DRAFT - 2015 GTO Peer Review Survey Questions

General Questions
1. The purpose and scope of the review were well defined: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
2. The quality, breadth and depth of the following were sufficient to contribute to a well-considered review (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
   a. Answer Options
      i. Presentations
      ii. Question and Answer periods
      iii. Answers provided concerning programmatic questions
      iv. Answers provided concerning technical questions
3. Enough time was allocated for presentations: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
4. The time allowed for the Audience Question and Answer period and the Technology Wrap-up sessions was adequate for rigorous exchange: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
5. The review was conducted smoothly: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
6. What was the most useful part of the review process?
7. What could have been done better?
8. What plenary session content would you like to see in the future?
9. What was your role in the review?
   a. Peer Reviewer
   b. Presenter of a program activity or project under review
   c. Presenter of a program activity or project not under review
   d. Attendee, neither reviewer nor presenter

Reviewer Specific Questions
1. The number of projects I was expected to review was:
   a. Too many
   b. Too few
   c. Just about right
2. Were the scoring criteria proper for this type of review?
3. What should have been added/removed from the scoring criteria?
4. Were the criteria properly weighted?
5. There were no problems with the numerical rating scheme used: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
6. Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations and the Question and Answer period provided sufficient depth of review: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the review process? (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
8. As a reviewer, you were provided the presentation and project summary materials for review sufficiently prior to the start of the review: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)

9. During the review process, reviewers had adequate access to principle investigators, research staff or requested sources of additional data: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
10. Review instructions were provided in a timely manner: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
11. The format of the information provided in the presentations and project summaries was adequate for a meaningful review of the projects: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
12. The reviewers in my session had the proper mix and depth of credentials for the purpose of the review: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
13. Please provide any additional comments and recommendations on the overall review process:

Principal Investigator Specific Questions
1. Rate how well the staggered deadlines for submitting the presentations and project summaries for the review worked (project summaries were due 3 weeks prior to the presentations): (rate on a scale of 0 to 5)
2. Instructions for preparing the presentation and summary materials were sufficient: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
3. The right criteria were used to rate the project(s)/program and were clear and sufficient: (general comments/feedback)
4. The reviewers in my session had the proper mix of depth and credentials for the purpose of the review: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
5. Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentation and the Question and Answer session provided sufficient depth of review: (rate on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 being worst.)
6. Please provide any additional comments in the space below: