

Peer Reviewer Performance Evaluation Rubric

Site Visit

Criteria	Outstanding	Very Good*/Satisfactory**	Needs Improvement
OVERALL: Conducting the Site Visit	Reviewer is responsive to staff and museum communications, meets or exceeds deadlines, collaborates effectively with partner, and fulfills role appropriately and discretely.	*Reviewer is responsive to museum & program staff, fulfills role effectively. **Reviewer requires some reminders but fulfills role satisfactorily.	Reviewer does not fulfill his/her role in some way throughout the visit; including but not limited to lack of responsiveness, timeliness, discretion, or collaboration/participation.
1. Responsiveness to Requests (e.g. take on a review, edits to a report)	Reviewer acknowledged the request, responded definitively in a reasonable time frame, and took initiative to meet the request.	Reviewer acknowledged the request and responded definitively within a reasonable time frame, generally within 10 business days.	Reviewer did not acknowledge the request or did not respond definitively within a reasonable time frame.
2. Timeliness	Reviewer consistently met and/or exceeds program deadlines, or reviewer met deadlines despite significant challenges.	Reviewer met all program deadlines within 15 business days or contacted program staff to discuss challenges or arrange for extensions.	Reviewer missed one or more program deadlines by more than 15 business days. Reviewer did not contact staff regarding delays.
3. Discretion	Reviewer met the expectations of AAM when faced with a challenging situation during the review process.	Reviewer maintained confidentiality in all communications and treated all information appropriately to maintain rapport and trust with participants.	Reviewer damaged rapport and/or trust of participating institution through the injudicious sharing of information gained through the review process.
4. Responsibility Sharing	Reviewer shared review responsibilities and made an extra effort to ensure mutual agreement throughout the review. Reviewer mentored a less experienced reviewer.	Responsibilities for the visit (preparation, agenda development, site visit activities, follow-up, and report-writing) were negotiated with the team member and divided according to the abilities and strengths of each member.	Responsibilities for the review were not negotiated. Responsibilities were divided unevenly, either overloading one party, or excluding their fair participation.



Peer Reviewer Performance Evaluation Rubric

Report

Criteria	Outstanding	Very Good*/Satisfactory**	Needs Improvement
5. Structure	Report is very effective and easily understood due to attention paid to grammar, organization, format, and clarity. Report reads easily. No changes by staff were necessary.	<p>*Report is written and organized so information follows a logical order and is easy to reference.</p> <p>*Report incorporates program format. Only a few minor changes by staff required.</p> <p>**Report structure makes it difficult to follow ideas or reference information. Report does not follow program format.</p>	Report structure interferes with the effective reading and interpretation of the report. Major changes by staff are needed or report was unacceptable.
a. Grammar & Spelling	Report contains no spelling or grammatical errors. No editing by staff was needed.	Report contains only a few minor errors that were easily corrected by staff.	Report contains numerous or consistent errors that detract from the readability of the report and require significant attention by staff.
b. Organization & Format	Report organization is clear and logical, enhancing its effectiveness for the intended audience. Report contains all of the recommended elements, including a summary. Creative use of format for meeting specific needs may be considered. No changes by staff were needed.	Report generally uses the recommended format, or deviates in a thoughtful and effective way. Report organization supports the understanding and use of the information (e.g., sections and headers).	Report organization impedes understanding and/or use of information provided.
c. Clearly Written	Report is thoughtfully composed. Language is clear and accessible to a broad audience.	Report language is clear and ideas are easy to identify and understand.	Ideas in the report are difficult to identify and understand. Language use interferes with report comprehension.

Peer Reviewer Performance Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	Very Good*/Satisfactory**	Needs Improvement
6. Writing Style	Through description, analysis, balance of presentation, and professional tone, the report advances the goals of the program.	<p>*Report is an effective record of the visit and communication tool for other audiences. Report meets the needs of the program and its intended audience.</p> <p>**Report serves as a record of the visit and fulfills its basic role for the program.</p>	<p>Report is not sufficient to serve as a record of the review and as a planning document for the museum.</p> <p>Acc: Commission decision-making is hindered by the report.</p>
a. Program appropriate use of consultative language	Not applicable for this criteria	<p>Acc: Report language is descriptive and free from any suggestions or language implying any specific course of action.</p> <p>MAP: Suggestions and recommendations are provided in a constructive manner and effectively incorporated in the report.</p>	<p>Acc: Report includes specific suggestions and /or recommendations.</p> <p>MAP: Report is judgmental of operations without offering constructive feedback and ideas.</p>
b. Sufficient context and detail	Many potential audiences are served by the report by providing meaningful context and details.	Language and description is sufficient to give someone who did not participate in the site visit a clear picture of the institution.	Language and description is <i>not</i> sufficient for someone who did not participate in the site visit to have a clear picture of the institution. Language used creates a barrier for a non-participant.
c. Respectful, fair & objective tone	Report strikes an effective balance. It describes concerns while avoiding critical language and achievements while avoiding effusiveness.	Report makes a balanced presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of an institution. The report avoids criticism of individuals.	Report is excessively negative or positive in presentation. Report may be authoritative or offensive in tone.



