020 is outdated, per the criteria unless it can be noted that there is still ongoing research they are completing. Count of researchers reported under credit does NOT currently meet the count included in the inventory. It appears there are 5 researchers missing from the inventory. For data sources and notes, it would be helpful to list a narrower site than the entire Muhlenberg website.	I reformated the attached file to increase the clarity of the survey results and provide consistency between the STAR5 input and attached PDF. There are 21 faculty members listed in the sheet and on the form	Corrected	The attached file is much clearer and more comprehensive. It could be helpful to note at the top of the "Inventory" section that the attachment is the full inventory because more are listed there. It looks like they have a great variety of work!		Meets criteria
Student and faculty support - In order to count, sustainability research programs must specifically aim to increase student/faculty sustainability research. General or interdisciplinary support programs do not count, unless the program is clearly focused on sustainability or has a sustainability component.	Suggestion for improvement		- First paragraph grammar correction: All summer research students participate in an annual college wide celebration of student research					

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
AC 10: Support for Sustainability Research	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.	Unsure	where students [add PRESENT] their work in a poster session. - Promotion or tenure guidelines or policies: Is this the written guideline/policy in regard to tenure decisions? If so, it would helpful to note where specifically it is stated and perhaps to add te exact wording in quotations. Currently, this reads as more of an unwritten ethic, which would be valuable but would not meet the criteria in this section. - Library support for sustainability research: The beginning of this description is a little vague in the efforts of the librarians. Response would benefit from a more comprehensive answer if more information is available on the work the librarians do. - Links: there are a few links with publications or articles that appear to be over 3 years old (such as the ones from 2020). If there are newer examples, that would be great! Otherwise, it may be best to remove the technically outdated links.	Updated gramer. removed tenure guidelines until I can confirm document text. Updated library support to provide more detailed description including name of dedicated staff. Removed dated links.	Meets criteria	Looks great. Thank you.		Meets criteria
AC 11: Open Access to Research	**Yes** responses must be supported in the descriptive and URL fields. To support a Yes response under "Does the institution have a published policy that requires its employees to publish scholarly works open access.," - a policy requiring employees to publish scholarly works open access is required. The policy may allow for publisher embargoes and/or provide a waiver option, but this must be clarified in the descriptive text or policy upload.	Meets criteria						
		Unsure	It appears that the criteria (under Scoring B.) requires a published policy MANDATING open access publishing for full credit here. I understand from the submission that it is accepted/encouraged for faculty to do so, but it is not mandated. Is that correct?	Muhlenbergs policy is manditory for all faculty. Faculty are provided a waiver option but this is not a strictly opt-in policy. I expanded the quote for clarity.	Meets criteria	Thank you for the added clarity!		Meets criteria

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 1: Student Educators Program*	Score outlier - Reporting full points indicates that all students are served (i.e. directly targeted) by a student peer-to-peer program, and there is a high ratio of the number of hours worked by trained educators to the number of students served. Over-counting should be avoided (e.g., counting all students but only listing programs in residence halls, or counting hours spent on administrative, non-sustainability-focused tasks rather than sustainability peer education).	Suggestion for improvement	Great job highlighting various peer to peer education programs! One thing to note is in the description of Muhelnberg Green Team, The green team is missing the e in the. I would also suggest making the peer-to-peer connection even more explicit by giving specific examples of how students educate other students, and leaving out parts of the program that relate less to peer-to-peer education. For example, RA's checking the dorms after move out does not involve RA's educating their peers about sustainability, so this part may not be necessary. The Weigh the Waste sounds like a really cool initiative! I think that the description for this initiative could be more clear by explaining how the student volunteers are trained and how they share the food waste information with other students.	More detail was added about the specifics of peer to peer interactions	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement	Looks good but does not include a description about the transfer student orientation program.	Transfer students participate in the same programs as first year students. This was clarified in the description	Corrected			
	Student-Run Enterprises - Response must affirm that the effort is student-run, and that the business or enterprise includes sustainability as part of its mission or stated purpose. Sustainable Investment and Finance - Response must reference an investment funds through which students can develop socially, environmentally and fiscally responsible investment and financial skills. Student membership in an institution-wide Committee for Socially Responsible Investment does not meet the criteria here (but is recognized under PA 8). Wilderness and Outdoors Programs - Response should affirm that the wilderness/outdoor program follows Leave No Trace Principles. 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. Graduation Pledge - Response must reference a graduation pledge through which students pledge to consider social and environmental responsibility in future job and other decisions. Resources for students to find socially/environmentally responsible employers are not sufficient.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable Not Pursuing or Not Applicable Meets criteria Suggestion for improvement Meets criteria	Looks great! I suggest rethinking the Sustainability-Focused Themes section, as the criteria indicates that campaigns and basic outreach are not sufficient to fulfill this criteria. While giving students reusable water bottles and encouraging reuse is a great way to inspire sustainable behavior, I am not sure that it meets these requirements.	Replaced with Semester long Sustainability Careers for all Majors Series event information	Corrected			
