Planning & Administration

Coordination, Planning & Governance

This subcategory seeks to recognize colleges and universities that are institutionalizing sustainability by dedicating resources to sustainability coordination, developing plans to move toward sustainability, and engaging students, staff and faculty in governance. Staff and other resources help an institution organize, implement, and publicize sustainability initiatives. These resources provide the infrastructure that fosters sustainability within an institution. Sustainability planning affords an institution the opportunity to clarify its vision of a sustainable future, establish priorities and help guide budgeting and decision making. Strategic planning and internal stakeholder engagement in governance are important steps in making sustainability a campus priority and may help advocates implement changes to achieve sustainability goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Points Available: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA 1</td>
<td>Sustainability Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 2</td>
<td>Sustainability Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 3</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional Reporting Field

- A brief text summary of the institution’s activities relevant to this subcategory
PA 1: Sustainability Coordination

1 point available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions with active committees, offices, or officers charged by the administration or board of trustees to coordinate sustainability work on campus. Institution-wide coordination helps institutions organize, implement, and publicize sustainability initiatives.

B. Criteria
Institution has at least one sustainability committee, office, and/or officer tasked by the administration or board of trustees to advise on and implement policies and programs related to sustainability on campus. The committee, office, and/or officer focus on sustainability broadly (i.e. not just one sustainability issue, such as climate change) and cover the entire institution.

An institution that has multiple committees, offices and/or staff with responsibility for subsets of the institution (e.g. schools or departments) may earn points for this credit if it has a mechanism for broad sustainability coordination for the entire campus (e.g. a coordinating committee or the equivalent). A committee, office, and/or officer that focuses on just one department or school within the institution does not count for this credit in the absence of institution-wide coordination.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn 1 point for having at least one committee, office, and/or officer that meets the criteria outlined above. Partial points are not available for this credit.

E. Reporting Fields

Required

- An indication of whether the institution has at least one sustainability committee, office, and/or officer that focuses on sustainability broadly and covers the entire institution
- An indication of whether the institution has at least one sustainability committee
- An indication of whether the institution has at least one sustainability office that includes more than 1 full-time equivalent (FTE) employee
- An indication of whether the institution has at least one sustainability officer
An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party's knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

**Conditional**
Required if the institution is reporting a sustainability committee, office, and/or officer:
- A brief description of the activities and substantive accomplishments of the committee(s), office(s), and/or officer(s) during the previous three years

Required if the institution is reporting a sustainability committee:
- The charter or mission statement of the committee(s) or a brief description of each committee's purview and activities
- Members of each committee, including affiliations and role (e.g. staff, student, or faculty)

Required if the institution is reporting a sustainability office:
- A brief description of each sustainability office
- Full-time equivalent (FTE) of people employed in the sustainability office(s)

Required if the institution is reporting a sustainability officer:
- Name and title of each sustainability officer
- A brief description of each sustainability officer position

**Optional**
- The website URL where information about the sustainability committee(s) is available
- The website URL where information about the sustainability office(s) is available
- The website URL where information about the sustainability officer(s) is available
- Notes about the submission

**F. Measurement**

**Timeframe**
Report on current sustainability committee composition and practices, office status, and/or officer position status.

**Sampling and Data Standards**
Not applicable
PA 2: Sustainability Planning

4 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that have developed comprehensive plans to move toward sustainability. Sustainability planning affords an institution the opportunity to clarify its vision of a sustainable future and provides a road map to help guide decision-making. Establishing measurable goals and objectives allows an institution to track its future progress, identify and document its successes, and manage the levels of resources devoted to (and required for) the attainment of its sustainability goals. Including sustainability at a high level in the institution’s strategic plan and other guiding documents also signals an institution’s commitment to sustainability and may help infuse an ethic of environmental, fiscal and social responsibility throughout the campus community.

B. Criteria
Institution has current and formal plans to advance sustainability. The plan(s) cover one or more of the following areas:

- Curriculum
- Research (or other scholarship appropriate for the institution)
- Campus Engagement
- Public Engagement
- Air & Climate
- Buildings
- Dining Services/Food
- Energy
- Grounds
- Purchasing
- Transportation
- Waste
- Water
- Diversity & Affordability
- Health, Wellbeing & Work
- Investment
- Other

The plan(s) may include measurable objectives with corresponding strategies and timeframes to achieve the objectives.

The criteria may be met by any combination of formally adopted plans, for example:

- Strategic plan or equivalent guiding document
- Campus master plan or physical campus plan
- Sustainability plan
- Climate action plan
- Human resources strategic plan
- Diversity plan

For institutions that are a part of a larger system, plans developed at the system level are eligible for this credit.
C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn $\frac{1}{6}$ point for each of the areas listed for which they have formally adopted plans and an additional $\frac{1}{6}$ point if the plans include at least one measurable objective with corresponding strategies and timeframes. A maximum of 4 points is available for this credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Example: Sustainability Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example University has several formally adopted plans that address sustainability: a strategic plan, a physical campus plan, a climate action plan and a diversity plan. Collectively, the plans cover 10 specific sustainability areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air &amp; Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity &amp; Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plans include at least one measurable objective with corresponding strategies and timeframes for 5 of those areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points earned = (0.167 × 10 subject areas) + (0.167 × 5 measurable objectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 1.67 + 0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 2.5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Reporting Fields

Required

- An indication of whether the institution has formally adopted plans to advance sustainability covering the following areas:
  - Curriculum
  - Research (or other scholarship appropriate for the institution)
  - Campus Engagement
  - Public Engagement
  - Air & Climate
  - Buildings
  - Dining Services/Food
  - Energy
  - Grounds
  - Purchasing
  - Transportation
  - Waste
  - Water
  - Diversity & Affordability
  - Health, Wellbeing & Work
  - Investment
  - Other (please specify)

- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party's knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

Conditional

Required for each area for which the institution is reporting formally adopted plans:

- A brief description of the plan(s)
- An indication of whether the plan(s) include at least one measurable objective with corresponding strategies and timeframes

Required for each area for which the institution is reporting formally adopted plans with measurable objectives, strategies and timeframes:

- A brief description of the measurable objectives, strategies and timeframes
- Accountable parties, offices or departments

Optional

- The institution's definition of sustainability (e.g. as included in a formally adopted plan)
- An indication of whether the institution’s strategic plan or equivalent guiding document includes sustainability at a high level
- A brief description of how the institution’s strategic plan or equivalent guiding document addresses sustainability
- The website URL where information about the institution’s sustainability planning is available
- Notes about the submission
F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on the institution’s current and formally adopted plan(s). Draft documents are not eligible for this credit.

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable
PA 3: Governance

3 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that engage students, staff and faculty in the ongoing governance of the college or university. Governance includes a variety of organizational functions and decision-making processes, from financial oversight and personnel management to goal-setting and strategic planning. Sustainability requires participatory processes and structures that empower stakeholder groups to come together and work collaboratively to address sustainability challenges through access to and involvement in institutional governance. Without transformed governance structures, many sustainability gains cannot be realized.

