Rubric edits 2.0 from February 3-10

- Consolidated campus and community engagement category into the social impact.
- The Duration of Impact was made into a yes/no question.
- The Clear and Measurable Outcomes was made into a yes/no question.
- The innovation point was clarified as "is this a new project to campus?" and used as a yes/no question.
- Outreach and Education was clarified as "Will information about the project be readily available to the campus/community at large?" and made into a yes/no question.
- The Tie in with Broader Campus Sustainability Initiatives item was clarified as "Does this add onto, or work in tandem with any other campus initiatives, goals, or projects?" and made into a yes/no question.
- The bullet points on the remaining boxed rubric questions were made into more grammatically clear sentences, none of the factual content has changed except for what was mentioned above.
- A rough draft/placeholder of the disclaimer at the top of the rubric was added. It read, "Note to applicants: No one project must meet all of these criteria. Project planners should try to meet as many as they can, but the committee will weigh the impacts of projects through both magnitude and quantity."

Rubric edits from February 17- 24

- Broke up "social Impact" category into "social impact" and "social reach" as requested by Greg McBride, to be more specific about who is effected and how deeply they are effected by the project.

Rubric Edits from February 25-March 2

- Changed wording in social reach to "large groups of people" as requested by Greg McBride, to be more clear about the goal of the category

Rubric Edits from March 10-April ???

- Changed "Doesn't Meet Criteria" scale from 0-1 to 0 and have meets criteria to scale from 1-5.
- Changed "social Reach" to "Engagement and Marketing" to specifically address who benefits or deals with a project, without putting singular emphasis on Social Sustainability.
- Created Cell for Offsetting Emissions, the language is based on the SUNY rubric.
- Reduced Student Leadership and Stakeholder Buy-In to Yes/No questions, because they are simple categories, that are pre-assessed by the Office.
- On the Environmental Impact Meets Criteria section added improves "community sustainability".
- On Environmental Sustainability Exceeds Criteria section, change "sustainability" to "Environmental Sustainability" and removed required types of sustainability.

April 27 edits

- Defined environmental and social impact
- Added "student/university benefit" for economic impact category
- Either add "education" to the engagement category or another category.
- Change the rubric to a base 10 to make it more accessible to students and teachers.

- Made the lowest score one to reflect the probability that projects will meet bear minimum requirements before coming to committee.
- Clarified the meaning of a score of 1 and made the definition more consistent.
- Added minimum for yes /no question requirements to make it easier to asses a project for the committee and applicants.

May 1 edits
- Clarified that environmental impact refers to making a more healthy earth and healthier physical spaces.
- Clarified that social impact refers to centering healthy communities, both doing no harm to the marginalized and making positive change to the communities we work with.
- Changed economic impact to address ongoing cost implication of projects
- Removed specific example of social sustainability