EN 3: Student Life	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.	Suggestion for improvement	The Green Living Guide, website materials, and strategic plan all look great. Nice job! One thing to note is that your strategic plan is listed two times in a row for the data source (s) and notes about the submission section.	Removed Duplication	Corrected			
EN 4: Outreach Materials & Publications	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".	Meets criteria						
EN 5: Outreach Campaign	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If a "Yes" response is provided for faculty and/or students, the descriptive response must clarify how the campaign targets each group.	Suggestion for improvement	Great job on meeting this criteria. I would suggest being more explicit about how the Just Tap It campaign targets both students and employees.	Added note about new employee orie	Corrected			

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 6: Assessing Sustainability Culture	Assessment must cover sustainability-related values, behaviors or beliefs on multiple sustainability-related topics, rather than sustainability literacy. An institution may use a single instrument that addresses sustainability literacy, culture, and/or engagement to meet the criteria for this credit if at least 10 questions or a third of the assessment focuses on culture, behavior, and engagement. Culture/behavior/engagement questions typically do not include right/wrong answers, whereas literacy questions do.	Not Pursuing						
	If "The entire campus community (students, staff and faculty), directly or by representative sample..." is selected, descriptive information must explain how each of the three groups was targeted. If there is indication that certain groups were not assessed (e.g., the assessment is sent to students only), response should be changed to "A subset of the campus community..."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If "Longitudinally to measure change over time..." was selected, there must be some mention of a follow-up assessment. (A scheduled post assessment that has not yet occurred may count.) If the response doesn't include information about a follow-up assessment, response should be changed to "Without a follow-up assessment of the same cohort or representative samples."	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
EN 7: Employee Educators Program*	Score outlier - Reporting full points indicates that all employees (academic and non-academic staff) are served (i.e. directly targeted) by an employee peer-to-peer program, and there is a high ratio of the number of hours worked by trained educators to the number of employees served. Over-counting should be avoided (e.g., counting all staff but listing programs that do not target all staff, or counting hours spent on administrative, non-sustainability-focused tasks rather than sustainability peer education).	Meets criteria	The description for the Fahey Commons Representatives is cut short and ends in the middle of a sentence. So, the description of the Fahey Commons Representatives program should be revised and clearly explain how the representatives are trained and how they educate peers, beyond answering questions. The data is not consistent between EN 7 and PRE 5. PRE 5 indicates there are 802 full time employees, whereas EN 7 says there are 783 full time employees.	Updated Employee numbers & description	Corrected			
	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						
	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.	Requires revision						
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.	Suggestion for improvement	Meets the criteria. The sustainability handout looks great, but has "draft" written in the center. Is there a final version that you can upload instead?	Updated Document	Corrected			
EN 9: Staff Professional Development & Training	This credit focuses on formal professional development and training opportunities, for example as delivered by trainers, managers, sustainability staff, the Human Resources office or external contractors. Informal programs are not sufficient.	Suggestion for improvement	For the internal professional development, the description mentions the All Plants Operations staff, which was part of the peer-to-peer educator programs section. The internal professional development does not describe any professional development or training, but only lectures on sustainability related topics, which may not fit this criteria. For the external professional development, I suggest giving an example of a sustainability conference that staff previously attended to strengthen this description.		Corrected	Plant ops is training in sustainable practices as related to cleaning & grounds maintenance. Additionally food service employees are trained in decreasing food waste. AASHE conference added as example		
	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 <i>Employee Educators Program</i> and <i>Outreach Campaign</i> credits respectively, and should only be reported in this credit if such programs are formally recognized by the institution as professional development and training.	Suggestion for improvement						