B. Criteria

Part 1
Institution’s students participate in governance in one or more of the following ways:
A. All enrolled students, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)
B. There is at least one student representative on the institution’s governing body. To count, student representatives must be elected by their peers or appointed by a representative student body or organization.
And/or
C. Students have a formal role in decision-making in regard to one or more of the following:
• Establishing organizational mission, vision, and/or goals
• Establishing new policies, programs, or initiatives
• Strategic and long-term planning
• Existing or prospective physical resources
• Budgeting, staffing and financial planning
• Communications processes and transparency practices
• Prioritization of programs and projects
Part 2
Institution’s staff participate in governance in one or more of the following ways:

A. All staff members, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

B. There is at least one non-supervisory staff representative on the institution’s governing body. To count, staff representatives must be elected by their peers or appointed by a representative staff body or organization.
   a. And/or

C. Non-supervisory staff have a formal role in decision-making in regard to one or more of the areas outlined in Part 1

Part 3
Institution’s faculty participate in governance in one or more of the following ways:

A. All faculty members, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

B. There is at least one teaching or research faculty representative on the institution’s governing body. To count, faculty representatives must be elected by their peers or appointed by a representative faculty body or organization.
   a. And/or

C. Faculty have a formal role in decision-making in regard to one or more of the areas outlined in Part 1

Participatory or shared governance bodies, structures and/or mechanisms may be managed by the institution (e.g. committees, councils, senates), by stakeholder groups (e.g. student, faculty and staff committees/organizations), or jointly (e.g. union/management structures).

Structures or mechanisms adopted by entities of which the institution is part (e.g. government or university system) may count for this credit as long as they apply and are adhered to by the institution.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.
D. Scoring

Each part is scored independently.

**Part 1**

Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for Part 1 of this credit by fully meeting two of the three criteria listed for students. Partial points are available as follows:

A. 0.5 points are awarded when all students, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

B. 0.5 points are awarded when there is at least one student representative on the institution’s governing body who was elected by peers or appointed by a representative student body or organization

C. 0.1 points are awarded for each of the following areas in which students have a formal role in decision-making, up to a maximum of 0.5 points:
   - Establishing organizational mission, vision, and/or goals
   - Establishing new policies, programs, or initiatives
   - Strategic and long-term planning
   - Existing or prospective physical resources
   - Budgeting, staffing and financial planning
   - Communications processes and transparency practices
   - Prioritization of programs and projects

For example, an institution for which all enrolled students, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 1).

**Part 2**

Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for Part 2 of this credit by fully meeting two of the three criteria listed for staff. Partial points are available as follows:

A. 0.5 points are awarded when all staff, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

B. 0.5 points are awarded when there is at least one non-supervisory staff representative on the institution’s governing body who was elected by peers or appointed by a representative staff body or organization

C. 0.1 points are awarded for each area (outlined in Part 1) in which when non-supervisory staff have a formal role in decision-making, up to a maximum of 0.5 points.

For example, an institution for which all staff, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 2).
**Part 3**

Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for Part 3 of this credit by fully meeting two of the three criteria listed for faculty. Partial points are available as follows:

A. 0.5 points are awarded when all faculty, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

B. 0.5 points are awarded when there is at least one faculty representative on the institution’s governing body who was elected by peers or appointed by a representative faculty body or organization

C. 0.1 points are awarded for each area (outlined in Part 1) in which faculty have a formal role in decision-making, up to a maximum of 0.5 points

For example, an institution for which all faculty, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 3).

**E. Reporting Fields**

**Required**

- An indication of whether all enrolled students, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

- An indication of whether there is at least one student representative on the institution’s governing body who was elected by peers or appointed by a representative student body or organization

- An indication of whether the institution’s students have a formal role in decision-making in regard to each of the following:
  - Establishing organizational mission, vision, and/or goals
  - Establishing new policies, programs, or initiatives
  - Strategic and long-term planning
  - Existing or prospective physical resources
  - Budgeting, staffing and financial planning
  - Communications processes and transparency practices
  - Prioritization of programs and projects

- An indication of whether all staff, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)
□ An indication of whether there is at least one non-supervisory staff representative on the institution’s governing body who was elected by peers or appointed by a representative staff body or organization

□ An indication of whether the institution’s non-supervisory staff have a formal role in decision-making in regard to each of the following:
  ○ Establishing organizational mission, vision, and/or goals
  ○ Establishing new policies, programs, or initiatives
  ○ Strategic and long-term planning
  ○ Existing or prospective physical resources
  ○ Budgeting, staffing and financial planning
  ○ Communications processes and transparency practices

□ An indication of whether all faculty, regardless of type or status, have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies (through direct participation or the election of representatives)

□ An indication of whether there is at least one teaching or research faculty representative on the institution’s governing body who was elected by peers or appointed by a representative faculty body or organization

□ An indication of whether the institution’s faculty have a formal role in decision-making in regard to each of the following:
  ○ Establishing organizational mission, vision, and/or goals
  ○Establishing new policies, programs, or initiatives
  ○ Strategic and long-term planning
  ○ Existing or prospective physical resources
  ○ Budgeting, staffing and financial planning
  ○ Communications processes and transparency practices

□ An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once it is submitted and available to the public.

**Conditional**
Required if the institution is reporting that all enrolled students have an avenue to participate in governance:

□ A brief description of the mechanisms through which all enrolled students have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies
Required if the institution is reporting that there is at least one student representative on the institution’s governing body:

- A brief description of student representation on the governing body, including how the representatives are selected

Required if the institution is reporting that its students have a formal role in decision-making:

- A brief description of the formal student role in regard to each area indicated, including examples from the previous three years

Required if the institution is reporting that all staff have an avenue to participate in governance:

- A brief description of the mechanisms through which all staff have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies

Required if the institution is reporting that there is at least one non-supervisory staff representative on the institution’s governing body:

- A brief description of non-supervisory staff representation on the governing body, including how the representatives are selected

Required if the institution is reporting that its non-supervisory staff have a formal role in decision-making:

- A brief description of the formal staff role in regard to each area indicated, including examples from the previous three years

Required if the institution is reporting that all faculty have an avenue to participate in governance:

- A brief description of the mechanisms through which all faculty (including adjunct faculty) have an avenue to participate in one or more governance bodies

Required if the institution is reporting that there is at least one teaching or research faculty representative on the institution’s governing body:

- A brief description of faculty representation on the governing body, including how the representatives are selected

Required if the institution is reporting that its faculty have a formal role in decision-making:

- A brief description of the formal faculty role in regard to each area indicated, including examples from the previous three years

Optional

- The website URL where information about the institution’s governance structure is available
- Notes about the submission
F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current policies and procedures and activities during the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable
Diversity & Affordability

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that are working to advance diversity and affordability on campus. In order to build a sustainable society, diverse groups will need to be able to come together and work collaboratively to address sustainability challenges. Members of racial and ethnic minority groups and immigrant, indigenous and low-income communities tend to suffer disproportionate exposure to environmental problems. This environmental injustice happens as a result of unequal and segregated or isolated communities. To achieve environmental and social justice, society must work to address discrimination and promote equality. The historical legacy and persistence of discrimination based on racial, gender, religious, and other differences makes a proactive approach to promoting a culture of inclusiveness an important component of creating an equitable society. Higher education opens doors to opportunities that can help create a more equitable world, and those doors must be open through affordable programs accessible to all regardless of race, gender, religion, socio-economic status and other differences. In addition, a diverse student body, faculty, and staff provide rich resources for learning and collaboration.

Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Points Available: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA 4</td>
<td>Diversity and Equity Coordination 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 5</td>
<td>Assessing Diversity and Equity 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 6</td>
<td>Support for Underrepresented Groups 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 7</td>
<td>Support for Future Faculty Diversity 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 8</td>
<td>Affordability and Access 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional Reporting Field

- A brief text summary of the institution’s activities relevant to this subcategory
PA 4: Diversity and Equity Coordination

2 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions with active committees, offices, or officers charged by the administration or governing body to coordinate diversity and equity work on campus. Diversity and equity coordination increases the ability of an institution to more effectively address these issues.

