

## Interpreting Your Feedback

### Evaluation Perspectives -- Who rates you and how

Your evaluation comes from some or all of the following sources. When you read your results, keep in mind that each of the parties evaluates you on different aspects of your performance. All groups also have the opportunity to write in any comments. They are provided to you in their entirety, except where minor edits were needed.

- ♦ **The Museum:** evaluates your performance, and its overall experience with you in advance of the visit and while you were on site. The evaluation largely encompasses the criteria set out in the Site Visit Expectations. The museum uses the following rating scale.

Performance Met Expectations			
<b>① Outstanding</b> When actions have been exceptional, contributing to an outstanding visit.	<b>② Very Good</b> When actions were proficient and contributed to a successful visit.	<b>③ Satisfactory</b> When actions were capable and contributed to the effectiveness of the visit.	<b>④ Needs Improvement</b> When actions lessened the effectiveness of the visit or actions were improper/unacceptable.

- ♦ **The (MAP or Accreditation) Program staff:** evaluate your site visit report, and your performance related to meeting assignment logistics (e.g., timeliness). The staff use the Evaluation Rubric -- found in the *Peer Review Manual* -- as the basis for its ratings. The Program staff use the same scale as listed above.

The evaluation of your **report** makes up a significant portion of the feedback, as it is a long-lasting, concrete product of the review. For visits that consisted of more than one peer reviewer, it is not generally possible to determine which reviewer was responsible for which parts of the report. Therefore the report is evaluated and reported to you as a whole.

- ♦ **The Accreditation Commission** (for Accreditation visits only): evaluates you on how well your report informed its decision-making. The Commission’s feedback represents the opinion of the Commission as a whole and is based upon ratings and comments from one or more Commissioners. The Commission only cites instances of outstanding performance [O] or cause for concern [NI—needs improvement], rather than the four point scale used by the staff and museum. If ratings varied among Commissioners, you will see the notation “differing opinions.”

### Format: How to read your results:

