

# Policy on Use and Distribution of Evaluation Information

---

The American Association of Museums (AAM) collects information on the performance of its peer reviewers for the following purposes:

- Improve the peer reviewer roster
- Guide training and support decisions
- Identify specific areas of concern about a peer reviewer's performance

To meet these purposes, evaluative information on the report and visit performance is collected from the museums receiving a visit, the appropriate MAP or Accreditation Program staff, and the Accreditation Commission (for Accreditation visits only). The resulting information will be managed as follows:

- 1) All evaluation forms filled out and returned to AAM will be subject to AAM's Policy on Confidentiality of Evaluation Information.
- 2) All information on any evaluation forms, except that written in an area designated as confidential, will be entered into the Peer Reviewer Evaluation database, which is restricted to use by MAP staff, Accreditation staff, the Peer Reviewer Manager, and the Director of Museum Advancement & Excellence.
- 3) A summary of the information from each evaluation form will also be entered into the peer reviewer's individual iMIS record (AAM's association management software program). Access to this information is also restricted to the same group of people as cited above.
- 4) All the information in the Peer Reviewer Evaluation database will be available to the peer reviewer. A report built off all of the evaluations related to a specific visit will be sent to the peer reviewer(s) involved in the review, along with a cover sheet outlining the evaluation process and summarizing the evaluation results.
  - a) For evaluation information provided by the museum: the ratings and written responses will be included in their entirety with attribution to the institution only. No individual at the museum will be cited in the report.
    - i) If the evaluation comments are particularly

inflammatory, AAM reserves the right to remove them from the report or edit them. This is an infrequent occurrence and museum staff should not rely upon AAM staff to soften any of their comments to be more palatable to the reviewer.

b) For evaluation information provided by the Accreditation Commission

i) Only the results of the Presenter will be entered into the database and communicated to the Peer Reviewer; unless the results of the Presenter and Reader(s) are polar opposites (one person rates Outstanding, another rates Needs Improvement). In such cases, the Peer Reviewer will receive a message indicating "differing opinions."

ii) The comments from all Commissioner evaluations will be provided to the Peer Reviewer, who will be informed that the comments may reflect the perspective of one or more individuals.

iii) For evaluation information gathered from the AAM staff: any comments entered into the Peer Reviewer Evaluation database will be included in the report provided to the peer reviewer, except any written in the designated confidential area. Ratings and written responses will be included in their entirety with attribution to AAM or the program only; no individual staff member will be cited in the report.