B. Criteria
Part 1
Institution has a diversity and equity committee, office and/or officer tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies, programs, and trainings related to diversity and equity on campus. The committee, office and/or officer focuses on student and/or employee diversity and equity.

Part 2
Institution makes cultural competence trainings and activities available to all members of one or more of the following groups:
- Students
- Staff
- Faculty
- Administrators

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Each part is scored independently.

Part 1
Institutions earn 1 point for having a committee, office or officer that meets the criteria outlined above and focuses on both student and employee diversity and equity. Partial points are available if the committee, office and/or officer focuses on students or employees, but not both. For example, an institution with a diversity and equity office that focuses solely on student diversity would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 1 of this credit).

Part 2
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for Part 2 for making cultural competence trainings available to all members of the campus community. Partial points are available based on the number of groups for whom the institution makes trainings available. For
example, an institution that makes cultural competence trainings available to all members of 2 of the groups listed would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 2).

**E. Reporting Fields**

**Required**

- An indication of whether the institution has a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies, programs, and trainings related to diversity and equity on campus
- An indication of whether the institution makes cultural competence trainings and activities available to all members of any of the following groups:
  - Students
  - Staff
  - Faculty
  - Administrators
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party's knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

**Conditional**

Required if the institution is reporting a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer:

- An indication of which of the following the committee, office and/or officer focuses on (select all that apply):
  - Student diversity and equity
  - Employee diversity and equity
- A brief description of the diversity and equity committee, office and/or officer, including purview and activities

Required if the institution is reporting cultural competence trainings:

- A brief description of the institution's cultural competence trainings

**Optional**

- The full-time equivalent of people employed in the diversity and equity office (or the equivalent)
- The website URL where information about the diversity and equity committee, office and/or officer is available
- The website URL where information about the cultural competence trainings is available
- Notes about the submission
F. Measurement

Timeframe
Part 1
Report on current diversity and equity committee composition and practices, office status, and/or officer position status.

Part 2
Report on trainings offered during the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable
PA 5: Assessing Diversity and Equity

1 point available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that systemically assess diversity and equity on campus. Fostering an inclusive and welcoming campus culture is important to ensuring the academic and social success of all campus community members. In order to foster such a culture, it is helpful to gather information about campus stakeholders’ personal experiences and assess diversity and equity in terms of an institution’s students, employees and governance.

B. Criteria
Institution assesses diversity and equity on campus and uses the results to guide policy, programs, and initiatives. The assessment(s) address one or more of the following areas:

1) **Campus climate**, e.g. through a survey or series of surveys to gather information about the attitudes, perceptions and experiences of campus stakeholders and underrepresented groups

2) **Student diversity and educational equity**, e.g. through analysis of institutional data on diversity and equity by program and level, comparisons between graduation and retention rates for diverse groups, and comparisons of student diversity to the diversity of the communities being served by the institution

3) **Employee diversity and employment equity**, e.g. through analysis of institutional data on diversity and equity by job level and classification, and comparisons between broad workforce diversity, faculty diversity, management diversity and the diversity of the communities being served by the institution

4) **Governance and public engagement**, e.g. by assessing access to and participation in governance on the part of underrepresented groups and women, the centrality of diversity and equity in planning and mission statements, and diversity and equity in public engagement efforts

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for this credit for having conducted assessments that meet all of the criteria outlined above. Partial points are available based on the number of areas assessed. For example, an institution whose assessments covered 2 of the 4 areas listed would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for the credit).
E. Reporting Fields

Required
- An indication of whether the institution has assessed diversity and equity in the following areas:
  - Campus climate
  - Student diversity and educational equity
  - Employee diversity and employment equity
  - Governance and public engagement
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party's knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

Conditional
Required for each assessment area the institution is reporting:
- A brief description of the assessment(s) (including year the assessment was last conducted, results, and how results are used in shaping policy, programs, and initiatives)

Optional
- The website URL where information about the assessment(s) is available
- Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on the most recent assessment(s) conducted or updated during the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.

Sampling and Data Standards
Diversity and equity may be assessed using representative samples.
PA 6: Support for Underrepresented Groups

2 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that have programs in place to support underrepresented groups on campus. Certain challenges accompany being a minority on campus. Schools can help create and maintain a diverse student body and help build diversity within academic disciplines by offering support programs to help individuals in underrepresented groups thrive academically and socially.

B. Criteria
Part 1
Institution has mentoring, counseling, peer support, academic support, or other programs in place to support underrepresented groups on campus.

This credit excludes programs to help build a diverse faculty throughout higher education, which are covered in PA 7: Support for Future Faculty Diversity.

Part 2
Institution has a discrimination response policy, program and/or team (or the equivalent) to respond to and support those who have experienced or witnessed a bias incident, act of discrimination or hate crime.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Each part is scored independently.

Part 1
Institutions earn 1 point for meeting the criteria outlined above. Partial points are not available for Part 1 of this credit.

Part 2
Institutions earn 1 point for meeting the criteria outlined above. Partial points are not available for Part 2 of this credit.
E. Reporting Fields

Required
- An indication of whether the institution has mentoring, counseling, peer support, academic support, or other programs to support underrepresented groups on campus
- An indication of whether the institution has a discrimination response policy and/or team (or the equivalent) to respond to and support those who have experienced or witnessed a bias incident, act of discrimination or hate crime
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party's knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

Conditional
Required if institution is reporting programs to support underrepresented groups:
- A brief description of the program(s)

Required if institution is reporting a discrimination response policy and/or team:
- A brief description of the institution's discrimination response policy, program and/or team (including examples of actions taken during the previous three years)

Optional
- An indication of whether the institution produces a publicly accessible inventory of gender neutral bathrooms on campus
- An indication of whether the institution offers housing options to accommodate the special needs of transgender and transitioning students
- The website URL where more information about the support programs for underrepresented groups is available
- The website URL where more information about the institution's discrimination response policy, program and/or team is available
- Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current program offerings and status

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable
PA 7: Support for Future Faculty Diversity

1 point available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that are taking steps to help build a more diverse faculty by supporting future faculty members from underrepresented groups. Having a diverse faculty helps provide a rich learning experience for all students. Mentoring and other support programs encourage the participation of underrepresented groups in higher education.

B. Criteria
Institution administers and/or participates in a program or programs to help build a diverse faculty throughout higher education.

Such programs could take any of the following forms:

• Teaching fellowships or other programs to support terminal degree students from underrepresented groups in gaining teaching experience. (The terminal degree students may be enrolled at another institution.)
• Mentoring, financial, and/or other support programs to prepare and encourage undergraduate or other non-terminal degree students from underrepresented groups to pursue further education and careers as faculty members.
• Mentoring, financial, and/or other support programs for doctoral and post-doctoral students from underrepresented groups.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn 1 point for this credit by administering or participating in a program that meets the criteria outlined above. Partial points are not available for this credit.

E. Reporting Fields

Required

□ An indication of whether the institution administers and/or participates in a program or programs to help build a diverse faculty that meet the criteria for this credit

□ An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.
Conditional
Required if the institution is reporting a program to help build a diverse faculty:
□ A brief description of the institution’s programs that help increase the diversity of higher education faculty

Optional
□ The website URL where more information about the program(s) is available
□ Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current program offerings and status.

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable
PA 8: Affordability and Access

4 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that are implementing strategies to improve their accessibility and affordability. Achieving a college degree is a valuable tool in addressing inequity, but in order for higher education to help society move toward greater equity, schools must be accessible to low-income populations and non-traditional students.

B. Criteria

Part 1
Institution has policies and programs in place to make it accessible and affordable to low-income students and/or to support non-traditional students. Such policies and programs may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Policies and programs to minimize the cost of attendance for low-income students
- Programs to equip the institution’s faculty and staff to better serve students from low-income backgrounds
- Programs to prepare students from low-income backgrounds for higher education (e.g. U.S. federal TRIO programs)
- Scholarships provided specifically for low-income students
- Programs to guide parents of low-income students through the higher education experience
- Targeted outreach to recruit students from low-income backgrounds
- Scholarships provided specifically for part-time students
- An on-site child care facility, a partnership with a local facility, and/or subsidies or financial support to help meet the child care needs of students

Part 2
Institution is accessible and affordable to low-income students as demonstrated by one or more of the following indicators:

A. The percentage of entering students that are low-income
B. The graduation/success rate for low-income students
C. The percentage of student financial need met, on average
D. The percentage of students graduating with no interest-bearing student loan debt
C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Each part is scored independently.

Part 1
An institution earns the maximum of 1 point available for Part 1 of this credit by having policies and programs in place to make it accessible and affordable to low-income students and to support non-traditional students. Partial points are available. For example, an institution that has policies and programs in place to support non-traditional students but not low-income students, would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 1).

Part 2
Institutions earn up to the maximum of 3 points available for Part 2 of this credit based on performance measured by one or more of the indicators listed. For example, an institution that reports 100 percent for three of the four indicators would earn 3 points for this credit. Likewise, an institution that reports 75 percent or more for all four indicators would earn 3 points. Incremental points are available; for example, an institution that reports 50 percent for 3 of the four indicators would earn 1.5 points (half of the points available for Part 2 of this credit). Points are earned according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility/Affordability Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage (0-100)</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The percentage of entering students that are low-income</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The graduation/success rate for low-income students</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The percentage of student financial need met, on average</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The percentage of students graduating with no interest-bearing student loan debt</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Up to 3 available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Example: Affordability and Access (Part 2)

The following data describe Example University:

A. The percentage of entering students that are low-income = 15
B. The graduation/success rate for low-income students = 72
C. The percentage of student financial need met, on average = 80
D. The percentage of students graduating with no interest-bearing student loan debt = 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility/Affordability Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage (0-100)</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The percentage of entering students that are low-income</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The graduation/success rate for low-income students</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The percentage of student financial need met, on average</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The percentage of students graduating with no interest-bearing student loan debt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Earned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.79</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Reporting Fields

**Required**

- An indication of whether the institution has policies and programs in place to make it accessible and affordable to low-income students
- An indication of whether the institution has policies and programs in place to support non-traditional students
- An indication of whether the institution wishes to pursue Part 2 of this credit (accessibility and affordability indicators)
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.
Conditional
Required if institution is reporting policies and programs to make it accessible and affordable to low-income students:

- A brief description of the policies and programs the institution uses to improve its accessibility and affordability in the following categories (at least one description is required):
  - Policies and programs to minimize the cost of attendance for low-income students
  - Programs to equip the institution’s faculty and staff to better serve students from low-income backgrounds
  - Programs to prepare students from low-income backgrounds for higher education
  - Scholarships for low-income students
  - Programs to guide parents of low-income students through the higher education experience
  - Targeted outreach to recruit students from low-income backgrounds
  - Other admissions policies or programs to make the institution accessible and affordable to low-income students
  - Other financial aid policies or programs to make the institution accessible and affordable to low-income students
  - Other policies and programs to make the institution accessible and affordable to low-income students not covered above

Required if institution has policies and programs in place to support non-traditional students:

- A brief description of the policies and programs the institution uses to support non-traditional students (at least one description is required):
  - Scholarships provided specifically for part-time students
  - An onsite child care facility, a partnership with a local facility, and/or subsidies or financial support to help meet the child care needs of students
  - Other policies and programs to support non-traditional students (please specify)

Required if the institution is pursuing Part 2 of this credit (accessibility and affordability indicators) (at least one indicator is required):

- The percentage of entering students that are low-income (0-100)
- The graduation/success rate for low-income students (0-100)
- The percentage of student financial need met, on average (0-100)
- The percentage of students graduating with no interest-bearing student loan debt (0-100)

Optional

- The percentage of students that participate in or directly benefit from the institution’s policies and programs to support low-income and non-traditional students (0-100)
The website URL where information about the institution's affordability and access programs is available

Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe

Part 1
Report on current programs, policies, and practices.

Part 2
Report the most recent data available.

Sampling and Data Standards

Part 1
In addition to institution-wide policies or programs, report on policies and programs pertaining to the institution’s largest admissions group or student cohort (e.g. undergraduate students). Institutions may choose to include or omit programs and policies offered by smaller schools or departments within the institution.

Part 2
Report on the institution’s largest admissions group or student cohort (e.g. undergraduate students). Institutions may choose to include or omit smaller schools or departments within the institution.

For guidance in identifying low-income students, see Standards and Terms. Institutions may report graduation rates, success rates and/or combined graduation/success rates as appropriate to their particular context and types of programs offered.

Institutions may meet student financial need in a variety of ways, for example:

- Scholarships and grants
- Self-help (e.g. work study, employment)
- Tuition waivers or not requiring tuition
- Subsidized or no-interest loans
- Athletic awards

Exclude non-need-based aid, any aid awarded in excess of need, and unsubsidized or interest-bearing loans. Institutions that do not assess student need as a matter of standard practice may report the percentage of cost met, on average, for low-income students.
Health, Wellbeing & Work

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that have incorporated sustainability into their human resources programs and policies. An institution’s people define its character and capacity to perform; and so, an institution’s achievements can only be as strong as its community. An institution can bolster the strength of its community by making fair and responsible investments in its human capital. Such investments include offering benefits, wages, and other assistance that serve to respectfully and ethically compensate workers and acting to protect and positively affect the health, safety and wellbeing of the campus community. Investment in human resources is integral to the achievement of a healthy and sustainable balance between human capital, natural capital, and financial capital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Points Available: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA 9</td>
<td>Employee Compensation 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 10</td>
<td>Assessing Employee Satisfaction 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 11</td>
<td>Wellness Program 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 12</td>
<td>Workplace Health and Safety 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional Reporting Field

□ A brief text summary of the institution’s activities relevant to this subcategory
PA 9: Employee Compensation

3 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that ensure that their lowest paid workers earn sustainable compensation. Poverty, or the inability of current generations to meet their needs, is a sustainability challenge even in highly developed countries. By providing employees wages and benefits that meet basic needs, a university or college can enfranchise its entire workforce so that each individual can contribute positively and productively to the community.

B. Criteria

Part 1
Institution’s employees and/or the employees of its on-site contractors are covered by sustainable compensation standards, guidelines, or policies and/or collective bargaining agreements.

A sustainable compensation (or “living wage”) standard, guideline or policy is one that addresses wages and benefits in terms of the ability of employees to meet basic needs. For example, a sustainable compensation policy may index hourly wages to a poverty guideline or to local cost-of-living indicators. A labor market survey, salary survey or similar assessment may be used in conjunction with a basic needs/cost-of-living approach, but is not sufficient on its own to count as a sustainable compensation policy.

