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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |  | | --- | |  | | form a: Shadow Member | |  | |

Instructions: This form is designed to take feedback for shadow participant who have participated in the peer review visit. Please select only one choice for each item.

Name of Peer Reviewer (for whom the feedback is provided):

Name of the Institution:

Date (s) of visit :

# purpose of the visit

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | The panelist had a clear understanding of the purpose and process of the visit. |
|  | The panelist had a fair understanding of the purpose and process of the visit. |
|  | The panelist had a fair understanding of the purpose but was unclear of the process. |
|  | The panelist had little understanding of the purpose of the visit and indicated partial clarity of the process to be followed. |

# participation as a team member

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | The panelist was willing and able to extend cooperation to other team members. |
|  | The panelist was willing but demonstrated partial ability for cooperating with team members. |
|  | The panelist was partially willing and able to cooperate with team members. |
|  | The panelist was not forthcoming in cooperating with other team members. |

# preparedness for the visit

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | The panelist appeared to have read the report and identified areas for discussion. |
|  | The panelist appeared to have read the report but was less clear about the areas for discussion. |
|  | The panelist appeared to have little idea of the content of the report. |
|  | The panelist appeared to have no idea of the content of the report. |

# contribution during the sessions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | The panelist was seldom spokes but asked very valuable questions. |
|  | The panelist was very active during the sessions and asked probing and valuable questions. |
|  | The panelist was present during the sessions but only asked a few random questions. |
|  | The panelist was not present during all sessions and had minimal participation in asking questions. |

# general attitude and conduct during the visit

* The panelist was professional, polite and responsive towards the institution’s representatives.
* The panelist was professional but somewhat polite and responsive towards the institution’s representatives.
* The panelist was professional, aggressive and non- responsive towards the institution’s representatives.
* The panelist was casual and non-responsive towards the institution’s representatives.

# Quality of report writing

* The panelist wrote a professional, analytical report with substantial recommendations within the specified timeline.
* The panelist wrote a professional, analytical report with few recommendations.
* A basic report was provided which more or less repeated verbal feedback points without expanding them.
* A basic report was provided which more or less repeated details in the sample report.

# Timely Submission of Peer Review Report

* The panelist submitted their part of the report to all members within two weeks’ time period.
* The panelist submitted their part of the report to all members within three weeks’ time period.
* The panelist submitted their part of the report to all members within four weeks’ time period.
* The panelist submitted their part of the report to all members beyond a months’ time and delaying the whole process

# Comments (optional)