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“If you can’t measure it, you can’t manage it.”

Peter Drucker
FILM RATINGS
Rating Methodologies

Moody's approaches to assessing risk.

We invite market participants to provide feedback on the Requests for Comments by sending Response Form to RFC@moodys.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Dec 2013</td>
<td>Rating Methodology</td>
<td>Regulated Electric and Gas Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec 2013</td>
<td>Rating Methodology</td>
<td>Global Chemical Industry Rating Methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest Rated Coffees

We found 293 outstanding coffees and espressos with scores of 94 points or higher. These coffees and espressos are among the best coffees in the world. Reviews are listed in reverse chronological order. Older reviews may no longer accurately reflect current versions of the same coffee or roaster websites.
Stanley 51-621 16-Ounce Curve Claw Fiberglass Hammer

by Stanley

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ 67 customer reviews

List Price: $44.98
Price: $7.88 Prime
You Save: $7.10 (47%)

In Stock.
Ships from and sold by Amazon.com. Gift-wrap available.

Want it Tuesday, Jan. 14? Order within 51 hrs and choose One-Day Shipping at checkout. Details
ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (BRONZE, SILVER, and GOLD AWARDS)

The TSA Achievement Program (brass, silver, and gold awards) is designed to motivate and recognize student members for high effort in a school's technology education program. The TSA Achievement Program is

- an opportunity for every TSA member to strive and receive recognition for accomplishments.
- designed to encourage excellence in the areas of leadership development, understanding technology, school/community service, and career/personal planning.
- planned so the highest awards represent outstanding individual performance.

The Technology Student Association Achievement Program provides opportunities for TSA members to attain the highest ideals and goals of TSA. This noncompetitive, self-initiated program encourages students to develop appropriate attitudes and increase their knowledge and skills through involvement in technology education programs and activities.
Bronze, Silver or Gold Award Medallions for Endowment Growth

Awards of Bronze, Silver and Gold Medallions for donor-restricted permanent additions to local council endowment funds or to a local council fund in the BSA National Foundation will be presented at the BSA National Annual Meeting during Regional Luncheons. To secure a Bronze, Silver, or Gold Award, a local council must document the addition of donor-restricted gifts (recordable assets) to their endowment fund, which will be confirmed by their Area Director.

Councils must earn the 2011 National Major Gifts Achievement Award to earn a Medallion.

Bronze Medallion Requirement: the current-year addition of at least $500,000 in new gifts permanently restricted by the donor to the Council Endowment Fund.

Silver Medallion Requirement: the current-year addition of at least $1,000,000 in new gifts permanently restricted by the donor to the Council Endowment Fund.

Gold Medallion Requirement: the current-year addition of at least $5,000,000 in new gifts
Drilling down
Introducing Green Star

Inspiring innovation
Encouraging environmental leadership
Building a sustainable future

greenstar
Developed by the Green Building Council of Australia
Steps

1. Design
2. Score the design
3. Get rating
# Green Star - Education v1

## Credit Summary for:

### Indoor Environment Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Aim of Credit</th>
<th>Credit Criteria Summary</th>
<th>No. of Points Available</th>
<th>No. of Points Achieved</th>
<th>Points to be Confirmed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IEQ-1   | Ventilation Rates            | To encourage and recognise designs that provide ample amounts of outside air to counteract build up of indoor pollutants. | Three points are available as follows:  
**Naturally Ventilated Spaces**  
Three points are awarded where it is demonstrated that 95% of the nominated area is naturally ventilated in accordance with AS1668.2 2002.  
**Mechanically Air Conditioned and Mechanically Assisted Ventilation of Naturally Ventilated Spaces**  
Up to three points are awarded where the ventilation of the nominated area, outside air is provided at the rate prescribed by the requirements of AS1668.2 1991, as follows:  
• One point for 50% improvement;  
• Two points for 100% improvement; and  
• Three points for 150% improvement.  
**Mixed Mode Ventilated Spaces**  
Both modes of operation must individually satisfy the relevant mechanical and natural ventilation criteria. The points awarded will be limited to the maximum points awarded under the mechanical ventilation criteria.  
For the purposes of this credit ‘nominated area’ is UFA, excluding external covered areas. | | | | | |
| IEQ-2   | Air Change Effectiveness     | To encourage and recognise systems that effectively deliver optimum air quality to any occupant throughout the occupied area. | Two points are awarded where it is demonstrated that the Air Change Effectiveness (ACE) for at least 95% of the nominated area meets the following criteria:  
**Naturally Ventilated Spaces**  
A distribution and laminar flow pattern for at least 95% of the nominated area of each space in the direction of air flow for not less than 95% of standard hours of occupancy is demonstrated. | | | | |
### LEED for New Construction and Major Renovations (v2009)