Part 2
Institution’s employees and/or the employees of its on-site contractors receive sustainable compensation.

To earn points for Part 2 of this credit, an institution must assess employee compensation against one or more of the following:

1) A sustainable compensation standard developed or adopted by a committee with multi-stakeholder representation (i.e. its membership includes faculty, staff, and students and may include Human Resources administrators or other parties). The standard need not be formally adopted by the institution.

2) A sustainable compensation standard that is in use in the institution’s locality. The standard may be formal (e.g. a “living wage” ordinance covering public employees) or informal (e.g. a standard adopted by a local, regional or national campaign).

3) An appropriate poverty guideline, threshold or low-income cut-off for a family of four.
For institutions that elect to assess compensation against a poverty guideline, threshold or low-income cut-off, sustainable compensation is defined as wages equivalent to 120 percent of the poverty guideline for a family of four. An institution may offset up to 20 percent of the wage criteria with employer-paid benefits that address basic needs (e.g. healthcare and retirement contributions).

Both parts of this credit are based on the total number of employees working on campus as part of regular and ongoing campus operations, which includes:

- Staff and faculty, i.e. all regular full-time, regular part-time and temporary (or non-regular) employees, including adjunct faculty and graduate student employees (e.g. teaching and research assistants). Institutions may choose to include or omit undergraduate student workers.
- Employees of contractors that work on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations. Such contractors may include, but are not limited to, providers of dining/catering, cleaning/janitorial, maintenance, groundskeeping, transportation, and retail services.

Construction and demolition crews and other temporary contracted employees may be excluded.

**C. Applicability**
This credit applies to all institutions.

**D. Scoring**
Each part is scored independently.

**Part 1**
An institution earns the maximum of 1.5 points available for Part 1 of this credit when 100 percent of its employees and the employees of any on-site contractors are covered by sustainable compensation standards, guidelines, or policies and/or collective bargaining agreements. Incremental points are available based on the percentage of employees covered. For example, an institution for which 50 percent of campus workers are covered by collective bargaining agreements would earn 0.75 points (half of the points available for Part 1 of this credit). Points earned are calculated according to the following table:
Enter values as indicated below to calculate points earned for Part 1 of this credit
Points will be calculated automatically when data are entered in the STARS online Reporting Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Number of Employees Covered by Sustainable Compensation Standards, Guidelines, or Policies and/or Collective Bargaining Agreements</th>
<th>Divide</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees Working On Campus</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>÷</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2**
An institution earns the maximum of 1.5 points available for Part 2 of this credit when 100 percent of its employees and the employees of any on-site contractors earn sustainable compensation. Incremental points are available based on the percentage of employees that earn sustainable compensation as defined in one or more of the ways outlined above. For example, an institution for which 50 percent of campus workers earn wages equal to or greater than 120 percent of the poverty guideline for a family of four would earn 0.75 points (half of the points available for Part 2 of this credit). Points earned are calculated according to the following table:

Enter values as indicated below to calculate points earned for Part 2 of this credit
Points will be calculated automatically when data are entered in the STARS online Reporting Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Number of Employees that Receive Sustainable Compensation</th>
<th>Divide</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees Working On Campus</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>÷</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Example: Employee Compensation

Example Community College employs 800 individuals directly and has an additional 200 employees of contractors working on campus. Thus the total number of employees working on campus = 1,000.

Part 1
The college does not have sustainable compensation policies or collective bargaining agreements covering its employees, however 100 workers employed by its cleaning services and maintenance contractors are covered by collective bargaining agreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Number of Employees Covered By Sustainable Compensation Standards, Guidelines, or Policies and/or Collective Bargaining Agreements</th>
<th>Divide</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees Working on Campus</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned for Part 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>÷</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2
The college typically assesses its wage and benefits policies using a market-based salary survey and no living wage standard has been developed locally. Therefore, to report for this credit the institution opts to assess the compensation it provides its employees against 120 percent of the current national poverty guideline for a family of four. In assessing its wages and benefits, the college finds that 700 of its 800 employees receive sustainable compensation. The college does not conduct a similar assessment for the 200 contracted workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Number of Employees that Receive Sustainable Compensation</th>
<th>Divide</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees Working on Campus</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned for Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>÷</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total points earned = 0.15 + 1.05 = 1.2 points
E. Reporting Fields

Required

- Number of employees (staff + faculty, headcount)
- Number of staff and faculty covered by sustainable compensation standards, guidelines, or policies; and/or collective bargaining agreements (headcount)
- An indication of whether the institution has employees of contractors working on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations
- An indication of whether the institution wishes to pursue Part 2 of this credit (assessing employee compensation)
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

Conditional

Required if the institution has employees of contractors working on-site as part of regular and ongoing campus operations:

- Number of employees of contractors working on campus (headcount)
- Number of employees of contractors covered by sustainable compensation standards, guidelines, or policies and/or collective bargaining agreements (headcount)

Required if the institution has employees or employees of contractors that are covered by sustainable compensation standards, guidelines, or policies; and/or collective bargaining agreements:

- A brief description of the sustainable compensation standards, guidelines, or policies; and/or collective bargaining agreements covering staff, faculty and/or employees of contractors

Required if the institution is pursuing Part 2 of this credit (assessing employee compensation):

- Number of staff and faculty that receive sustainable compensation (headcount)
- Number of employees of contractors that receive sustainable compensation (headcount) (report zero if there are no employees of contractors working on campus)
- A brief description of the standard(s) against which compensation was assessed
- A brief description of the compensation (wages and benefits) provided to the institution’s lowest paid:
  - Regular, full-time employees
  - Regular, part-time employees
  - Temporary (non-regular) staff
Temporary (non-regular, adjunct or contingent) faculty
Student employees (graduate and/or undergraduate, as applicable)

Optional
- The website URL where information about the institution’s sustainable compensation policies and practices is available
- The local legal minimum hourly wage for regular employees (US/Canadian dollars)
- An indication of whether the institution has an onsite child care facility, partners with a local facility, and/or provides subsidies or financial support to help meet the child care needs of its employees
- An indication of whether the institution offers a socially responsible investment option for retirement plans to its employees
- Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current compensation status and offerings, for example at a single representative point during the performance year that aligns with other institutional commitments. When using a representative point, institutions should strive to ensure that it recognizes seasonal and other variations that influence employment.

Sampling and Data Standards
Institutions unable to confirm that a contractor meets the criteria for this credit should include the contractor’s employees in the count of employees working on campus and exclude the contractor’s employees from the count of employees that are covered by sustainable compensation standards or collective bargaining agreements and the count of employees that receive sustainable compensation.

Institutions may use their own established definitions of each job type referenced.
PA 10: Assessing Employee Satisfaction

1 point available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that support the engagement of their employees by conducting a regular survey or other evaluation. Evaluating employee satisfaction and engagement helps institutions gauge their performance as an employer and can identify strengths as well as areas for development.

B. Criteria
Institution conducts a survey or other evaluation that allows for anonymous feedback to measure employee satisfaction and engagement. The survey or equivalent may be conducted institution-wide or may be done by individual departments or divisions. The evaluation addresses (but is not limited to) the following areas:

- Job satisfaction
- Learning and advancement opportunities
- Work culture and work/life balance

The institution has a mechanism in place to address issues raised by the evaluation.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for this credit by conducting an assessment of employee satisfaction and engagement that meets the criteria outlined above and that covers all employees (directly or by representative sample). Incremental points are available based on the percentage of employees assessed. For example, an institution that regularly assesses the satisfaction of all faculty members (who compose ⅓ of all employees), but does not assess staff (who compose ⅔ of employees) would earn ⅓ point (⅓ of the points available for this credit).