EN 10: Community Partnerships	Intent of the credit is to highlight formal partnerships with community organizations, rather than institutional initiatives that benefit the community. Partnerships between individuals affiliated with an institution, or with student/faculty groups, are not sufficient in the absence of an institution-level partnership.	Suggestion for improvement	Meets criteria. I suggest adding a description for the Jefferson Elementary School section on how the partnership is sustainability-focused. For the description of the Costa Rica partnership, the title of the course appears to be cut off or accidentally deleted. Additionally, as this credit is focused on partnerships with community organizations, I am not sure that the intent of the credit also encompasses global partnerships .	added description of after school activities related to sustainability for Jefferson	Corrected			
	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields for each of the following: a) Institution supports the partnership materially or financially; b) Partnership is multi-year or ongoing, rather than a short-term project or event; c) Partnership is sustainability-focused (focus is on the concept of sustainability, the interdependence of ecological and social/economic systems, or a major sustainability challenge); d) Partnership is inclusive and participatory, i.e., underrepresented groups and/or vulnerable populations are engaged as equal partners.	Suggestion for improvement						
	Intent of this credit is to recognize institutions that "collaborate with other colleges or universities to help build campus sustainability broadly." Therefore, ALL responses should focus on collaboration with other campuses or higher education-focused groups/initiatives (or list one valid example).	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
EN 11: Inter-Campus Collaboration	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.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	The mentorship description is cut off and incomplete, so I suggest going back to add more information about the mentorship relationship, and indicate specific schools if possible. Looks like Muhlenberg is part of great sustainability networks!	Removed cut off sentence	Meets criteria			
	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
EN 12: Continuing Education	Part 1 should reference sustainability-focused continuing education courses , whereas Part 2 should reference sustainability-focused programs in continuing education. While definitions may vary, responses should generally align with common definitions of courses and programs.	Meets criteria	Meets criteria. I suggest strengthening the explanation of how the course is sustainability-focused by providing more information about how the corporate social responsibility references sustainability.	Left as is	Meets criteria			
	Courses and programs must be offered for continuing education specifically (i.e. offered through a continuing education or extension department). Courses or programs designed for degree seeking students should not be included (they are recognized under the Curriculum section).	Meets criteria						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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.	Unsure						
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.	Suggestion for improvement	The total number of students in EN 13 is 1,953 but is 1,967 in PRE 5, so this discrepancy should be clarified in the notes. The employee community engagement section looks great, but it would be helpful to clarify if it is a formal program or an informal program, as the criteria is only for formal programs. I suggest clarifying who are the employees that get paid to go on the alternative break programs.	Updated student numbers to match. Clarified Office of Community Engagement Organizes annual opportunities for faculty and staff.	Corrected			
	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
EN 14: Participation in Public Policy*	In order to count, the policy advocacy must have the implicit or explicit support of the institution's top administrators and/or governing bodies.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Responses must reference sustainability-focused policy advocacy by the institution. Examples of advocacy efforts include supporting or endorsing legislation, ordinances, and public policies that advance sustainability; active participation in campaigns aiming to change public policy; and discussions with legislators in regard to the above. Community partnerships, research efforts, or outreach campaigns are covered in other credits and should not be referenced here unless there is an explicit policy advocacy focus.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	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.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Responses must align with the credit timeframe standard of within three years from the expected date of submission. If policy advocacy was initiated more than three years ago, there must be evidence of ongoing advocacy to still qualify.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
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 sufficient to earn points.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						Not Pursuing
	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	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PRE 1: Executive Letter	File is from a top ranking executive (President, Chancellor, Vice President, or Provost)	Meets criteria	Meets criteria but signed in December 2022. If it's not too much of an inconvenience, perhaps you can ask for an updated letter and signature.	Updated Date. Was a typo.	Corrected			
PRE 2: Points of Distinction	<i>No known issues.</i>	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. Non-US institutions should report the most appropriate UNESCO level, as identified in the credit language.	Meets criteria						
PRE 4: Operational Characteristics	Timeframe: Response references most recent operational characteristics for which data are available at the time of submission.	Meets criteria						
PRE 5: Academics & Demographics*	Data Consistency: Fulltime equivalent fields for students and academic staff should be lower than headcount fields for most institutions. Identical amounts are generally only valid if the institution has no part-time employees/students. Lower student headcount amounts are only valid if a significant number of students enroll in more courses than the standard full-time load.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