Peer Reviewer Performance Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	Very Good*/Satisfactory**	Needs Improvement
7. Meets Program Purpose	Report incorporates standards and best practices, and program criteria and requirements to support the immediate program needs and as a meaningful long-standing document for the museum.	<p>*Report effectively incorporates standards and best practices and program criteria and requirements.</p> <p>**Report is consistent with standards and best practices and with program requirements; however its usefulness beyond the program is limited.</p>	Report did not incorporate the necessary elements to meet the needs of the program and its participants.
a. "Big picture" focus	Report underscored sustainability and growth over time with a focus on the mission, institutional structure, planning, and finances.	Report provides insight into the underlying structure, operations, and issues of the institution.	Report tends to focus on the symptoms rather than the underlying issues. Report does not address long-term concerns.
b. Addresses program requirements	Program materials and requirements are fully incorporated and referenced. Report meets and exceeds the needs of the review.	<p>Program materials and requirements are effectively incorporated into the report.</p> <p>Acc: Additionally, report addresses whether progress was made regarding any concerns raised through the Self-Study Checklist or in previous reviews.</p>	Program materials and requirements are not partially or fully referenced/met through the report.
c. Standards and best practices incorporated	Standards and best practices are actively referenced and effectively applied throughout the report.	<p>Report analysis is consistent with standards and best practices.</p> <p>MAP: Recommendations are well-justified.</p>	Report analysis is not consistent with, or makes inadequate reference to, standards and best practices.

Peer Reviewer Performance Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	Very Good/Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
<p>d. Constructive and achievable recommendations</p> <p>N/A for Accreditation reports</p>	<p>Recommendations offer a range of practical, immediate options as well as long-term, allowing the institutions to envision growth. References and resources are incorporated.</p>	<p>Recommendations acknowledge and are appropriate to the museum’s interests, available resources, and stage of institutional development. Recommendations are useful in institutional planning.</p>	<p>Recommendations are not appropriate for the museums interests, available resources, and stage of institutional development.</p>
<p>e. Advisory Conclusion well supported</p> <p>N/A for MAP reports</p>	<p>The Advisory Conclusion is systematically and consistently supported by the description and analysis in the report.</p>	<p>Advisory Conclusion is in agreement with the description and analysis presented in the report.</p>	<p>Advisory Conclusion seems contradictory to or unsupported by the description and analysis presented in the report.</p>
<p>f. Advisory Conclusion not in report</p> <p>N/A for MAP reports</p>	<p>Not applicable for this criteria</p>	<p>No mention of the Advisory Conclusion is present in the report.</p>	<p>Advisory Conclusion is in the report or enough indication is given for a reasonable assumption to be made.</p>
<p>g. Written to Accreditation Commission</p> <p>N/A for MAP reports</p>	<p>Report addresses all the primary questions and concerns of the Commission, adding to its ability to make an informed decision.</p>	<p>Report contains sufficient and appropriate description and analysis to meet the decision-making needs of the Accreditation Commission.</p>	<p>Report does not contain sufficient and appropriate description and analysis to meet the decision-making needs of the Accreditation Commission.</p>



Peer Reviewer Performance Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	Very Good*/Satisfactory**	Needs Improvement
8. Content	Report provides a systematic and accurate review of all the necessary operations with integrated analysis tied to the unique circumstances of the museum.	<p>*Report provides a whole and accurate picture of the museum's unique operations with thorough analysis that meets the program and institution's needs.</p> <p>**Report provides a sufficiently complete and accurate picture of the museum's operations to meet the program needs.</p>	Report provides an incomplete or inaccurate representation of the museum's operations or report's analysis is cursory.
a. Analysis of museum's strengths and weaknesses	Report integrates analysis of strengths and weaknesses into a complete picture of the museum's operations, identifying inter-related issues.	<p>Report identifies an institution's operational strengths and weaknesses with sufficient depth and analysis to support planning and decision-making.</p> <p>Acc: Analysis sufficient to inform the Accreditation Commission.</p>	Report provides minimal or insufficient depth of analysis.
b. Comprehensiveness	Report addresses and expands upon the complete range of operations in the review, considering key issues to create a full picture of their influence.	Report covers the complete range of operations included within the scope of the review.	Report provides minimal or insufficient coverage of the complete range of operations in the review.
c. Museum-specific issues addressed	Report addresses and advances issues and circumstances unique to the institution, providing an exceptionally detailed picture of the institution and its operations.	Report incorporates the issues and circumstances unique to the participating institution throughout the report.	Report provides minimal or insufficient concentration on issues and circumstances specific to the institution in the report.
d. Accuracy of institution-specific details	Particular attention has been paid to ensuring that all statements about the museum are accurate.	Report does not include inaccuracies or misrepresentations related to the museum under review.	Report includes inaccuracies or misrepresentations related to the museum under review.