An institution that conducts an assessment using a representative sample earns points based on the total population from which the sample is drawn. For example, an institution that conducts an assessment with a sample that is representative of the entire employee population would earn the maximum of 1 point available for this credit. Likewise, an institution that conducts an assessment with a sample that is representative of 50 percent of its total employee population would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for this credit).
An institution that conducts an assessment of an unrepresentative portion of the employee population earns points based on the actual number of employees assessed. For example, an institution that conducts a mandatory survey of all non-supervisory staff (60 percent of the total employee population) would earn 0.6 points (60 percent of the points available for this credit).

E. Reporting Fields

Required
- An indication of whether the institution has conducted an employee satisfaction and engagement survey or other evaluation that meets the criteria for this credit
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party's knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

Conditional
Required if the institution is reporting an employee satisfaction and engagement evaluation:
- The percentage of employees (staff and faculty) assessed, directly or by representative sample (0-100)
- A brief description of the institution's methodology for evaluating employee satisfaction and engagement
- A brief description of the mechanism(s) by which the institution addresses issues raised by the evaluation (including examples from the previous three years)
- The year the employee satisfaction and engagement evaluation was last administered

Optional
- The website URL where information about the institution's employee satisfaction and engagement assessment is available
- Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on the most recent employee satisfaction and engagement evaluation conducted during the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and on current policies and practices.

Sampling and Data Standards
Institutions may choose to assess employee satisfaction and engagement by administering a survey or the equivalent to a representative sample of the employee population being assessed or by surveying the entire employee population being assessed (e.g. by making the assessment mandatory).
Institutions may report on a single assessment or on multiple assessments that target different groups (e.g. faculty, supervisory staff, and non-supervisory staff).
PA 11: Wellness Program

1 point available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that support the wellbeing of their employees and students. Providing wellness programs and related services can enhance the health and wellbeing of the entire campus community.

B. Criteria
Institution has a wellness and/or employee assistance program that makes available counseling, referral, and wellbeing services to all members of any of the following groups:

- Students
- Staff
- Faculty

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for this credit for making counseling, referral, and wellbeing services available to all members of the campus community. Partial points are available based on the number of groups for whom the institution makes wellness services available. For example, an institution that makes wellness services available to all members of 2 of the groups listed would earn $\frac{2}{3}$ point ($\frac{2}{3}$ of the points available for the credit).

E. Reporting Fields

Required

- An indication of whether the institution makes counseling, referral, and wellbeing services available to all members of any of the following groups:
  - Students
  - Staff
  - Faculty

- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.
Conditional
Required if the institution is reporting a wellness and/or employee assistance program:
- A brief description of the institution's wellness and/or employee assistance program(s)

Optional
- The website URL where information about the institution's wellness program(s) is available
- Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current program status and offerings.

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable
PA 12: Workplace Health and Safety

2 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that help ensure the health and safety of their employees. Institutions that reduce workplace injuries and occupational disease cases help ensure that all employees have a safe working environment.

B. Criteria
Part 1
Institution has reduced its total number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per full-time equivalent (FTE) employee compared to a baseline.

Part 2
Institution has fewer than 5 reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases annually per 100 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.

This credit includes employees of contractors working on-site for whom the institution is liable for workplace safety, for example workers for whom the institution is mandated to report injuries and disease cases by a health and safety authority such as the U.S. Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) or the Canadian Center for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS). Injuries and disease cases include OSHA/CCOHS-reportable fatal and non-fatal injuries (or the equivalent) arising out of or in the course of work and cases of diseases arising from a work-related injury or the work situation or activity (e.g. exposure to harmful chemicals, stress, ergonomic issues). See Sampling and Data Standards, below, for further guidance on reporting injuries and disease cases.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions.

D. Scoring
Each part is scored independently.

Part 1
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for Part 1 for having no reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases in the performance year. Incremental points are awarded based on the reduction achieved from a baseline. For example, an institution that reduced its total number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per full-time equivalent (FTE) employee by 50 percent compared to a baseline would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 1).
STARS awards only positive points; points will not be deducted if the total number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per FTE employee increased rather than decreased during the time period.

Points earned are calculated according to the formula below. Please note that users do not have to calculate the number of points earned themselves; points earned will be calculated automatically when the data listed under Section E: Reporting Fields is entered in the online Reporting Tool.

Points Earned = 1 × \left\{ \frac{\left(\frac{A}{B} \right) - \left(\frac{C}{D}\right)}{\frac{A}{B}} \right\}

A = Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, baseline year
B = Full-time equivalent of employees, baseline year (annualized FTE)
C= Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, performance year
D= Full-time equivalent of employees, performance year (annualized FTE)

**Part 2**
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for Part 2 for having no reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases in the performance year. Incremental points are awarded based on the institution’s performance between the **minimum performance threshold** of 5 reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per 100 FTE employees and the performance target of 0 reportable injuries and disease cases. For example, an institution that had 2.5 reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases per 100 FTE employees in the performance year would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for Part 2).

Points earned for Part 2 are calculated according to the formula below. Please note that users do not have to calculate the number of points earned themselves; points earned will be calculated automatically when the data listed under Section E: Reporting Fields is entered in the online Reporting Tool.

Points Earned = 1 × \left\{ \frac{0.05 - \left(\frac{A}{B}\right)}{0.05} \right\}

A = Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, performance year
B = Full-time equivalent of employees, performance year (annualized FTE)
Scoring Example: Workplace Health and Safety

The following data describe Example University:

**Part 1**

A. Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, baseline year = 15
B. Full-time equivalent of employees, baseline year (annualized FTE) = 1,200
C. Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, performance year = 9
D. Full-time equivalent of employees, performance year (annualized FTE) = 1,250

Points Earned = \(1 \times \left\{ \left( \frac{A}{B} \right) - \left( \frac{C}{D} \right) \right\} / A/B \)

\[
\begin{align*}
&= 1 \times \left\{ \left( \frac{15}{1,200} \right) - \left( \frac{9}{1,250} \right) \right\} / \left( \frac{15}{1,200} \right) \\
&= 1 \times \left\{ \frac{0.0125 - 0.0072}{0.0125} \right\} \\
&= 1 \times \left\{ \frac{0.0053}{0.0125} \right\} \\
&= 1 \times 0.424 \\
&= 0.42 \text{ points}
\end{align*}
\]

**Part 2**

A. Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, performance year = 9
B. Full-time equivalent of employees, performance year (annualized FTE) = 1,250

Points Earned = \(1 \times \left\{ 0.05 - \left( \frac{A}{B} \right) \right\} / 0.05 \)

\[
\begin{align*}
&= 1 \times \left\{ 0.05 - \left( \frac{9}{1,250} \right) \right\} / 0.05 \\
&= 1 \times \left\{ 0.05 - 0.0072 \right\} / 0.05 \\
&= 1 \times \left\{ 0.0428 \right\} / 0.05 \\
&= 0.86 \text{ points}
\end{align*}
\]

Total Points Earned = 0.42 + 0.86

\[= 1.28 \text{ points}\]
E. Reporting Fields

Required
- Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, performance year
- Full-time equivalent of employees, performance year (annualized FTE)
- Start date, performance year or 3-year period
- End date, performance year or 3-year period
- Number of reportable workplace injuries and occupational disease cases, baseline year
- Full-time equivalent of employees, baseline year (annualized FTE)
- Start date, baseline year or 3-year period
- End date, baseline year or 3-year period
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once it is submitted and available to the public.