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.	Suggestion for improvement	The response meets the criteria, however, (for transparency) it would be helpful to include the Scope 1 and Scope 2 fuel types and quantities that lead to the emission totals rather than just the final emission numbers. Also, check for typos in the description narrative. The entry for Scope 2 is empty yet in the attached PDF you are showing 5,586 tons of emissions for Scope 2. Is this an oversight? The Scope 3 commuting data looks good! However, this link is broken and needs to be fixed: https://ivpc.org/data-iv-transportation.html . Finally, can you provide a link to Liberty Environmental's air emissions inventory?	their website where we got information. I posted an unbroken link to the data section of their website but it is currently under construction. We are currently working on institutionalizing our GHG inventory and will take your comments into consideration for our next submittal. This work was done by a class and I am having trouble getting all the additional information for this submittal. We have 5,586 tons of emissions in our calculations but are reporting as 0 due to the purchase of RECs	Corrected			
	If indicating that the inventory has been verified by an independent, external third party or validated internally by independent personnel, descriptive response and/or upload must support verification of the inventory by an external party.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
OP 2: Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Score outlier: Uncommon for institutions to earn 6 out of 8 points or above. If a high score is reported, check closely for the issues below. Exemplary performance can be clarified in the descriptive fields.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
	Comparative outlier: Gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions between OP 1 and OP 2 should be consistent. Any significant outliers that are valid should be clarified in the descriptive fields or Notes section.	Meets criteria	Muhlenberg showed an excellent reduction in GHG emissions from baseline year to performance year. However, there was no explanation as to how this was achieved. The submission could be vastly improved if some context was provided as to how Scope 2 emissions went to "0" and how stationary and mobile Scope 1 emissions declined. Offsets from Raker and Graver Arboretums could be improved if link or additional information was provided (e.g., include size, location, and calculations of arboretum).	I added the description of our REC purchasing program to account for the "0" Scope 2 emissions and provided and explanation of the reduction in Scope 1 (we are replacing all dorm boilers with high efficiency Natrual Gas units)				
	Numeric outliers: Response of zero under either Gross Scope 1 GHG emissions from stationary combustion or Gross Scope 2 GHG emissions from purchased electricity is uncommon. A zero response for purchased electricity may qualify if institutions purchase RECs to cover 100 percent of purchased electricity. Any valid outliers or exemplary performance should be clarified in the descriptive fields or Notes section.	Requires revision						
	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.	Suggestion for improvement						
	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				Corrected			
OP 3: Building Design & Construction	Data outlier: Amount reported under "Total floor area of newly constructed or renovated building space (include projects completed within the previous five years)" should reflect only space that was "constructed or underwent major renovations in the previous five years". Data outliers, such as reporting a number that is consistent with OP 3 or PRE 4 gross square footage should be avoided or clarified.	Meets criteria	Excellent and inspiring project... wow! I love the birds and bees building. :)					
	If claiming any square footage under Certified Projects, response under "A list or inventory of new construction and major renovation projects..." should include detail on the buildings, rating systems and dates of project completion. Detail on any reported uncertified space (multi-attribute or single attribute rating systems) should be included in this descriptive field. See 2-page guide on Examples of multi-attribute and single attribute ratings .	Meets criteria		Thanks				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						
	LEED O+M Certification - This credit recognizes LEED O+M certification rather than the more common LEED BD+C standard, which is recognized in OP 3. Response under "A brief description of the green building rating system(s) used and/or a list or sample of certified buildings and ratings" should clarify the rating system and level for each certified building.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	If claiming any square footage under O+M Certified Space, response under "A brief description of the sustainable operations and maintenance policy/program and/or O+M rating system(s)" should include detail on the buildings, rating systems and dates of project completion. Detail on any reported uncertified space (multi-attribute or single attribute rating systems) should be included in this descriptive field. See 2-page guide on Examples of multi-attribute and single attribute ratings .	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable	Looks good. Some redundant information in the notes but otherwise looks really good.					

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
	Data consistency: Gross floor area and energy intensive building space should be consistent with PRE 4 or lower, if a similar performance year is used. A lower number may be reported under OP 4 if the institution excluded certain types of occupied space (parking garages, stairwells, etc.) from this credit but not others. Likewise, buildings for which certification is pending may be excluded for up to 2 years following registration with LEED or another rating system.	Meets criteria		Thanks				
OP 5: Building Energy Efficiency*	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	Submission meets all criteria!...but could be improved if documentation was provided to support the performance year energy consumption.					