#### Sustainable Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>Construction activity pollution prevention</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS2</td>
<td>Site selection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>Development density and community connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>Brownfield redevelopment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4.1</td>
<td>Alternative transportation - public transportation access</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4.2</td>
<td>Alternative transportation - bicycle storage and changing areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Material & Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRp1</td>
<td>Storage and collection of recyclables</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRc1</td>
<td>Building reuse - maintain existing walls, floors and roof</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRc1.1</td>
<td>Building reuse - maintain existing walls, floors and roof</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRc1.2</td>
<td>Building reuse - maintain interior nonstructural elements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRc2</td>
<td>Construction waste Mgmt</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRc3</td>
<td>Materials reuse</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRc4</td>
<td>Recycled content</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Energy & Atmosphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAp1</td>
<td>Fundamental commissioning of building energy systems</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAp2</td>
<td>Minimum energy performance</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAp3</td>
<td>Fundamental refrigerant Mgmt</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAc1</td>
<td>Optimize energy performance</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAc2</td>
<td>On-site renewable energy</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAc3</td>
<td>Enhanced commissioning</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAc4</td>
<td>Enhanced refrigerant Mgmt</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAc5</td>
<td>Measurement and verification</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAc6</td>
<td>Green power</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indoor Environmental Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQc1</td>
<td>Smoke (ETS) control</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc2</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc3</td>
<td>Gmt plan - during construction</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc4</td>
<td>Gmt plan - before occupancy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc5</td>
<td>Ials - adhesives and sealants</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc6</td>
<td>Ials - paints and coatings</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc7</td>
<td>Ials - flooring systems</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc8</td>
<td>Ials - composite wood and agrifiber products</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc9</td>
<td>Pollutant source control</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc10</td>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc11</td>
<td>Thermal comfort - verification</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc12</td>
<td>Daylight and views - daylight</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQc13</td>
<td>Daylight and views - views</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Introduction/Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC1</td>
<td>Innovation in design</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49 Points</td>
<td>CERTIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 Points</td>
<td>SILVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79 Points</td>
<td>GOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+ Points</td>
<td>PLATINUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRp1</th>
<th>MRc1.1</th>
<th>MRc1.2</th>
<th>MRc2</th>
<th>MRc3</th>
<th>MRc4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage and collection of recyclables</td>
<td>Building reuse - maintain existing walls, floors and roof</td>
<td>Building reuse - maintain interior nonstructural elements</td>
<td>Construction waste Mgmt</td>
<td>Materials reuse</td>
<td>Recycled content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2nd UW Oshkosh campus project earns LEED Gold status

Two years. Two of the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh newest buildings. Two examples of architectural and engineering "Gold."

UW Oshkosh’s newest residence hall building — Horizon Village — has been awarded LEED Gold certification by the U.S. Green Building Council.

Horizon Village’s distinction puts the residence hall at the top of a short list of buildings in the New North region, as well as in the state, to reach a LEED Gold status. There are fewer than 10 Gold certified buildings amongst the major cities of the New North region.

“Sustainability is infused in everything we do at UW Oshkosh,” Chancellor Richard Wells said. “It is part of our mission to reduce our environmental impact. Horizon Village is another step in that direction. It is a model for living and learning in a green way.”
University of Oregon building would be one of few LEED platinum science facilities

POSTED: Monday, April 2, 2012 at 03:19 PM PT
BY: Reed Jackson
Tags: University of Oregon

Because of their complex systems, science facilities present a number of sustainable design challenges that are usually considered hard to overcome. The University of Oregon’s $65 million Lewis Integrative Science Building could help change that notion.

Labs require a high degree of ventilation in order to remove chemical vapors, so the buildings use more energy than other types of structures commonly found on college campuses. In addition, health and safety requirements usually mean that the potentially toxic air in a science facility cannot be recycled.

But by employing some unique design techniques, the design teams at THA Architecture and HDR Inc. were able to create a five-story building that UO officials say is poised to earn a platinum designation in the U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design program.

“It was a huge challenge, but through the process we found some fairly groundbreaking building strategies,” said Amanda Petretti, as associate at THA Architecture. “(It) certainly represents the leading edge of sustainable lab design.”
Dartmouth’s Life Sciences Center Wins Platinum Award for Green Building Practices

POSTED ON MARCH 26, 2012 BY JOSEPH BLUMBERG

Dartmouth’s new Class of 1978 Life Sciences Center has just been awarded a Platinum LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification, the U.S. Green Building Council’s (USGBC) highest level of recognition for energy efficient and sustainable building practices.