Conditional
Required if end date of the baseline year/period is 2004 or earlier:
- A brief description of when and why the workplace health and safety baseline was adopted (e.g. in sustainability plans and policies or in the context of other reporting obligations)

Optional
- A brief description of the institution’s workplace health and safety initiatives, including how workers are engaged in monitoring and advising on health and safety programs
- The website URL where information about the institution’s workplace health and safety initiatives is available
- Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe

Performance Year
Report the most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. Institutions may use the most recent single year for which data is available or an average from throughout the period. Institutions may choose the annual start and end dates that work best with the data they have (e.g. fiscal or calendar year), as long as data are reported from a consecutive 12-month (or 3-year) period.
Report annualized FTE employees from the same time period as that from which workplace health and safety data are drawn (e.g. the consecutive 12-month or 3-year period that most closely overlaps with the injuries and disease cases performance period). Institutions may use an average from throughout the period or a snapshot at a single representative point during the period (e.g. the fall figures reported to IPEDS by U.S. institutions).

**Baseline Year**

Report data from the baseline year, which may be:

- Any year from 2005 to the present
- A baseline year, 1990 to 2004, that the institution has adopted as part of its sustainability plans or policies or in the context of other reporting obligations

Recommended best practices for defining a baseline include:

- Using the average of three consecutive years to reduce the impact of outliers
- Ensuring that baseline and performance year data are valid and reliable (e.g. that the data were gathered in the same manner)

Institutions without valid and reliable historical data should use performance year data for both the baseline and performance year. Following this approach, an institution would not be able to claim points during its first STARS submission, but would be able to use its newly established baseline for subsequent submissions.

Institutions may choose the start and end dates that work best with the data they have (e.g. fiscal or calendar year), as long as data are reported from a consecutive 12-month (or 3-year) period. Report annualized FTE employees from the same period as that from which workplace health and safety data are drawn (e.g. the consecutive 12-month or 3-year period that most closely overlaps with the injuries and disease cases baseline period).

**Sampling and Data Standards**

U.S. and Canadian institutions should report the total number of fatal and non-fatal injuries and occupational disease cases as reported to the Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) and the Canadian Center for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS), respectively. Other institutions should report data as generally required by the health and safety authority with jurisdiction over the institution. Minor (first-aid level) injuries should be excluded to the extent feasible.
**Investment**

This subcategory seeks to recognize institutions that make investment decisions that promote sustainability. Collectively, colleges and universities invest hundreds of billions of dollars. Like other decisions that institutions make, these investments have impacts that are both local and global in scope. Institutions with transparent and democratic investment processes promote accountability and engagement by the campus and community. By using the tools of sustainable investing, institutions can improve the long-term health of their endowments, encourage better corporate behavior, support innovation in sustainable products and services, support sustainability in their community, and help build a more just and sustainable financial system.

Throughout this subcategory, the term “sustainable investment” is inclusive of socially responsible, environmentally responsible, ethical, impact, and mission-related investment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Points Available: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA 13</td>
<td>Committee on Investor Responsibility* 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 14</td>
<td>Sustainable Investment* 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 15</td>
<td>Investment Disclosure* 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* credit does not apply to all institutions

**Optional Reporting Field**

- A brief text summary of the institution’s activities relevant to this subcategory
PA 13: Committee on Investor Responsibility

2 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions with an established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) with multi-stakeholder representation. Establishing a CIR provides a structure for fostering dialogue on investment decisions, and can help campuses make responsible investment decisions that promote sustainability. Drawing CIR membership from multiple sectors of the campus community provides educational experiences for involved students, faculty, alumni, and staff. In addition, a multi-stakeholder CIR is consistent with the sustainability principle of shared governance.

B. Criteria
Institution has a formally established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) or similar body that makes recommendations to fund decision-makers on socially and environmentally responsible investment opportunities across asset classes, including proxy voting. The body has multi-stakeholder representation, which means its membership includes faculty, staff, and students and may include alumni, trustees, and/or other parties.

Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system and/or a separate foundation of the institution should report on the investment policies and activities of those entities.

A general committee that oversees the institution’s investments does not count for this credit unless social and environmental responsibility is an explicit part of its mission and/or agenda.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to institutions with endowments of US $1 million or larger. Institutions with endowments totaling less than US $1 million may choose to omit this credit.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn 2 points for having a CIR or similar body that has multi-stakeholder representation and otherwise meets the criteria outlined above. Partial points are not available for this credit.
E. Reporting Fields

Required
- An indication of whether the institution has a formally established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) or similar body that has multi-stakeholder representation and otherwise meets the criteria for this credit.
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.

Conditional
Required if the institution is reporting a CIR or similar body:
- The charter or mission statement of the CIR or other body which reflects social and environmental concerns or a brief description of how the CIR is tasked to address social and environmental concerns.
- Members of the CIR, including affiliations and role (e.g. student, faculty, alumni).
- Examples of CIR actions during the previous 3 years.

Optional
- The website URL where information about the CIR is available.
- Notes about the submission.

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current committee composition and practices.

Sampling and Data Standards
Not applicable.
PA 14: Sustainable Investment

4 points available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that use their investment power to promote sustainability. There are a variety of approaches an institution can take toward sustainable investment, including making positive investments that promote sustainability and engaging with companies in which they already hold investments. Positive investing supports socially and environmentally responsible practices and the development of sustainable products and services. Active investor engagement can help align an institution’s investments with its values, protect the institution from the financial consequences of fines, lawsuits, customer boycotts and damages to a company’s reputation that may result from unsustainable corporate behavior, and improve the sustainability performance of the businesses it invests in. Both types of activities contribute toward a more just and sustainable financial system.

B. Criteria
There are two possible approaches to this credit; institutions may pursue one or both. Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities.

Option 1: Positive Sustainability Investment
Institution invests in one or more of the following:
- Sustainable industries (e.g. renewable energy or sustainable forestry)
- Businesses selected for exemplary sustainability performance (e.g. using criteria specified in a sustainable investment policy)
- Sustainability investment funds (e.g. a renewable energy or impact investment fund)
- Community development financial institutions (CDFI) or the equivalent
- Socially responsible mutual funds with positive screens (or the equivalent). Investment in a socially responsible fund with only negative screens (i.e. one that excludes egregious offenders or certain industries, such as tobacco or weapons manufacturing) does not count for Option 1.
- Green revolving loan funds that are funded from the endowment
Option 2: **Investor Engagement**
Institution has policies and/or practices that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Has a publicly available sustainable investment policy (e.g. to consider the social and/or environmental impacts of investment decisions in addition to financial considerations)
- Uses its sustainable investment policy to select and guide investment managers
- Has engaged in proxy voting to promote sustainability, either by its CIR or other committee or through the use of guidelines, during the previous three years
- Has filed or co-filed one or more shareholder resolutions that address sustainability or submitted one or more letters about social or environmental responsibility to a company in which it holds investments, during the previous three years
- Has a publicly available investment policy with negative screens, for example to prohibit investment in an industry (e.g. tobacco or weapons manufacturing) or participate in a divestment effort (e.g. targeting fossil fuel production or human rights violations)
- Engages in policy advocacy by participating in investor networks (e.g. Principles for Responsible Investment, Investor Network on Climate Risk, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility) and/or engages in inter-organizational collaborations to share best practices

