

Team Chair's Evaluation of Program Evaluator

Please provide your response to each of the competencies using the scale below.
For any rating of 1 or 2 you must explain your rationale for the rating under "Comments:"

<i>Evaluator</i>	<i>Program</i>					
<i>Visit Dates</i>	<i>Institution</i>					
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Needs Improvement		Met Expectations		Exceeded Expectations	Not able to evaluate
1. Technically Current						
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
A. Knowledge of general criteria	<input type="radio"/> Some misunderstandings of the general criteria	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated knowledge of general criteria	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Exceptional ability to explain general criteria to others	<input type="radio"/>
B. Knowledge of program criteria	<input type="radio"/> Some misunderstandings of the program criteria	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated knowledge of program criteria	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Exceptional ability to explain program criteria to others	<input type="radio"/>
C. Knowledge of accreditation policies. & procedures	<input type="radio"/> Some misunderstandings of the accreditation policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated knowledge of accreditation policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Exceptional ability to explain accreditation policies and procedures to others	<input type="radio"/>
D. Technical Currency	<input type="radio"/> Was unaware of technical advances in their professional field.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Quality of statement reflected technical competence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Was very aware of the most current advances in their professional field.	<input type="radio"/>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px;"></div>						
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Needs Improvement		Met Expectations		Exceeded Expectations	Not able to evaluate
2. Effective Communications						
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
A. Exit Statement	<input type="radio"/> Written exit statement required extensive editing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Written exit statement was effectively done. Key points were highlighted	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Exceptionally written exit statement. Little or no edits required from Team Chair.	<input type="radio"/>

B. Exit Interview	<input type="radio"/> Exit interview lacked sensitivity and/or did not provide specific suggestions for improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Effectively communicated the most important points during the exit interview	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated particular skill in conveying the most important points during exit interview in a sensitive manner.	<input type="radio"/>
C. Suggestions	<input type="radio"/> Suggestions made were too prescriptive or biased	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Was non-prescriptive in suggestions aimed at encouraging innovation and continuous improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Very effectively communicated specific and helpful suggestions for continuous improvement and innovation	<input type="radio"/>

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Needs Improvement		Met Expectations		Exceeded Expectations	Not able to evaluate

3. Interpersonally Skilled

A. Interactions	<input type="radio"/> 1 Did not demonstrate effective interactions	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3 Was effective in interactions with program, faculty, staff and students	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5 Exceptional ability to diffuse potential or real conflict when communicating strengths and weaknesses	<input type="radio"/> N/A
B. Bias	<input type="radio"/> Was biased in assessing program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated an open-minded approach in assessing program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Exceptional ability to make judgments in the context of the institution	<input type="radio"/>
C. Diplomacy	<input type="radio"/> Abrasive and combative toward team members or institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated ability to make difficult observations in a diplomatic manner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Was forthright and courageous in making the tough call	<input type="radio"/>

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Needs Improvement		Met Expectations		Exceeded Expectations	Not able to evaluate

4. Team Oriented

A. Willingness to listen	<input type="radio"/> 1 Interrupted others and tended to monopolize conversation	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3 Demonstrated a willingness to listen to other views during team meetings	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5 Encouraged others to express their viewpoints	<input type="radio"/> N/A
B. Willingness	<input type="radio"/> Only focused on own program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated a willingness to	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Consistently offered to help	<input type="radio"/>

to help	and did not volunteer to help others		help other team members during the visit		others on the team if needed	
C. Collaboration	Demonstrated limited ability to see other perspective or find common ground		Worked collaboratively with team members to reach consensus		Exceptional ability to help group members find common ground and resolve conflict in order to ultimately reach consensus	

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Needs Improvement		Met Expectations		Exceeded Expectations	Not able to evaluate

5. Organized

A. Pre-visit	Was not prepared when arrived on campus		Demonstrated preparedness in completing all pre-visit tasks in a timely manner		Demonstrated preparedness on pre-visit task and communicated pro-actively to Team Chair and/or team members ahead of time	
B. Time Management	Did not give program sufficient time to prepare for additional requests		Effectively managed time on campus		Exceptionally organized and efficient during the site visit	
C. Responsiveness	Was late with materials and unresponsive to Team Chair		Submitted documentation to Team Chair on time		Documentation was received in advance of deadlines	
D. Organization	Was unorganized in every aspect of the process		Demonstrated effective organization in the evaluation process from first contact until program report was submitted		Was exceptionally efficient, timely and responsive throughout the entire process	

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Needs Improvement		Met Expectations		Exceeded Expectations	Not able to evaluate

6. Professional

A. Respect	Showed little regard for the institution		Showed respect for the institution		Demonstrated high regard for institutional representatives during interviews	
------------	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	--

B. Behavior	<input type="radio"/> Did not represent ABET well during exit interview	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Showed respect for institution during exit interview	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated superior ability to show respect for institution during the exit interview under tough conditions	<input type="radio"/>
C. Conduct	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated inappropriate conduct for an ABET PEV	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Upheld ABET's Code of Conduct at all times	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Provided leadership for team members in questions of appropriateness of conduct	<input type="radio"/>
D. Judgment	<input type="radio"/> Evaluated program based on personal opinion, not criteria.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrated professional judgment in evaluating the program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> Excellent professional judgment in interpretation of criteria and program performance.	<input type="radio"/>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 68px; width: 100%;"></div>						
<input type="button" value="Submit"/>						

 Comment: Shared Bottom Border