



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:	Lindsey Van Zile
Type of Review:	Internal
Title & Organization:	Sustainability & Campus Projects Coordinator at Randolph College
Email (optional):	lvzile@randolphcollege.edu
Comments (optional):	Completed and reviewed STARS Assessment and reporting information is inside the reporting tool.
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:	Karin Warren
Type of Review:	Internal
Title & Organization:	Randolph College's Herzog Family Chair of Environmental Studies & Science and Sustainability Council Co-Chair
Email (optional):	kwarren@randolphcollege.edu
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):	