**C. Applicability**
This credit applies to institutions with endowments of US $1 million or larger. Institutions with endowments less than US $1 million may choose to omit this credit.
D. Scoring
An institution earns the maximum of 4 points available for this credit by investing 30 percent of its investment pool sustainably and meeting all of the investor engagement criteria listed in Option 2 (above) or by investing 60 percent of its investment pool in one or more of ways listed in Option 1. Incremental points are available for Option 1 and partial points are available for Option 2. Each option is scored as follows:

Option 1. Positive Sustainability Investment
An institution earns the maximum of 4 points available in Option 1 by investing 60 percent of its investment pool in one or more of the ways listed above. Incremental points are awarded based on the percentage of the institution’s investment pool that is invested sustainably. For example, an institution that invested 30 percent of its investment pool sustainably would earn 2 points (half of the points available in Option 1). Points earned under Option 1 of this credit are calculated according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Value of Positive Sustainability Investments</th>
<th>Divide</th>
<th>Total Value of the Investment Pool</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned for Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ⅔</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>÷</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>(up to 4 available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2. Investor Engagement
⅓ point is awarded for each of the policies or practices listed. An institution with all of the policies and practices listed earns the maximum of 2 points available for Part 2.

Total points earned for this credit are calculated according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Earned in Option 1: Positive Sustainability Investments</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Points Earned in Option 2: Investor Engagement</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(up to 4 available)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(up to 2 available)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>(up to 4 available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scoring Example: Sustainable Investment**

Model College’s investment pool totals **$100 million**. The college invests **$20 million** in sustainable industries and community development financial institutions. The college also engages as an investor in **3 ways**, by: (1) having a sustainable investment policy; (2) using its policy to select and engage its investment managers; and (3) participating in the Investor Network on Climate Risk.

**Option 1. Positive Sustainability Investment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Value of Positive Sustainability Investments</th>
<th>Divide</th>
<th>Total Value of the Investment Pool</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned for Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ⅔</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>20 million</td>
<td>÷</td>
<td>100 million</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 2. Investor Engagement**

⅓ point is awarded for each of the policies or practices listed for a total of **1 point**.

Total points earned for this credit are calculated according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Earned in Option 1: Positive Sustainability Investments</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Points Earned in Option 2: Investor Engagement</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Reporting Fields

Required
- Total value of the investment pool (US/Canadian dollars)
- Value of holdings in each of the following categories:
  - Sustainable industries (US/Canadian dollars)
  - Businesses selected for exemplary sustainability performance (US/Canadian dollars)
  - Sustainability investment funds (US/Canadian dollars)
  - Community development financial institutions (CDFI) or the equivalent (US/Canadian dollars)
  - Socially responsible mutual funds with positive screens or the equivalent (US/Canadian dollars)
  - Green revolving funds funded from the endowment (US/Canadian dollars)
- An indication of whether the institution has a publicly available sustainable investment policy
- An indication of whether the institution uses its sustainable investment policy to select and guide investment managers
- An indication of whether the institution has engaged in proxy voting, either by its CIR or other committee or through the use of guidelines, to promote sustainability during the previous three years
- An indication of whether the institution has filed or co-filed one or more shareholder resolutions that address sustainability or submitted one or more letters about social or environmental responsibility to a company in which it holds investments during the previous three years
- An indication of whether the institution has a publicly available investment policy with negative screens
- An indication of whether the institution engages in policy advocacy by participating in investor networks and/or engages in inter-organizational collaborations to share best practices
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once submitted and available to the public.
Conditional
Required if the institution is reporting positive sustainability investments:
  □ A brief description of the companies, funds, and/or institutions referenced above. Specific disclosure of holdings (e.g. fund or company names) is not required; general information about the industries or fund types represented by the holdings is sufficient.

Required if the institution has a publicly available sustainability investment policy:
  □ A copy of the policy (text or PDF upload)

Required if the institution is reporting using its sustainable investment policy to select and guide investment managers:
  □ A brief description of how the policy is applied, including recent examples

Required if the institution is reporting proxy voting:
  □ A copy of the proxy voting guidelines or proxy record or a brief description of how managers are adhering to policy (text or PDF upload)

Required if the institution has engaged with corporations in its portfolio about sustainability issues during the previous three years:
  □ Examples of how the institution has engaged with corporations in its portfolio about sustainability issues during the previous three years

Required if the institution has an investment policy with negative screens:
  □ A brief description of the negative screens and how they have been implemented
  □ Approximate percentage of endowment that the negative screens apply to (0-100)

Required if the institution engages in policy advocacy by participating in investor networks and/or inter-organizational collaborations:
  □ A brief description of the investor networks and/or collaborations

Optional
  □ The website URL where information about the institution's sustainable investment efforts is available
  □ Notes about the submission

F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on current policies and actions taken within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.
**Sampling and Data Standards**

*Option 1*

Report on a snapshot of the entire investment portfolio. Reporting on a sample of the endowment or a special fund of the endowment is not allowed for this credit. Institutions should strive to report on a representative snapshot. Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities to the extent possible and document any anomalies under “Notes about the submission”.

*Option 2*

Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities.
PA 15: Investment Disclosure

1 point available

A. Credit Rationale
This credit recognizes institutions that regularly make their investment holdings publicly available. The transparency ensured by public disclosure acts as an important accountability mechanism and as a learning tool for students and other stakeholders.

B. Criteria
Institution makes a snapshot of its investment holdings available to the public, including the amount invested in each fund and/or company and proxy voting records. The snapshot of holdings is updated at least once per year.

Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities.

C. Applicability
This credit applies to all institutions that have an investment pool.

D. Scoring
Institutions earn the maximum of 1 point available for this credit by making a snapshot of its entire investment holdings publicly available. Incremental points are available based on the percentage of the investment pool included in the snapshot. For example, an institution that made a snapshot of 50 percent of its total investment pool publicly available would earn 0.5 points (half of the points available for this credit).

Total points earned for this credit are calculated according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>The Percentage of the Total Investment Pool Included in the Snapshot of Investment Holdings (0-100)</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scoring Example: Investment Disclosure**

Example University’s investment pool totals **$500 million**. $375 million (75 percent) is managed by the university and $125 million (25 percent) by a separate foundation. The institution publicly discloses the investments managed by the university, but not those managed by the foundation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>Percentage of the Total Investment Pool Included in the Snapshot of Investment Holdings (0-100)</th>
<th>Equals</th>
<th>Total Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Reporting Fields**

**Required**
- An indication of whether the institution makes a snapshot of its investment holdings available to the public
- An affirmation that the submitted information is accurate to the best of a responsible party’s knowledge and contact information for the responsible party. The responsible party should be a staff member, faculty member, or administrator who can respond to questions regarding the data once it is submitted and available to the public.

**Conditional**
Required if the institution makes a snapshot of its investment holdings available to the public:
- The percentage of the total investment pool included in the snapshot of investment holdings (0-100)
- A copy of the investment holdings snapshot (PDF upload) or the website URL where the holdings snapshot is publicly available

**Optional**
- Notes about the submission
F. Measurement

Timeframe
Report on the current holdings (i.e. most recent snapshot available).

Sampling and Data Standards
Institutions should strive to report on a representative snapshot. Institutions for which investments are handled by the university system, a separate foundation of the institution and/or a management company contracted by the institution should report on the combined activities of those entities. Document any anomalies under “Notes about the submission”.