

# Accreditation Visiting Committee Evaluation by Host Museum

Here is your opportunity to evaluate your Accreditation peer reviewers' **performance** as related to the **site visit**. (You will be given an opportunity to evaluate and comment on the resulting narrative *report*, and your satisfaction with other aspects of the accreditation *process*, at a later point, after you receive your decision letter from the Commission.)

We want to ensure each museum taking part in the Accreditation Program has a high-quality experience. Therefore, the American Association of Museums has established high performance expectations for its Peer Reviewers—with input from peer reviewers themselves, participant museums, and other members of the museum community.

Your responses in this evaluation form will help the Accreditation Program staff and Accreditation Commission:

- improve the program and the caliber of all peer reviewers by identifying individual problems and global training needs
  - recognize top-notch peer reviewers and identify mentors and models
  - give feedback to peer reviewers on their performance
- (See the reverse for details on how your responses will be disclosed and used.)

The elements of this evaluation are based on the “Responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer” in the AAM’s *Site Visit Expectations* document ([http://www.aam-us.org/getinvolved/pr/upload/E10\\_Site\\_Visit\\_Expectations.pdf](http://www.aam-us.org/getinvolved/pr/upload/E10_Site_Visit_Expectations.pdf))

<b>INSTRUCTIONS</b>
---------------------

**1. Use the following scale to rate each peer reviewer’s overall performance in each main category, and performance in a number of sub-criteria.**

<p><b>① Outstanding</b> Use when actions have been exceptional; contributing to an outstanding visit.</p>	<p><b>② Very Good</b> Use when actions were proficient and contributed to a successful visit</p>	<p><b>③ Satisfactory</b> Use when actions were capable and contributed to the effectiveness of the visit.</p>	<p><b>④ Needs Improvement</b> Use when actions lessened the effectiveness of the visit or actions were improper /unacceptable.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**2. Write-in any comments about your rating in the space provided. Attach extra sheets if more space is needed.**

**3. When done, fax, e-mail, or mail the form to:**

E-mail: [accreditation@aam-us.org](mailto:accreditation@aam-us.org)

Fax: (202) 289-6578

Accreditation Program  
Attn: Evaluation  
American Association of Museums  
1575 Eye St., NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20005

If you have serious concerns about a peer reviewer's performance that you would like to confidentially discuss one-on-one with an AAM staff member, please do not hesitate to first contact Vanessa Jones at (202) 218-7688. She will inform and involve the Accreditation Program leadership as appropriate.

### **AAM'S DISCLOSURE AND USE OF YOUR RESPONSES**

AAM is committed to providing consistent and constructive feedback and professional development to peer reviewers, whose work supports the efforts of AAM to advance the museum field.

Since we ask for your honest and candid feedback, you have the right to know how your responses will be used.

- Aspects of each Accreditation Visiting Committee members' performance for every site visit are evaluated by three groups: the host museum, the Accreditation Program staff, and the Accreditation Commission.
- Your responses are saved and analyzed electronically and the paper form archived. The data is available only to the Accreditation Program staff, the Peer Reviewer Manager, Museum Assessment Program staff\*, and the Director of Museum Advancement & Excellence. (\*Museum Assessment Program staff use many of the same peer reviewers as the Accreditation Program does, and therefore they have access to a peer reviewer's performance history.)
- Your responses are provided to the peer reviewers in the form of an electronic or paper report from the Peer Reviewer Manager.
- All of the museum's ratings and written comments are provided to the peer reviewers *in their entirety*. (However, if the evaluation comments are particularly inflammatory, defamatory, or unprofessional in nature, the AAM staff reserve the right to remove or edit them.)
- The Confidential Section contents are *not* provided to the peer reviewers.
- The museum's responses are attributed to the museum in general in the evaluation report provided to the peer reviewer. Neither the person who completed the evaluation form nor anyone else at the museum will be individually cited.