The Class of 1978 Life Science Center was constructed with a high-performance building envelope incorporating high insulation values, a continuous air and vapor barrier, and solar gain control systems. (Photo by Joseph Blumberg)
Knight Management Center Awarded LEED Platinum Rating for Environmental Sustainability

Thursday, March 15, 2012

The Knight Management Center at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, an eight-building complex designed to support an innovative MBA curriculum, has achieved the LEED Platinum rating for environmental sustainability from the U.S. Green Building Council.

STANFORD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS—The U.S. Green Building Council has certified the Knight Management Center at the Stanford Graduate School of Business as LEED Platinum®, the highest rating for environmental sustainability.

The Knight Management Center opened in April 2011 as a new home for the school's innovative MBA curriculum and other programs, and as a physical space intended to both bring students together from across Stanford University's seven schools for interdisciplinary learning and demonstrate the Graduate School of Business' commitment to environmental leadership. "As we train new generations of managerial leaders, we hope that Stanford's commitment to sustainability will inspire our students to promote sustainable business practices in the future," said Garth Saloner, dean of the Stanford Graduate School of Business.

Filled with natural light and the latest technology, the 360,000-square-foot facility underscores what is taught in many of the school's electives such as Environmental Entrepreneurship and...
Built Environment Goals

 Goals
 Design future projects to minimize energy and water consumption and wastewater production; incorporate sustainable design principles into capital investment decisions; base capital investment decisions on life cycle cost, including the cost of known future expenditures.

 Progress
 The campus now has ten (10) LEED™ certified building projects, representing almost 7% of total square footage.

UC Berkeley is Committed to Constructing LEED™ Certified Buildings

The campus now has seven (7) LEED™ certified building projects, representing 5.1% of total square footage. In addition, all major projects currently in the planning and design phase, as well as several projects now in construction, are registered with the Green Building Certification Institute and are expected to be LEED™ certified.

UC Berkeley received over $190,000 between 2010 and 2011 from PG&E, the local utility that administers the Savings by Design program for energy savings in new construction. In addition to these three projects, there are presently ten more in design and under construction that are expected to generate additional energy savings over the next several years.

UC Berkeley LEED™ Building Certifications

- UC Berkeley Children's Health Center
- UC Berkeley New Construction
green design

active learning design
LSRS goals and aspirations
Enable richer interaction

Measure potential to support active learning

A framework of criteria for best practice

Enhance support and evaluation systems

A system that continues to improve with community input
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LSRS Structure: 6 sections

1. Integration with campus context
2. Planning and design process
3. Support and operations
4. Environmental quality
5. Layout and furnishings
6. Technology and tools
SO Credit 7: Scheduling Systems

Intent
To provide users with a system that enables them to match their teaching and learning needs with learning space availability and capabilities.

1 Point

Criterion for credit
Create and maintain a class scheduling software/database, which includes information on space attributes such as total area, area per station/seat, flexibility of furnishings, potential configurations, available technologies, and equipment capabilities.

Potential strategies and approaches
- Incorporate information in the class scheduling database on walking time/distance to the “heart” or center of campus.
- Investigate how different course schedules of colleges or programs may be a deterrent or promote active learning pedagogies. For example, some active learning activities may benefit from more extended class periods to facilitate arrangement of the space.
- Gather information to discover why certain rooms might be more or less popular than others. Conduct data gathering in an ongoing way.
ICC Credit 2: Integration with Learning Space Master Plan

Intent
To ensure that learning space projects align with, inform, and complement a current or developing institutional learning space master plan.

1 Point

Criteria for credit
To obtain credit, do one of the following:

1. Provide evidence of alignment with an existing institutional strategic learning spaces master plan.

or

2. Provide evidence for how the design complements and extends the direction of campus wide learning environments, including teaching spaces, informal learning spaces, learning commons, libraries, study places, computing facilities, tutoring centers, service points, living/learning locations, etc.
TT Credit 5: Audio/Visual Interface and Control

Intent
To enable faculty and students to seamlessly manage audio/visual content across multiple output systems including installed displays, computers, and mobile devices.

1 point

Criteria for credit
To obtain credit, do all of the following:

1. Provide controls for device and room settings with both presets and custom configuration capabilities.
2. Provide for the management of displays through a multiple input and multiple output control system.
3. Provide a graphical user interface (GUI) that is easy to comprehend and use.
4. Provide multiple permission levels for room systems that allow instructors and students to interact and contribute content.