	Numeric outlier: Zero or very low response under "Imported electricity" or "Stationary fuels and other energy products used on-site" is highly unlikely. Most institutions purchase electricity or use natural gas, fuel oil, diesel, or coal for heating or other non-transportation purposes. A response of zero or other very low response should include clarification in the Notes field, including affirmation that the institution uses no/very little fuels for heating.	Meets criteria						
	Comparative outlier: Significant differences between Performance Year and Baseline Year amounts (e.g., 10-fold decrease) under "Imported electricity" or "Stationary fuels and other energy products used on-site" that is unexplained is unlikely. Large differences should be explained in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Low responses under Heating degree days and Cooling degree days. Typical responses in both figures are in the thousands, but responses for institutions in very mild, warm or cool climates may be in the hundreds or even zero if heating/cooling isn't needed.	Meets criteria						
	Site-source ratio: U.S. and Canadian institutions must use the ratios reported in the Technical Manual (3.0 and 2.0 respectively). Institutions in other countries can report their own national/regional figures if they differ from what is recommended in the Technical Manual.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Total energy consumption figures between OP 5 and OP 6 should match. Valid discrepancies must be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Gross floor area and Energy-intensive building space figures between OP 5 and PRE 4 should be equal. Figures in OP 5 can be slightly lower if outdoor energy from parking garages/stadiums, etc is metered separately and excluded under OP 5. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	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	Broken link needs to be fixed: http://www.muhsen.org/main/campuslife/sustainability/operations.html .					
	Data consistency: Response under "Total energy consumption, performance year (electric and non-electric)" should be consistent with what is reported under OP 5 if the same Performance Year is used. Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
	In order to count, the institution must retain or own the rights to the renewable energy reported. Grid mix reported by a utility does not count toward the credit (grid mix may be reported in optional fields under this credit).	Unsure						
	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	Suggestion for improvement						
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).	Meets criteria	List "Convenience stores" as not present but included in your inventory. Is this a mistake? Consider updating the description of the institution's sustainable food and beverage purchasing program as some of the information is dated and the weblink is broken. Include this					
	Numeric outlier - Reporting a plant-based foods percentage of 80% or more. If a higher percentage is reported, this may indicate misinterpretation in how plant-based foods are defined and/or calculated.	Meets criteria						
	For transparency and to help ensure comparability, a completed STARS Food and Beverage Purchasing Inventory template or equivalent inventory must be provided to document purchases that qualify as sustainably or ethically produced. The inventory must justify each product's inclusion and include, at minimum: Product name, label, or brand; Product description/type; Recognized sustainability standard met (e.g., third party certification or ecolabel).	Suggestion for improvement						
				We are leaving as is for now but will improve documentation for next years submittal				
					Corrected			

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits Linking	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
	<p>If claiming products under the institution-affirmed exemption, ALL of the following criteria must be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The product is single-ingredient; - The product is sourced through a short food supply change that provides full traceability; - Affirmation that the production methods used are consistent with the IFOAM Principles of Organic Agriculture, the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, OR the WTO 10 Principles of Fair Trade. <p>Products that do not meet ALL of these criteria should be excluded.</p> <p>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.</p>	Meets criteria	<p>Deleted the broken link to update the weblink as the URL where more information about your food and beverage purchasing program is available: https://dining.muhenberg.edu/sustainability</p>	Updated. Convenience Stores are not present on campus & Fixed Broken Link	Corrected			
OP 8: Sustainable Dining	<p>Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.</p> <p>Sustainability-Themed Outlet - Response should reference a sustainability-themed food outlet. Conventional food outlets that also offer sustainable options are not sufficient.</p>	Suggestion for improvement	<p>The criteria for this credit is met. However, the description for the sustainability-themed food outlet "Currently working with Humane Society for meatless programs." could be elaborated on. Is this program happening? Further details might be instructive and inspiring for other campuses who read your STARS report. Currently, there is not enough detail or information to know anything about this program.</p>	<p>Updated with information about Java Joes Coffee Shop - Fair Trade Coffee & Reusable mug discount & Community Fundraisers</p>	Meets criteria			
		Suggestion for improvement						
OP-9: Landscape Management	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	Meets criteria	<p>Meets all criteria! In the description of the institution's approach to plant stewardship, the second paragraph starting with "Healthy soil" is repeated twice. Delete one of the paragraphs. Under "A brief description of the institution's approach to energy-efficient landscape design:" the response is not a description of energy-efficiency measures. It's okay to leave this blank if there aren't any specific examples, but it would be great to include one or two.</p>	Updated Text				