A goal of the peer reviewer evaluation process is to ensure the credibility and consistency of the Accreditation Program. Therefore, ***when serious concerns about performance, or multiple areas needing improvement, are indicated***, we follow a set of response protocols based on the specific nature of the problem(s). Some type of action is always taken to communicate to the peer reviewer the basis of the concern(s) and provide positive suggestions and appropriate resources for improvement. If a reviewer is not willing or able to meet the expectations of the programs, we will not continue to involve that reviewer in future site visits.

## Evaluation of Accreditation Visiting Committee Site Visit Performance by Host Museum

Name of person completing this evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail or Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of site visit: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviewer 1 (Team Contact/Chair): \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviewer 2: \_\_\_\_\_

### I. Rating Performance

#### A. Conducting the Visit—Overall → ① ② ③ ④

Rate your peer reviewers' performance in each of the following areas related to conducting the visit (circle the number).

	Peer Reviewer 1	Peer Reviewer 2
Knowledge/experience as it related to the visit.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Thoughtfulness and effectiveness in asking questions and soliciting information.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Familiarity with self-study and supplemental materials.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Effectiveness in clarifying his/her role and the expectations of the visit.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Attention to the agenda and negotiation of any changes to meet the needs of all parties.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Discretion with information gathered on site.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

Comments:

#### B. Timeliness/Responsiveness → ① ② ③ ④

Rate the performance of your **Chair/Team Contact** related to his/her timeliness and responsiveness (e.g. setting the agenda, arranging travel logistics, and other communication)

Comments:

Turn over →

① **Outstanding:** actions have been exceptional; contributing to an outstanding visit.  
 ② **Very Good:** actions were proficient and contributed to a successful visit.  
 ③ **Satisfactory:** actions were capable and contributed to the effectiveness of the visit.  
 ④ **Needs Improvement:** actions lessened the effectiveness of the visit or were improper or unacceptable.

[NI]PR 2 [S] [NI]PR 1 [S] [NI]PR 2 [S] [NI]**C. Interpersonal Skills—**  
**Overall** → ①  ②  ③  ④

Rate your peer reviewers' performance in the following areas related to his/her interpersonal skills (circle the number).

	Peer Reviewer 1				Peer Reviewer 2			
Listening skills	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Respect shown to staff and governing authority	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Fairness and objectiveness	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Diplomacy	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Supportiveness	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

Comments:

**D. Overall: Peer Reviewers' Performance** → ①  ②  ③  ④

Give a final rating to your museum's peer reviewers' performance, overall.

Comments:

(use the last page for any comments you want to share confidentially to the AAM staff, which will not be shared with the peer reviewers).

## II. Nomination Form for Excellence in Peer Review Service Award

AAM annually presents five **Exemplary Peer Review Service Awards** to recognize peer reviewers who fulfilled their roles and assignments in an exceptional manner.

To be eligible for nomination for this award, a peer reviewer must:

- Demonstrate a broad knowledge of general museum operations,
- Effectively communicate facts and ideas,
- Develop good working relationships with visited museums and,
- Set the standard for excellence for museum professionals in general.

If you feel the peer reviewer(s) who conducted your site visit provided exceptional service and demonstrated the above characteristics as they relate to the site visit, please list by name below and check the adjacent box.

Peer Reviewer 1: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviewer 2: \_\_\_\_\_

Check box to nominate for Excellence in Peer Review Service Award

① **Outstanding:** actions have been exceptional; contributing to an outstanding visit.

② **Very Good:** actions were proficient and contributed to a successful visit.

③ **Satisfactory:** actions were capable and contributed to the effectiveness of the visit.

④ **Needs Improvement:** actions lessened the effectiveness of the visit or were improper or unacceptable.

**Accreditation Visiting Committee Evaluation by Host Museum**  
**CONFIDENTIAL SECTION**  
**NOT Given to Peer Reviewer(s)**

We realize sometimes there is feedback museum staff and leadership would rather not share with their peer reviewer(s). However, this information may be important for the AAM staff to know.

In the following space, please share anything about your peer reviewers' actions related to the site visit you would like us to treat confidentially. You may also attach a separate sheet instead, marked "confidential section." The Peer Reviewer Manager *may* contact you to discuss your concerns.

**CONFIDENTIAL SECTION**