Potential strategies and approaches
- Provide ability to manage content across multiple outputs.
- Provide ability to manage content across personal devices, team displays, and room displays.
- Provide ability to manage access to control capabilities for shared resources.
- Allow interface control from student devices as well as from “traditional” instructor station control point(s).
- Allow instructor and students to launch and use applications on displays that are visible to some or all of the class.
- Provide ability to introduce content to entire group using personal device or other sources.
- Provide ability to share content easily with each other, one-on-one, or with small group.
EQ Credit 7: Innovation in Environmental Quality

Intent
To create innovative ways to enhance the environmental qualities of learning spaces.

1 Point

Criteria for credit
Provide evidence of an initiative or project demonstrating innovation and leadership with respect to the environmental qualities of learning spaces in a way that falls outside of previous EQ Credits 1-6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Credit #</th>
<th>Credit Type</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-criterion</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Earned Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1. Integration with Campus Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Alignment w/ campus academic strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“or”</td>
<td>Integration w/ learning space master plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“or”</td>
<td>Integration w/ learning space master plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of complementing / extending direction of campus-wide learning environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Compatibility w/ technology strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“and”</td>
<td>Commitment to evidence-based research and assessment</td>
<td>Evidence of regular practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“and”</td>
<td>Commitment to evidence-based research and assessment</td>
<td>Maintain institutional assessment plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Innovation in Integrating Learning Spaces with Campus Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2. Planning Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“plus”</td>
<td>Best Practices in Planning</td>
<td>Provide documentation of consultation with best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“plus”</td>
<td>Best Practices in Planning</td>
<td>Provide documentation linking design strategies with best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Pilots and Prototypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Space Rating System

Why?
LSRS: Three Sections

• Institutional Context
• Space Planning
• Operations
Learning Space Rating System
LSRS: Institutional Context

• Align learning spaces with strategic plans and/or accreditation activities
• Align learning spaces with any master planning (space or technology) activities
• Create an institutional culture of regular assessment of whether spaces align to goals
• Promote evidence-based design that can be replicated
LSRS: Space Planning

- Help get involved during the planning stages
- Educate administrators, architects, campus planning staff, other IT staff about best practices
LSRS: Space Planning

- Provide impetus for connecting spaces with teaching & technology centers
- Pilot or prototype, potentially as part of a faculty development activity
- Plan to evaluate, share, innovate
LSRS: Operations

– Formalize documentation, training for support staff and customers
– Educate staff on layouts that promote active learning
– Pictures on doors can display effective layouts
LSRS: Operations

- Evaluating spaces can lead to continual improvement
- Occupancy goals (65%) can encourage a diverse use of the spaces (longer hours, summer groups)
- Documenting spaces (total ASF, ASF per seat, potential configurations) can inform space master planning
How can I make the case for improving my learning spaces?
The Learning space rating system provides a way to rate your portfolio of formal learning spaces (or a sampling of them) to understand their relative and absolute performance.

### Learning Space Rating System

**Instructions**

1. Review the rating system so you have a sense of the criteria for which you can receive credits.
2. Choose the spaces you wish to rate. For beta-testing we, suggest a poor and an exemplary space at each of 3 scales: large (>100), medium (30-60), and small (20).
3. Make a copy of this spreadsheet file for each space to be rated. Name one copy for each space using the naming convention, `school_name_building_roomnumber_MMDDYYYY`
4. Walk through each space and rate it according to the criteria below. Enter points into “Earned Points” column.
5. For each room’s total points on each of the six sections and rating, go to the LSRs Scoresheet (second tab), which is populated with the values from the earned points column, according to the weighting of sections shown.

### Building

<insert building name>  
<insert room #>  
**Legend**  
Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ROOM #</th>
<th>&lt;insert building name&gt;</th>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;insert room #&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Credit #</th>
<th>Credit Type</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-criterion</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Earned Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1. Integration with Campus Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Alignment w/ campus academic strategy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“or”</td>
<td>Integration w/ learning space master plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration w/ learning space master plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of complementing / extending direction of campus-wide learning environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Compatibility w/ technology strategic plan</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“and”</td>
<td>Commitment to evidence-based research and assessment</td>
<td>Evidence of regular practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to evidence-based research and assessment</td>
<td>Maintain institutional assessment plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Innovation in Integrating Learning Spaces with Campus Context</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Credits: 5 | Section Subtotal | 0 | 0 |
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**Instructions**

1. Review the rating system so you have a sense of the criteria for which you can receive credits.
2. Choose the spaces you wish to rate. For beta-testing we, suggest a poor and an exemplary space at each of 3 scales: large (>100), medium (30-60), and small (20).
3. Make a copy of this spreadsheet file for each space to be rated. Name one copy for each space using the naming convention, `school_name_building_roomnumber_MMDDYYYY`
4. Walk through each space and rate it according to the criteria below. Enter points into “Earned Points” column.
5. For each room’s total points on each of the six sections and rating, go to the LSRs Scoresheet (second tab), which is populated with the values from the earned points column, according to the weighting of sections shown.