OP 10: Biodiversity	<p>Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.</p>	Meets criteria			<p>Though you are not getting any credit for OP10 this time around, this seems like a possibility for future submissions!</p>	Thanks		
OP 11: Sustainable Procurement	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Part 3: Descriptions must reference actual policies for the purchase of products/services, rather than practices, which are recognized elsewhere in STARS.</p>	Meets criteria	<p>Broken link under, "The policies, guidelines or directives." Likewise, broken link under, "A brief description of the LCCA policy and/or practices:" Description under "transportation and fuels" highlights the good practice of purchasing 14 EVs but does not provide a link or reference to the purchasing policy.</p>	Fixed & added Links	Corrected			
		Requires revision						
OP 12: Electronics Purchasing	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Meets criteria	<p>Submission could be improved if you included in the notes what the single-attribute is for electronic equipment. For example, are all your computers, monitors, printers, etc., Energy Star rated?</p>	I added language from our Purchasing guidelines	Corrected			
OP 13: Cleaning & Janitorial Purchasing	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Meets criteria						
OP 14: Office Paper Purchasing	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Meets criteria						
OP 15: Campus Fleet	<p>Score and/or Numeric outliers: Earning full points or close to it may be an indication that conventionally fueled vehicles were underreported. Data outliers or exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.</p>	Meets criteria						
	<p>Score outlier: Earning full points or close to it is unlikely. Exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.</p>	Meets criteria	I think this credit meets AASHE's criteria.					

Credit & Help Center Link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
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	However, there is very little information on the commuting behavior of students and/or faculty/staff. The data provided is an estimate from the Registrar's Office but it would be helpful to know if this is just a guess or if there was some sort of survey conducted and when. Any link to the survey or estimate would be helpful for the credit and for future tracking for the Sustainability Office at Muhlenberg.	All students are required to live in on campus housing starting in 2023. With exceptions being made for local residents. With this being the case we will not have minimal off-campus comuters. text was updated with on campus housing requirement for all students	Meets criteria			
	Survey must reach a representative sample (e.g., assessing students in a single class or employees in a single office/department isn't sufficient)	Unsure						
	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	Broken links under, "A brief description of the incentives or programs to encourage employees to live close to campus."	Updated Links	Corrected			
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						
	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, a different performance or baseline year selected, or the credit should be updated to Not Pursuing.	Meets criteria						
	Numeric outlier: Part 3, Waste Diversion - High amount (e.g., 90% or above) for "Percentage of materials diverted from the landfill or incinerator by recycling, composting, donating or re-selling, performance year" may indicate data entry error. Check closely for issues below. Exemplary performance should be clarified in descriptive field.	Meets criteria						
	Data consistency: Weighted campus user (WCU) figures should be consistently 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.	Meets criteria	Wow! A model for all college and university building projects! Great work.	Thanks				
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						
OP 21: Water Use*	Numeric and Comparative outliers: Large differences between baseline year and performance year, or very high/low amounts under Total and Potable water use should be clarified under the Notes field.	Meets criteria	You cut your water consumption nearly in half. So impressive. Nice work by the Muhlenberg team.					
	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		Thanks we replaced grass with Turf on a lot of our fields, removed chillers and replaced all fixtures with low flow.				
OP 22: Rainwater Management	If pursuing points for having a green infrastructure and low impact development policy, there must be information about a policy that covers green infrastructure and low impact development.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 1: Sustainability Coordination	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields.	Unsure	Where it says "Name and title of each sustainability officer" there is no title listed. Also the question "Does the institution have at least one sustainability office that includes more than 1 full-time equivalent employee?" is answered as yes, but the field "Full-time equivalent of people employed in the sustainability office(s):" is answered as 0.5. This seems inconsistent, so I am unsure which field is accurate.	Clarified. There are three staff members one at 0.5, and two at 0.25 for the equivalent of 1 FTE	Meets criteria			
PA 2: Sustainability Planning*	Part 1: Institutions should reference measurable objectives in "current and formal plans to advance sustainability", such as published and final strategic plans, campus master plans, sustainability plans, etc. At least one measurable objective should be listed, and the plan should be cited in each area with a Yes response.	Meets criteria	Looks good.					
	Part 2: Response must reference the institution's highest guiding document (institution-wide strategic plan or the equivalent). Lower-level guiding documents are not sufficient.	Meets criteria						
	Part 2: If indicating that sustainability is included as a major theme in the highest guiding document, there must be evidence that the plan includes a section on sustainability, references sustainability as a major institutional goal, or includes multiple sustainability-focused objectives.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 3: Inclusive & Participatory Governance*	Part 1: Affirmative responses for Students/Academic staff/Non-academic staff must be supported in the descriptive field. To qualify, institutions should reference student governments, faculty councils, staff councils, collective bargaining units, or similar.	Meets criteria	Looks Good.					
	Parts 2/3: Response must reference the institution's highest governing body, which has ultimate decision-making authority over the institution (board of trustees, board of governors, board of overseers, board of visitors, etc.). For institutions that are part of larger systems, the highest governing body is typically the system-wide board.	Meets criteria						
	Part 4: A Yes response under this section must be supported by information provided in the subsequent descriptive field. The intent is to highlight institutional programs that give typical community members a voice in institutional decisions that affect them. Examples that count include campus-community councils, "town and gown" committees, community advisory panels, and regular multi-stakeholder forums that are convened at least once a year and open to any community member.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 4: Reporting Assurance*	To count, the institution must have had a finalized version of its current STARS submission reviewed by one or more individuals not affiliated with the data entry process for the sections they review. Completion of this template is required, and any	Requires rev	This currently says "not pursuing" on the AASHE platform, however can be updated after our suggestions are considered.	I will update when complete	Corrected			
PA 5: Diversity & Equity Coordination	Part 1: Response must reference a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer.	Meets criteria	Looks Good. I noticed missing punctuation in "Data source(s) and notes about the submission." section.	Updated gramer	Corrected			
	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						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 6: Assessing Diversity & Equity	Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. An employee satisfaction or engagement survey does not qualify, unless diversity, equity and inclusion criteria have also been incorporated.	Unsure	Note that the COACHE faculty job satisfaction survey conducted in spring 2020 is no longer applicable because it occurred over 3 years ago. It would be wonderful if you have access to an updated version! Try to confirm the NACCC from the USC Center for Race and Equity conducted in 2021 meets the required timeline depending on the submission date because it is on the cusp. There are a few grammatical typos in this section. Muhlenberg answered no when asked if "the results (or a summary of the results) of the most recent structured diversity and equity assessment publicly posted" but did provide a link "where the diversity and equity assessment report or summary is publicly posted". Is this a potential for an additional point if you do have the link available? The criteria states that it must be shared with the entire campus community, but the response indicates it only being shared with faculty. Are there instances or examples where it is shared more broadly?	Removed COACHE Data & not taking credit for publicly sharing data				
PA 7: Support for Underrepresented Groups*	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Support for Future Academic Staff - Intent of this section is to recognize programs that specifically aim to support and prepare students from underrepresented groups for academic careers as faculty members (sometimes known as pipeline programs). Response should reference programs to help underrepresented students attain doctoral degrees or otherwise obtain careers in academia. Responses on employee recruitment or other types of support for underrepresented students that is not specific to earning a terminal degree should be omitted from this section, but could probably fit under one of the preceding sections.</p>	<p>Suggestion for improvement</p> <p>Meets criteria</p> <p>Meets criteria</p>	<p>Broken links (3/8). Minor formatting issues. Likely need to expand on the Bias Response Team's efforts. Could consider expanding on efforts to recruit non-academic staff, great work with faculty specific efforts! Also, CFD seems more employee recruitment oriented so it may fit better in a preceding section rather than the "Support for Future Academic Staff" section, as is suggested by the common issues column. Overall looks good!</p>	<p>Removed Broken Link. Website is currently being updated</p>	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.	Meets criteria	Looks good. Does Muhlenberg offer any policies, programs, or resources to low-income and nontraditional students that are not already available to the entire student body? If it does, I would recommend including that in the brief descriptions.	Expanded program descriptions in optional section	Corrected			
PA 9: Committee on Investor Responsibility	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Descriptive response should affirm Yes responses for committee representation of staff, faculty and student representation. Any areas not clarified should be updated to No.</p>	<p>Not Pursuing or Not Applicable</p> <p>Not Pursuing or Not Applicable</p> <p>Not Pursuing or Not Applicable</p>			Not Pursuing			Not Pursuing
	A credit status of "Not Applicable" is only allowed if the institution does not have an endowment, or the institution's endowment is less than US \$1 million.	Meets criteria						

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits	Common Issues	Status: 1st Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 1st Review	Institution Response: 1st Review	Status: 2nd Review	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions: 2nd Review	Institution Response: 2nd Review	Final Status
PA 10: Sustainable Investment*	Score outlier: Earning full points (or close to) may be the result of data entry errors such as double-counting, or credit misinterpretation. If a high score is reported, please review closely for the issues listed below.	Meets criteria	Math looks good! It may be helpful to expand on what various networks across ESG investing and impact investing Muhlenberg's Outsourced Chief Investment Officer participates in. Some sentences seem out of place (one starts with "Yes..." but is not responding to a question).	Updated out of place sentences	Meets criteria			
	Part 1 - Response under "A brief description..." must reference each category of sustainable investment. The intent is to count each sustainable investment dollar one time, and listing it under the one category that is most appropriate. Double-counting must be avoided.	Meets criteria						
	Part 2 - Sustainable Investment Policy - The intent of this section is to reference a policy that includes specific sustainability or ESG language to be used to select investments and guide investment managers (i.e., positive screens). A published investment policy with sustainability language must be referenced.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
	Data consistency: Total value of the investment pool should be equal to or higher than what is reported under PRE 4 for Endowment Size (endowment is a part of total investment pool). Valid discrepancies should be clarified in the Notes field.	Meets criteria						
PA 11: Investment Disclosure*	A credit status of "Not Applicable" is only allowed if the institution does not have an endowment, or the institution's endowment is less than US \$1 million.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable			Not Pursuing			Not Pursuing
	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 or Not Applicable						
PA 12: Employee Compensation*	Numeric Outlier: Part 1 - Low amount under "The local living wage" may indicate that a standard other than (2 Adults, 2 Children) was incorrectly applied. Low responses should be double-checked. U.S. institutions: MIT Living Wage Calculator ; Canadian institutions: Living Wage Canada ; Other institutions: a local equivalent or the local poverty indicator for a family of four.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable			Not Pursuing			Not Pursuing
	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.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable						
PA 13: Assessing Employee Satisfaction	Responses should reference evaluation of employee job satisfaction, learning and advancement opportunities, work culture, and work-life balance. A diversity, equity and inclusion or campus climate survey is not sufficient to meet the criteria for this credit, unless employee satisfaction criteria have also been incorporated.	Unsure	Diversity, equity and inclusion or campus climate surveys are not sufficient to meet the criteria for this credit, unless employee satisfaction criteria have also been incorporated. If the NACCC includes employee satisfaction criteria, please specify because that is required for full credit. I believe the COACHE faculty job satisfaction survey conducted in spring 2020 is no longer in date, as AASHE requires schools to report current policies and practices and on the most recent employee satisfaction and engagement evaluation conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. Do you have a more recent survey to use in this section?	provided question topic areas from NACCC related to employee satisfaction	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, academic staff, non-academic staff).	Suggestion for improvement	The "Website URL where information about the institution's wellness programs is available:" section includes a link to your smoke free policy rather than information on your wellness programs.	updated				
	Part 2: If pursuing points for prohibiting or restricting smoking, an indication of a smoke-free policy must be provided.	Meets criteria	Looks Good.	Thanks				
PA 15: Workplace Health &	Numeric outliers: Response of .1 or higher under "Number of injuries and cases per FTE employee" or 10 or higher under "Number of workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per 100 FTE employees" may indicate a data entry error.	Meets criteria	Looks Good. Could consider clarifying what year your data is from to ensure it meets the required timeframe.	UPdated	Meets criteria			

Credit & Help Center link * High error rate credits PA 15- Workplace Health & Safety	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
	Part 1: Affirmative responses must be supported by information provided in descriptive fields. If indicating that the occupational health and safety management system uses a nationally or internationally recognized standard or guideline, supporting documentation must be provided.	Not Pursuing or Not Applicable			Not Pursuing			Not Pursuing

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

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

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

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