### Building

<insert building name>  
<insert room #>  
**Legend**  
Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ROOM #</th>
<th>&lt;insert building name&gt;</th>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;insert room #&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Credit #</th>
<th>Credit Type</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-criterion</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Earned Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1. Integration with Campus Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Alignment w/ campus academic strategy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“or”</td>
<td>Integration w/ learning space master plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration w/ learning space master plan</td>
<td>Provide evidence of complementing / extending direction of campus-wide learning environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Compatibility w/ technology strategic plan</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“and”</td>
<td>Commitment to evidence-based research and assessment</td>
<td>Evidence of regular practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to evidence-based research and assessment</td>
<td>Maintain institutional assessment plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>Innovation in Integrating Learning Spaces with Campus Context</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Credits: 5 | Section Subtotal | 0 | 0 |
See how you compare to others

As more institutions adopt the rating system and contribute to a common data set, comparisons across institutions will be possible.

image credits: http://www.visualizing.org/stories/visualizing-college-choice
http://chancellor.utk.edu/annualreport/2012/images/rank.gif
Identify the low-and high-performers

Once you’ve rated your spaces (or a sampling of them) you can identify which ones best support active learning and which are good candidates for renovation or repurposing, setting internal benchmarks.
Reference an objective, Third-party standard

Being able to reference an objective third-party standard can help make the case to leaders and funders about the need to improve learning spaces.
Get guidance on getting started

The rating system sections on process and campus context can be used to help guide the process for getting started by following the steps you get credits for, like alignment with institutional goals and user-centered process.
Poll: How can I get involved?
Learning Space Rating System

Overview

The Learning Space Rating System (LSRS) project provides a set of measurable criteria to assess how well the design of classrooms support and enable active learning activities. Noting the success of several architectural programs to promote sustainable building design, the LSRS provides a scoring system to serve as an indicator of how well a classroom’s design serves the goal of active learning. The LSRS criteria form the basis for a rating system that will allow institutions to benchmark their environments against best practices within the higher education community.

This current version of the LSRS measures formal learning spaces, but future versions will include informal spaces and more specialized spaces.

The information in the About section contains more detailed background and information on the LSRS project. In the Resources section, you will find articles, websites, and other resources relevant to the project. We highly recommend an article in the Journal of Learning Spaces for a conceptual introduction to the LSRS project.

A copy of the beta version of the LSRS criteria and scoresheet is available from this site, in the Community Input section. The ELI invites community members to participate in the community input process. We will use the input to revise the beta version and produce the first version of the criteria. Please visit the Community Input section for more information.

All LSRS materials are covered by the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 license (CC BY 3.0).

LSRS Advisory Team Members:

- Malcolm Brown, EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative
Downloading the criteria and scoresheet

http://www.educause.edu/eli/initiatives/learning-space-rating-system
Next steps

- Community review Nov 13 > Jan 14
- Feb > July revision of beta
- Summer 2014: publication of version 1
Review team

- Jeremy Todd, U Minnesota
- Adam Finkelstein, U Toronto
- Roger Yohe, Mesa CC
- Jenn Stringer, UC Berkeley
- Lisa Stephens, SUNY Buffalo
- Scott Diener, U of Auckland
- Ed Gomes, Duke
- Clare van den Blink, Cornell
- Beth McCullough, Stanford
- Tim Murphy, George Mason
- Amy Keller, Skidmore Owings & Merrill
- Kenn Fisher, U Melbourne
Learning Space Rating System (LSRS) community input form

The LSRS Advisory team solicits feedback from the community on its beta draft. You can download a copy of the criteria and the scoresheet at http://www.educause.edu/eli/initiatives/learning-space-rating-system-community-input

* Required

Name *

Title *

Institution *

Email *

The overall organization, structure, and logic of LSRS beta is clear

- Strongly agree
- Agree somewhat
- Disagree somewhat
- Strongly disagree

Comments on overall organization, structure, and logic of the LSRS beta draft

 tinyurl.com/lsrscomment
LSRS site
http://tinyurl.com/eliLSRS

ELI Community Forum
http://tinyurl.com/forumeli

Learning Space discussion group
http://tinyurl.com/LSPACEcg
Thank you!